

**From:** [Gigi and Dushan](#)  
**To:** [info@planbayarea.org](mailto:info@planbayarea.org)  
**Subject:** Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 04, 2020 5:14:20 PM

---

**\*External Email\***

I am against my rural neighborhood, the Springs Specific Plan, included as one of your 2050 PDAs, for the following reasons:

1. We reside in a High Fire Area with limited routes for evacuation.
2. Bus line 32 does not meet the required headways, which is necessary to be considered as a PDA area. Bus 32 does not even run in the late afternoon or evening to be useful to commuters.
3. There is no plan in place to reduce green house gasses and/or a plan to reduce vehicle miles traveled which is needed prior to being designated as a PDA.
4. The PDA application was signed on 9-11-2019 and neither the residents nor the surrounding communities were consulted prior to the nomination which is against MTC policies on public participation.
5. There is no emergency back up water supply.
6. There is no industry in the area to support expansion.
7. The Springs Specific Plan sits outside the Urban growth boundary which is prohibited by where PDA's can be developed.
8. High-density development only belongs in incorporated urban areas that have the tax-base, governance and infrastructure to support it. The Springs area has none of these

The residents here were never included in the development of the Specific Plan which is against MTC policies of public disclosure and participation. Read the 2020 Sonoma County's Civil Grand Jury report and findings which confirms Permit Sonoma's failure to include the

homeowners in the development of the Springs Specific Plan. Please  
right this wrong and take us out of the Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint!

Resident of



Thank you neighbors for your help in protecting our area.

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).