

Neiger, Jeanette

From: CAO-Clerk
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 8:41 AM
To: Hannigan, Erin; Brown, Monica E.; Spering, Jim P.; Vasquez, John M.; Thomson, Skip
Cc: Wilson, Michael L.; Lacey, Josette M.; Hallett, Stephen L.; Dwyer, Kelly; Cook, Catherine M.; Goerke-Shrode, Sabine; Chalk, Ryan L.; Hamilton, Jennifer; Louzon, Anna M.; Patterson, Adrienne L.; Corsello, Birgitta E.; Huston, Nancy L.; Bezek, James M.; Emlen, Bill F.; Schmidtbauer, Terry; Bunting, Dennis W.; Darbinian, Azniv; Nolan, Jodene F.; Neiger, Jeanette
Subject: FW: Resolution of the Solano County Board of Supervisors Use Permit No. U-16-04 - the "Resolution"

Please see the email noted below regarding Item 25, Caymus Suisun Winery on today's agenda.

Myra Chirila

Administrative Secretary
Solano County Board of Supervisors
675 Texas Street, Suite 6500
Fairfield, CA 94533
MEChirila@solanocounty.com
Telephone: 707-784-6126
Fax: 707-784-6665

From: xValerie Dodini [mailto:valsatt@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2017 3:57 PM
To: Michael T. Carlson <MCarlson@caymus.com>
Cc: Hannigan, Erin <EHannigan@SolanoCounty.com>; Brown, Monica E. <MEBrown@SolanoCounty.com>; Spering, Jim P. <JPSpering@SolanoCounty.com>; Vasquez, John M. <JMVASQUEZ@SolanoCounty.com>; Thomson, Skip <SThompson@SolanoCounty.com>; Mary Browning <mbrowning@valleyinternet.com>; CAO-Clerk <Clerk@SolanoCounty.com>
Subject: Re: Resolution of the Solano County Board of Supervisors Use Permit No. U-16-04 - the "Resolution"

Ms Dodini is physically unable to be at this meeting
And no amount of advance planning would have
Changed that. Mr Carlson's claim that I could be
There is out of line.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 25, 2017, at 3:47 PM, Michael T. Carlson <MCarlson@caymus.com> wrote:

Dear Solano County Board of Supervisors,

We write to you in response to Ms. Dodini's below email correspondence and previous request for a continuance of the pending appeal stemming from the Planning Commission's approval of Use Permit U-16-04 for the Caymus-Suisun Winery on August 3, 2017. We vehemently oppose this request for continuance for several reasons:

- (1) Ms. Dodini and Ms. Browning jointly filed the appeal, and Ms. Browning will be present at tomorrow's hearing;
- (2) Ms. Dodini has had adequate time to plan for this hearing and make arrangements to be present; and
- (3) Any further delays will certainly result in our inability to commence work at the site and prepare the building pad(s) prior to winter, which will cause substantial delay in completing any aspect of the project, much less Phase I, before the end of calendar year 2018.

For all the foregoing reasons, we do not believe a continuance is appropriate or necessary. Thank you.

Regards,
Mike

Michael T. Carlson
Vice President and General
Counsel

Wagner Family of Wine

Office: 707.967.3000 x262

MCarlson@caymus.com



From: VALERIE DODINI [<mailto:valsatt@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Monday, September 25, 2017 2:50 PM

To: ehannigan@solanocounty.com; mebrown@solanocounty.com; jpspering@solanocounty.com; jmvasquez@solanocounty.com; sthomson@solanocounty.com

Cc: Mary Browning; Michael T. Carlson

Subject: Resolution of the Solano County Board of Supervisors Use Permit No. U-16-04 - the "Resolution"

Dear Solano County Board of Supervisors,

I write as I cannot be at the meeting on Sept. 26th for Mrs. Browning's and my appeal of the subject Resolution.

The Board is scheduled to consider my request for a continuance. I have read the Resolution, and, from its content, it appears the board is not inclined to grant my request for a continuance.

Should this be the case, I note that the Resolution does not address my Due Process claim, to wit, that the county failed to give the People adequate notice of this project. This project will impact the lives of many people, yet the county did not provide the public with the description of the Caymus project, as noted in Caymus's application ("see attached project description" written on the Caymus application, but said description was never disseminated). The public was not provided with substantive information on this project that they were entitled to by law. Consequently, we were not given the full picture of what this project is supposed to be. Due Process is a Constitutional right that the county has, from all appearances, chosen to ignore.

From what I know about this project it is not on par with the lifestyle and character of Solano County -- this project is not merely a winery -- it is a winery on steroids. I cannot

believe that this type of winery is one that was envisioned by either the General Plan or the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan. Many may be in favor due to the money aspect, but I believe this approach is short-sighted. This winery, if it comes to fruition, stands to negatively impact the health, safety and lifestyle of those who live in its vicinity or have to travel by it. It's easy for the county to claim it won't have a negative impact when it hasn't even been built yet. Just one example: The surrounding infrastructure is inadequate to handle the increase in traffic, which could be disastrous if there were a fire.

Finally I note #56 on the Resolution. It calls for the project to be halted only if human remains and only human remains are found. I believe this is not in keeping with CEQA, which refers to Native American artifacts as historical resources (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, 15064.5). As the Resolution stands now, if burial artifacts, pottery, arrowheads or anything of that ilk are uncovered during excavation, Caymus can simply till them under and bury them without so much as blinking. I believe the county, if #56 remains as is, could potentially be doing our Native American ancestors a grave and significant injustice. I ask that the county change #56 so as to include historical resources in keeping with 15064.5.

Respectfully submitted,
Valerie J. Dodini