

**From:** [Wendy Krupnick](#)  
**To:** [CityCouncilListPublic](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Maintain ban on new gas stations  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:22:50 PM

---

Dear Santa Rosa City Council members,

It is unbelievable that you are actually considering revising or eliminating the ban on new gas stations Santa Rosa and most of the other jurisdictions in the County have wisely adopted. Are there not enough climate related disasters happening already? And enormous political instability world wide due to dependence on oil? It would be insane and a violation of your duty to protect the well being of your constituents to remove this ban and allow any new or expanded oil infrastructure to move forward.

Please reject this proposal and focus on implementing policies that enhance the quality of life and sustainability of our city and region.

Thank you, Wendy Krupnick

Santa Rosa

**From:** [Jenny Blaker](#)  
**To:** [Stapp, Mark](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Alvarez, Eddie](#); [MacDonald, Dianna](#); [Fleming, Victoria](#); [Banuelos, Caroline](#); [Rogers, Natalie](#); [City Council Public Comments](#); [\\_CityCouncilListPublic](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] SR City Council 1/13/26: Item 4.1 - Gas Station Land Use Regulations  
**Date:** Sunday, January 11, 2026 11:42:28 AM

---

January 11, 2026

## **City Council, January 13, 2026: Item 4.1: Gas Station Land Use Regulations**

Dear Mayor Stapp, Vice Mayor Okrepkie, and Council members Alvarez, MacDonald, Fleming, Bañuelos and Rogers:

I am dismayed to learn that you are being asked to consider making changes to Ordinance No. 2022-010 prohibiting new gas stations and expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in Santa Rosa. I urge that no changes are made to the ordinance.

1. The reasons for approving the ordinance in 2022 are just as valid now as they were then, perhaps even more so. All the statements about greenhouse gas emissions, the serious health and environmental impacts of air pollution, and pollution of soil, surface and groundwater, the long-term impacts and future costs of remediating brownfield sites, the traffic impacts, and the economic considerations, including the increasing use of electric vehicles, are still just as true in 2026 as they were in 2020. Sales of electric vehicles surged in California in 2025.
2. The General Plan 2050 is clear and strong on its statements on the need to reduce the use of fossil fuels and greenhouse gas emissions, mostly due to vehicles, and the need to reduce vehicle miles traveled. Weakening the ordinance would contravene the General Plan and the City's stated policies on climate.
3. Those who worked on the wording of the ordinance did their job thoughtfully, carefully, and thoroughly. The ordinance does not prohibit improvements that would reduce health and environmental impacts of existing gas stations, such as safety upgrades. It just prohibits the construction of new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure. Period.
4. One very important question is WHY the request is being made to review the ordinance. At the June 3, 2025, City Council meeting, Mayor Okrepkie requested a future agenda item to look at potential modifications to the ordinance because it had "become an issue with some of our businesses looking to modify their gas stations." Neither the Staff Report nor the Attachments give any further explanation. I have heard that the request has come about because Costco wants to relocate the fossil fuel infrastructure at its current site. Is this true? Is Costco hoping to move or

expand to a new site? If so, what exactly is involved? Both the City Council and the public deserve a more complete and detailed explanation of the request for review.

5. Costco is expanding massively everywhere. Its business model is based on selling memberships (currently \$65-\$130/person, totaling approximately \$4.8 billion, or 73% of Costco's profits in 2024), then selling gas to members only at its gas stations, where the cost is significantly less than at other gas stations. Some people apparently drive miles, even 30-40 miles, out of their way to buy cheaper gas at Costco, but what are the costs of this to the local community and environment? If this is true, then Costco is adding to vehicle miles traveled, in direct contradiction to the City's General Plan and other stated climate policies to reduce VMT. What would be the impact to the City of making allowances for a corporation such as Costco, and should City policies, designed to protect the health and safety of the community, be overturned by corporate business interests in this way? Exactly what and where does Costco want to relocate? Or, if this is not the reason for the review, can the public please receive a full explanation of exactly what is being requested and why?

Sincerely

Jenny Blaker

**From:** [CONGAS](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Stapp, Mark](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Alvarez, Eddie](#); [MacDonald, Dianna](#); [Banuelos, Caroline](#); [Fleming, Victoria](#); [Rogers, Natalie](#); [Jones, Jessica](#); [Osburn, Gabe](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 4.1 Gasoline Station Land Use Regulations - Study Session  
**Date:** Monday, January 12, 2026 8:36:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [CONGAS Letter to SR City Council - Sept 12, 2026.pdf](#)

---

Good Morning,

Please see attached letter, also pasted below for convenience, regarding agenda item 4.1 on your January 13 agenda: Gasoline Station Land Use Regulations - Study Session

Please let me know if you have any difficulty accessing the attachment or have any questions.

Thank you,

Woody Hastings, Coordinator,  
Coalition Opposing New Gas Stations  
310-968-2757

[www.con-gas.org](http://www.con-gas.org)

-----



January 12, 2026

Mayor Mark Stapp, Vice Mayor Jeff Okrepkie, and Santa Rosa City Council  
City Hall, 100 Santa Rosa Ave,  
Santa Rosa, CA, 95404

Via email: [citycouncil@srcity.org](mailto:citycouncil@srcity.org)

**Subject: Agenda Item 4.1 Gas Station Land Use Regulations**

Dear Mayor Stapp, Vice Mayor Okrepkie, and Council Members,

On behalf of the Coalition Opposing New Gas Stations, its more than two dozen coalition organizational members, and its hundreds of supporters in Santa Rosa and thousands in Sonoma County, I write to strongly urge you to choose option 4. a. of the Staff Report: "Retain the existing Zoning Code regulations with no changes." There is no need to reconsider the ordinance.

The City Council and staff were careful in 2022 to adopt an ordinance that is narrowly confined to prohibiting the *construction of new gas stations* and the *expansion* of fossil fueling infrastructure at existing stations. The ordinance imposes no restrictions regarding modifications on any other aspect of a gasoline retail business.

As outlined in the staff report, there is no restriction on making modifications in order to comply with local, state, or federal law, for example, replacing single-wall underground fuel storage tanks (USTs) with double-walled tanks. Although a minor conditional use permit is required for modifications to fossil fuel infrastructure at existing gas stations, the ordinance does not prohibit such modifications as long as the modification does not constitute an

*expansion* of the fueling infrastructure. There are no prohibitions on making modifications in order to improve air, soil, and groundwater quality or for stormwater management. Gas stations may be modified to conform to current air quality or stormwater control regulations, or to remediate contamination of soil or groundwater. Modifications can also be made to improve public safety related to traffic circulation, pedestrian and cycling amenities and safety. Lastly, the ordinance does not prevent an existing gas station from adding electric vehicle charging to its facility.

Relocation of fueling islands/dispensers at an existing gas station are likewise not prohibited by the ordinance as long as the relocation does not include construction of *additional* dispensers or USTs. The relocation of, or addition of, USTs either on the same site or at a new site is a non-starter as allowing such a modification would defeat a major purpose of the ordinance, which is to cease the creation of toxic sites that will require costly future clean-up. The responsibility for the clean up of these contaminated sites, known as petroleum brownfields, is by law the owner and operator of the station, but the reality is that very often these responsible parties abandon their obligation, leaving local governments and their constituents holding the bag.

Until such time that the locations are fully remediated, they constitute an economic and environmental burden on the community in which they are located due to the fact that many future land uses are prohibited by state law until the site in question is cleaned up. These economic and environmental realities are detailed well in the 2021 report “Governing the Gasoline Spigot: Gas Stations and the Transition Away from Gasoline.”

In making the request that this item come to the Council for consideration, Vice Mayor Okrepkie stated that there is “zero latitude” in the ordinance for modifications not related to fossil fueling infrastructure. This is simply not the case, as outlined above. The ordinance is sound, as all of the similar ordinances are in the five other cities in the County that have adopted them, along with the County of Sonoma itself.

Also lacking and incomplete in the request that this item be heard was any specific information about the motivation and actual purpose of revisiting the ordinance. Vague references were made to local businesses interested in “renovations” and “relocations,” but coming from whom, and for what specific purpose?

CONGAS brought the original draft ordinance to the city council for consideration and worked closely with Santa Rosa’s Climate Action Subcommittee and city staff to refine it to suit Santa Rosa’s needs. We have heard nothing from anyone we worked with or from any Santa Rosa community member that there is a need to erode the thoughtfully-designed ordinance that was adopted.

2025 is on track to go down in the record books as one of the five hottest years ever, globally. Reminders of the impacts of global warming such as the devastating fires in southern California one year ago this month continue unabated. The reasons for the ordinance remain as strong today as they were in 2022.

Again, CONGAS sees no reason why the 2022 ordinance should be on the table for discussion in 2026. We strongly urge you to choose option 4. a. of the Staff Report: “Retain the existing Zoning Code regulations with no changes.”

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Woody Hastings". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Woody Hastings, Coordinator, Coalition Opposing New Gas Stations

cc:

City Council Clerk

Jessica Jones, Deputy Director, Planning and Economic Development

Gabe Osburn, Director of Planning and Economic Development



January 12, 2026

Mayor Mark Stapp, Vice Mayor Jeff Okrepkie, and Santa Rosa City Council  
City Hall, 100 Santa Rosa Ave,  
Santa Rosa, CA, 95404  
Via email: [citycouncil@srcity.org](mailto:citycouncil@srcity.org)

**Subject: Agenda Item 4.1 Gas Station Land Use Regulations**

Dear Mayor Stapp, Vice Mayor Okrepkie, and Council Members,

On behalf of the Coalition Opposing New Gas Stations, its more than two dozen coalition organizational members, and its hundreds of supporters in Santa Rosa and thousands in Sonoma County, I write to strongly urge you to choose option 4. a. of the Staff Report: “Retain the existing Zoning Code regulations with no changes.” There is no need to reconsider the ordinance.

The City Council and staff were careful in 2022 to adopt an ordinance that is narrowly confined to prohibiting the construction of new gas stations and the expansion of fossil fueling infrastructure at existing stations. The ordinance imposes no restrictions regarding modifications on any other aspect of a gasoline retail business.

As outlined in the staff report, there is no restriction on making modifications in order to comply with local, state, or federal law, for example, replacing single-wall underground fuel storage tanks (USTs) with double-walled tanks. Although a minor conditional use permit is required for modifications to fossil fuel infrastructure at existing gas stations, the ordinance does not prohibit such modifications as long as the modification does not constitute an expansion of the fueling infrastructure. There are no prohibitions on making modifications in order to improve air, soil, and groundwater quality or for stormwater management. Gas stations may be modified to conform to current air quality or stormwater control regulations, or to remediate contamination of soil or groundwater. Modifications can also be made to improve public safety related to traffic circulation, pedestrian and cycling amenities and safety. Lastly, the ordinance does not prevent an existing gas station from adding electric vehicle charging to its facility.

Relocation of fueling islands/dispensers at an existing gas station are likewise not prohibited by the ordinance as long as the relocation does not include construction of *additional* dispensers or USTs. The relocation of, or addition of, USTs either on the same site or at a new site is a non-starter as allowing such a modification would defeat a major purpose of the ordinance, which is to cease the creation of toxic sites that will require costly future clean-up. The responsibility for the clean up of these contaminated sites, known as petroleum brownfields,<sup>1</sup> is by law the owner and operator of the station, but the reality is that very often these responsible parties abandon their obligation, leaving local governments and their constituents holding the bag.

Until such time that the locations are fully remediated, they constitute an economic and environmental burden on the community in which they are located due to the fact that many future land uses are prohibited by state law until the site in question is cleaned up. These economic and environmental realities are detailed

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/ust/petroleum-brownfields>

well in the 2021 report “Governing the Gasoline Spigot: Gas Stations and the Transition Away from Gasoline.”<sup>2</sup>

In making the request that this item come to the Council for consideration, Vice Mayor Okrepkie stated that there is “zero latitude” in the ordinance for modifications not related to fossil fueling infrastructure. This is simply not the case, as outlined above. The ordinance is sound, as all of the similar ordinances are in the five other cities in the County that have adopted them, along with the County of Sonoma itself.

Also lacking and incomplete in the request that this item be heard was any specific information about the motivation and actual purpose of revisiting the ordinance. Vague references were made to local businesses interested in “renovations” and “relocations,” but coming from whom, and for what specific purpose?

CONGAS brought the original draft ordinance to the city council for consideration and worked closely with Santa Rosa’s Climate Action Subcommittee and city staff to refine it to suit Santa Rosa’s needs. We have heard nothing from anyone we worked with or from any Santa Rosa community member that there is a need to erode the thoughtfully-designed ordinance that was adopted.

2025 is on track to go down in the record books as one of the five hottest years ever, globally.<sup>3</sup> Reminders of the impacts of global warming such as the devastating fires in southern California one year ago this month continue unabated. The reasons for the ordinance remain as strong today as they were in 2022.

Again, CONGAS sees no reason why the 2022 ordinance should be on the table for discussion in 2026. We strongly urge you to choose option 4. a. of the Staff Report: “Retain the existing Zoning Code regulations with no changes.”

Respectfully,



Woody Hastings, Coordinator, Coalition Opposing New Gas Stations

cc:  
City Council Clerk  
Jessica Jones, Deputy Director, Planning and Economic Development  
Gabe Osburn, Director of Planning and Economic Development

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://coltura.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Governingthegasolinespigot.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://wmo.int/news/media-centre/2025-set-be-second-or-third-warmest-year-record-continuing-exceptionally-high-warming-trend>