

**Patterson, Adrienne L.**

---

**From:** E. A. DeCaro <bewareofmuddle@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 05, 2018 8:10 AM  
**To:** Thomson, Skip; Winston, Alexandra  
**Cc:** Patterson, Adrienne L.; Winston, Alexandra  
**Subject:** Solano 360 Concerns

Dear Supervisor Thomson,

Thank you to Adrienne for returning my call yesterday on your behalf. As I conveyed to her yesterday I have significant concerns regarding the Solano 360 project and the possible vote today to demolish potentially historic structures for a project with little substantive review. This should be more than a consent calendar vote (and it certainly shouldn't have been scheduled on a election day with little public notification). I learned of it from a newspaper article published yesterday. I would fathom to guess the general public is not generally aware of this project and the substantial negative ramifications it could have.

- The project was conceived in 2008 at the height of the real estate bubble. Nothing contained in that draft EIR is relevant today. Per the Solano County web page for the project, the last semblance of public review was 2013 - half a decade ago. At that time the Draft EIR did not fully address the potential historic significance of the structures being considered for demolition. (it merely promises to assess them for significance beforehand - a promise that runs counter to the requirements of CEQA).
- Was an historic assessment done for the historic structures in question? If so when and who was consulted? The Solano County Historical Society was never consulted. Were the Vallejo Architectural Heritage Foundation or Vallejo Naval and Historical Museum? If not, why not? Where are the assessments if they were done? If they weren't completed, per the EIR, it is premature to authorize demolition.
- The numbers don't add up. Per the California Department of Fairs and Agriculture 2016 STOP report, our fair is in the black not the red. It is also in line with neighboring fairs. Based on the report alone, there is no need to 'downgrade' the fair in an attempt to garner more state funding (per the last budget report submitted by the Board to the BOS)
- The last budget report references unnamed interested parties (developers). Who are these individuals/entities? What specific request have they made to the Fair Board?
- The line items in the STOP report that stands out for concern is the high pension allocation compared to surrounding, equitable fairs. Why is the pension expense so high when it is managed by a BOS appointed board?

- From a cursory review of the STOP (pages 23 and 24) and Solano budgets, the actual reason for the budget concern for the fair is the 4 million dollar consulting expenditure specific to the Solano 360 project.
- "Consulting" is a term I'd use loosely. It appears the study wasn't specific to the needs of the fair, but rather was a specific retail development scheme.
- To justify the project the fair itself is being run into the ground. Case in point, the reduction of scheduled days from 5 to 2 and the exclusion of activities that generate revenue.
- The project has significant public safety issues. The secondary purpose of the fair was evident with the recent fires. It (like all of the other surrounding county fairs) was utilized for providing emergency shelter. If this is lost due to redevelopment, the county will be ill prepared to provide basic necessities.
- The EIR doesn't cover the land use requirements/stipulations that were placed on the property at the time the fair was established requiring it to remain a fair.

These points only scratch the surface. Please do not vote for demolition of these structures without a more substantive and updated review of the project.

With Respect,  
Elissa DeCaro