

# APPROVED

## City of Sebastopol City Council Regular Meeting Minutes

### Meeting of February 16, 2016

#### Approved by the City Council at their Regular City Council Meeting of March 1, 2016

6:00 pm - Convene Regular City Council Meeting, Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, Ca

The public is advised that pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.5 all writings submitted to the City Council are public records and will be made available for review.

Please note that minutes are not verbatim minutes and are meant to be the City's record of a summary of actions that took place at the meeting.

Notice: All resolutions and ordinances introduced and/or adopted under this agenda are waived of all reading of entire resolution(s) and ordinance(s).

The Sebastopol City Council welcomes you to its meetings that are generally scheduled for the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of every month. Your interest and participation are encouraged and appreciated.

A notice of the meeting was posted by the City Clerk on February 10, 2016.

#### **6:00 pm      Convene Regular City Council Meeting, Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, Ca**

**Call to Order:** Mayor Gurney called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

#### **Roll Call**

**Present:** Mayor Gurney  
Vice Mayor Glass  
Councilmember Eder  
Councilmember Jacob  
Councilmember Slayter

**Absent:** None

**Staff:** City Manager-City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
City Clerk Mary Gourley  
Engineering Manager Henry Mikus  
Finance Director Ana Kwong  
Fire Chief Bill Braga  
Planning Director Kenyon Webster  
Superintendent of Public Works Rich Emig  
Captain James Conner

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG:** Mayor Gurney led the salute to the flag.  
**PROCLAMATION(S)/PRESENTATION(S):**

The following was presented:

- Proclamation Honoring the 15th Anniversary of the Next STEP Newsletter and Recognizing Patricia Dines for Her Work for the STEP Newsletter

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** (This is an opportunity for the public to address the City Council on items that are not listed on the agenda. This time is set aside to receive comments from the public regarding matters of general interest not on the agenda, but related to City Council business. Pursuant to the Brown Act, however, the City Council cannot consider any issues or take action on any requests during this comment period. Speakers are allowed to speak for a maximum of three minutes so that all speakers have an opportunity to address the City Council. The Mayor has the authority to limit the time allowed for speakers dependent on the amount of speakers in attendance. It is the goal of the Council to conclude the public comments portion of the agenda within 30 minutes. If the public comment period exceeds twenty minutes, the presiding officer, typically the Mayor, reserves the right to reduce the time per speaker or carry over public comments to after all business items are completed.)

Colleen Fernald, Norlee Street, commented as follows:

- Waiting on meeting with Mayor
- Discussed Madame Albright's comments
- Discussed politics interfering with justice
- Discussed her personal problems with raping and other crimes committed
- Stated something can be done
- Stated person is not being held accountable due to failure of law enforcement
- Stated this is disturbing
- Stated a meeting needs to be conducted in person to hear facts that have been recorded as evidence
- Discussed an article in the paper with Representative Barbara Lee and President Obama
- Discussed approaching Representative Lee to stop criminal unconstitutional policies
- Discussed undeclared unconstitutional wars
- Stated we are the world's leading terrorists

ila Benavidez-Heaster, 7777 Bodega Avenue, commented as follows:

- Discussed the request for a stop light
- Thanked the Council for reading all the emails and letters
- Stated the Council indicates they ae with them a 100 percent
- Commended Safe Bodega for leading the way
- Thanked Chief Weaver and stated he is exceptional
- Discussed having only numbers in front of the Council
- Please take into mind that the only reason there are no more incidents are because the people at Bodega and Nelson Way when they go across the road, they do defensive walking and defense driving
- Stated they need a stop light
- Numbers are important but does not reflect the reality of what is going on
- Do not go across that way unless clear
- Doing defensive walking and defensive driving

Michael Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Discussed shoes
- Stated 75% of people have disposable shoes
- Discussed toxics and cheap labor
- Stated they last one to two years at most then dumped into the trash
- Bring consciousness to shoes worn
- Expensive but will last
- Become fertilizer when thrown into the dump
- Sebastopol's current residency throw 50,000 pairs of shoes in the dump every ten years

**STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST BY MAYOR/CITY COUNCILMEMBERS FOR ITEMS ON THE AGENDA** (This is the time for the Mayor or City Councilmembers to indicate any statements of conflicts of interests for any item listed on this agenda)

*There were none.*

Consent calendar items are routine matters or matters which have been reviewed by the City Council previously. These items may be approved by one motion without discussion unless a member of the City Council requests that the item be taken off the consent calendar. Items removed from the consent calendar will be taken up upon completion of action on the remainder of the items on the consent calendar.

Vice Mayor Glass moved and Councilmember Slayter seconded the motion to approve Consent Calendar Items Numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Eder, Jacob, Slayter, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Gurney  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM(S):**

1. Approval of Minutes of February 2, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes (City Clerk)  
**City Council Action: Approved the Minutes of the February 2, 2016 City Council Meeting**  
**Minute Order Number: 2016-037**
2. Approval of Amendment No. 2 to Contract with Questa Engineering, Professional Services, Skategarden Expansion Project (Planning Director)  
**City Council Action: Approved the Amendment Number 2 to Contract with Questa Engineering Professional Services, Skategarden Expansion Project**  
**Minute Order Number: 2016-038**
3. Approval and Authorization for Approval of Resolution for the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency for CalRecycle City-County Payment Program Beverage Container Recycling Grant (Engineering Manager)  
**City Council Action: Approved Resolution for the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency for CalRecycle City-County Payment Program Beverage Container Recycling Grant**  
**Resolution Number: 6070**
4. Approval of Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget Sub-Committee Meeting Schedule (Finance Director)  
**City Council Action: Approve Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget Sub-Committee Meeting Schedule**  
**Minute Order Number: 2016-039**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEM(S) AND/OR PRESENTATION(S):** NONE

**PUBLIC HEARING(S):** NONE

**REGULAR CALENDAR AGENDA ITEM(S) (DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION):**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATION:**

5. Presentation to the City Council from PG&E on Change out of PG&E Owned Street Lights to LED by PG&E and Request for Approval (Superintendent of Public Works)

Superintendent of Public Works Emig presented the staff report recommending the City Council receive the presentation from PG&E on Change out of PG&E Owned Street Lights to LED by PG&E.

Brian Bottari, PG&E representative, provided a presentation on LED Streetlight Upgrade for the City of Sebastopol.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Commended Rich Emig on the comprehensive information provided to the City Council
- Requested a description of how this program is paid for and if there are any effects on rate payers' utility bills

Brian Bottari commented as follows:

- Displayed the LED program incremental facility chart – shows how program is funded
- \$2.81 charge per light for next two years – possibly longer

Jeff Bollard commented as follows:

- \$2.81 – not permanent charge – duration of time program is reimbursed
- Stated it is at CPUC discretion
- Stated charge will most likely go away in 2018

Mayor Gurney questioned if this fee is per customer.

Mr. Bollard stated it is per fixture and that the net cost is a reduction in fees with no upfront out of pocket costs.

Councilmember Eder questioned if the City will see an increase in the cost to pay to operate for use of the street lights, but that the individual rate payers will not see an increase.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Stated no one will see an increase on their bills
- Stated this only relates to the customer of record
- Stated this only applies to people who get discount
- Stated the only scenario of rater payers who will pay more is if the light wattage is dramatically increased
- Discussed the direct cost to the facility
- Stated once it is paid for, the fee will go away
- Stated it could go away sooner than that depending on CPUC

Councilmember Eder discussed the material of the standardized 4000 Kelvin light fixture and questioned if this is standard in the entire retrofit program.

Mr. Bollard commented that it is and that it relates to the selection process, but that PG&E is evaluating new technologies.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Read that 3000 Kelvin lights are now commonly available on the market at the same cost as the 4000 Kelvin lights
- Questioned if there are options for individual cities to indicate what light fixtures they like to have them retrofitted

Mr. Bollard stated it is the 4000 Kelvin fixture only.

Councilmember Eder commented this is a huge decision and the City is in the information gathering phase rather than the decision making phase.

Mr. Bollard stated this program is an opt-in program.

Councilmember Eder questioned if individual locations will be assessed for light trespass and can they be shielded accordingly.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Stated PG&E has provided an inventory of lights that they are planning to change
- Stated the City can select the brightness and wattage
- Stated if there are issues after the fact, such as a need for shields, those things can be done
- Stated that decision would be made by the City and not the residents
- Stated it is the customer of record who makes the choice of the fixture
- Discussed another City where the customers requested shielding
- Stated decision will be up to City but the cost to shield is about \$200 per fixture and the City would pay for the shield
- Stated the intent is not to spread the cost to the rate payers in town who do not receive benefit of shield

Councilmember Eder questioned the use of remote control for turning lights off or on.

Mr. Bollard stated none of that is included in this program and that there is no communication and no other attempt to make intelligent light fixtures for turning the bulbs off or on.

Councilmember Eder questioned if there is an industry for remote controlled light fixtures.

Mr. Bollard commented he is not an expert in that field and that it would be driven by manufacturers as opposed to cities.

Councilmember Eder questioned if the City wanted to do testing of fixtures in a certain test area, would PG&E be amenable to that.

Mr. Bollard stated if that were the case, it would probably not be at PG&E's cost, but stated that PG&E can provide locations of where they have already been changed out.

Councilmember Eder discussed light flicker and questioned if this is a function of the quality of drive in the LED light.

Mr. Bollard stated he is not an expert and does not know if the flicker of light is related to electricity, and that he has not heard about problems with flicker.

Councilmember Eder commented in the event the City wanted to use different types of light fixtures, is there a mechanism by which the City could have those installed and pay back the cost of the retrofit through the energy savings. He discussed working outside the program.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Stated he did not know for sure that answer to that question
- Stated something similar has been done with poles

- Stated it was worked out over time
- Stated he can research this question
- Stated the inventory products installed to provide support and maintenance and they are constrained to some level

Vice Mayor Glass commented if the City were to sign up for this, could PG&E provide analysis of the costs and savings.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Stated a spreadsheet could be provided
- Stated PG&E would need to have specific costs from the different energy provide
- Stated PG&E can get together with staff and do the math

Vice Mayor Glass commented that given the City would be paying \$\$2.81 for fixtures, it would be helpful to see how much in total billing it will be and what can the City expect to pay. She stated she would like to see information on how much energy the City is using and what we are paying and what we will be paying.

Mr. Bollard stated PG&E can compute both, but the City will need to select the fixtures and wattages. He stated he can supply numbers for energy costs that the City is paying now and discussed transmission and distribution.

Vice Mayor Glass questioned how does the actual brightness of what PG&E is proposing to install compares to what we have now and can the City choose the wattage.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Stated the City can choose the wattage
- Discussed that the City Council could choose to reduce wattage of existing lights during the LED change out program, therefore also reducing the LED wattages

Vice Mayor Glass discussed lumens for lumens.

The contractor from CREE for the LED lights commented as follows:

- Stated people want more light
- Stated PG&E has determined which lights to use through the procurement process
- Stated they are good at trying to make sure that areas are not over-lighted

Vice Mayor Gurney commented that the before and after pictures shown are not good for this City, and the City is not looking to be brighter and lighter.

Councilmember Slayter questioned if these lights are similar to the ones just recently placed in the Santa Rosa Junior College area.

Mr. Bollard stated he did not know, but he can find out.

Councilmember Slayter commented that area is similar to our neighborhoods, it is close at hand to see, and is a new installation that is a good example of what the lights would look like.

Mr. Bottari stated he will find out and get back to the Council with the information.

Councilmember Slayter questioned if the \$200 per light fixture to shield would be borne by the City and not born by any part of the program.

Mr. Bollard stated that the costs would be borne by the City but that they could easily be paid for out of the energy savings. He discussed experiences of this happening with other cities.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Stated the quality of the light is a significant concern
- Stated the difference between lights is significant
- Stated it would be of interest to potentially retrofit 2700 K lamps into luminaires down the road
- Questioned if these lights are modular

Mr. Bollard showed a photo of the fixture on the projection screen.

Councilmember Slayter questioned if the lights are integral with the luminaire.

Mr. Bollard stated that is correct.

Councilmember Jacob commented if for the 25 lights that are City owned, this is a loan program.

Mr. Bottari commented that it is a loan program and that other cities have done this and stated it is an on-bill financing program.

Councilmember Jacob questioned if the City is planning to take advantage of that program and is that a decision before the Council on how to deal with the 25 owned City lights.

Superintendent Emig stated that the City installed the decorative lights on the Plaza through a grant and that the City could go through the financial program with PG&E to retrofit the City owned lights.

Councilmember Jacob questioned if the city would keep the decorative lights and only replace the old lights.

Superintendent Emig commented that the City has other lights in town that could be retrofitted.

Mayor Gurney clarified that PG&E could complete the spreadsheet that shows the analysis before the City decides whether or not to commit to the program.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Stated they could do the spreadsheet
- Stated they would do the match
- Stated they would work with staff to get the costs from Sonoma Clean Power

Mayor Gurney discussed Santa Cruz who had increased the power and the lights had to be shielded.

Mr. Bollard stated they increased the wattage to a 100 wattage equivalent LED and shields were installed.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated in the report it states no upfront costs for the City
- Discussed capital costs paid by PG&E
- Recouped in energy savings
- Savings realized by City
- Not pay money to have this done
- PG&E do labor and material
- Recover PG&E costs by billing City
- Questioned how PG&E bills the \$\$2.81 surcharge

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Discussed the new, added incremental facility charge
- Discussed the charge for the light
- Discussed regular maintenance
- Discussed a new, lower energy charge
- New added incremental facility charge
- Energy cost reduction
- See net reduction

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Clarified that the energy costs will go down if the City has use of these materials
- Incremental charge will pay P&GE back for labor and materials
- Once paid off that charge goes away

Mr. Bottari stated once installed, the City will already be in the savings mode.

Mayor Gurney questioned if CPUC approves the length of the charge.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Stated the charge will be discontinued once it is fully reimbursed – stated it will stop automatically
- Stated the City will not continue to pay if the program is paid for in full
- Anticipate CPUC will decide to drop that charge before PG&E is fully reimbursed for program
- Cost stays in effect until fully reimbursed

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows;

- Questioned if staff can remind the Council and the public how the power bill works
- Questioned if a power bill arrives at the City and this bill is paid for through the Street Light Assessment District

Superintendent Emig stated that is correct. He stated the City receives three to four invoices per month and they are paid out of the Street Light Assessment Fund.

Councilmember Slayter questioned if the funds that flow into that fund from the Street Light Assessment District are from the property owners tax bill.

Director Kwong stated that is correct.

Councilmember Slayter stated this is where the Sebastopol residents will see the savings - on their property tax bill.

Superintendent Emig requested clarification as follows:

- Stated it is his understanding that the Kelvin deals with color and the wattage is brightness
- Stated from 3000 – 4000 is more of being a white light
- Stated the lower is more like color from the high pressure sodium lights

Mr. Bollard stated that is correct.

Superintendent Emig commented as follows:

- When talking of brightness, specifically talking of wattage
- Color would be whatever Kelvin wanted
- If City did not do at this time, in future may be possible to do a future program, including the 3000 Kelvin
- Stated the City does not have to do this at this time

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated the City may want to put a different fixture on top, but stated the City has no choice
- Streetscape decorations may be inappropriate
- Cannot choose fixture

The contractor from CREE for the LED lights commented as follows:

- Stated the color is the temperature
- Stated the fixture shown is the look of the fixture
- Stated the Mayor is correct

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Needs to be clearly stated the concern in our town of bright LED lights
- Understanding the 4000 Kelvin fixtures is that the higher the Kelvin the more blue the light is
- Stated when move down in the 2700 Kelvin lamp, the more yellow and rich the color of the light is
- Questioned if that is accurate

Mr. Bollard stated it is independent of the wattage.

Councilmember Eder questioned if the Kelvin rating is directly linked to the color correlation.

The contractor from CREE for the LED lights, commented as follows:

- Stated the 3000 Kelvin is something they are looking at now
- Stated there are products available that are inefficient
- Stated dropping the color temperature of the luminaire makes the LED go down
- Discussed a 56 watt LED fixture in 4000 Kelvin to get that same light output in 3000 Kelvin would have to be 83 watts and this would start burning the savings

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated they are talking two different concepts
- Discussed energy savings

- Discussed quality of light output and color of light out and effect of light output
- Stated this is disconnected
- Discussed the lower Kelvin rated fixture is preferred
- Stated the blue rich LED lights are 10-15 percent more efficient than yellow lights

The contractor from CREE stated he will need to run the calculation.

Councilmember Eder questioned if CREE (contractor's company) makes 3000 Kelvin fixtures.

The contractor from CREE stated not in all types.

Councilmember Eder questioned if in the equivalent rating cost is there a differential in terms of sale price.

The contractor from CREE stated in quantity, there is a great deal of different and the price is much higher for 3000.

Vice Mayor Glass questioned what is the standard street light wattage.

The contractor from CREE commented as follows:

- Stated it varies
- Discussed the high pressure sodium range of 70 – 400 watts
- Stated residential is typically 70 watts
- Stated the arterial is normally 150-200 watts
- Stated major intersections are brighter
- Stated the decision for wattage is typically made by the Public Works Departments

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Questioned if staff knows what our wattage is for our lights
- Questioned if the range is 70-400
- Questioned what is the wattage of most of our lights

Superintendent Emig commented as follows:

- Stated staff has a list of all the street lights in town
- Stated the wattage varies
- Stated the range is not in any particular order
- Discussed range of wattage from 70-150
- Stated he does not know the percentage of which lights are which wattages

Vice Mayor Glass commented if it would be accurate that there is a lower wattage in residential areas and higher wattages in arterials.

Superintendent Emig stated one would think that, but he would have to review to make sure.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment.

Donna Fisher, Cleveland Avenue, commented as follows:

- Stated she is speaking on behalf of her husband
- Read a prepared statement

- Discussed the effects of health and enjoyment of the City
- Discussed her husband being a graphic designer
- Stated there should never give a go ahead without first showing the client proof and getting approval from the client
- Color shifts under different light
- Suggested showing the lights under the conditions of the intended use
- Stated the City can learn something from the City of Davis
- Propose small trial with 15 street lamps
- Discussed locations of lamps
- Discussed broad public feedback
- Received email from her husband who stated he spoke with experts
- Read email from Mr. Peters

Michael Carnacchi, 385 Murphy Street, commented as follows:

- Second Councilmember Eder's suggestion to try it first as a test project
- Brought LED light and showed brightness to the City Council
- Asked for list of local cities to see their lights
- Discussed carbon footprint
- Discussed life expectancy and replacement costs – difference between LED and HPS
- Ask that for spreadsheet to see costs and savings
- Discussed a Street light phenomenal – walk up and light goes off or on

Margie Stewart, 1418 Deer Lane, commented a follows:

- Good reason to prioritize energy efficiency and make improvements
- Reservations about plan to retrofit with blue white intensity LED Street lights
- Discussed her own personal experience with the types of lights
- Stated she was sitting next to Whole Foods, outside lights went on, intensive glare of lights
- Created eye strain, headaches and overall malaise
- Stated she packed up and left
- Discussed scientific studies with exposure to high intensity LEDs
- Discussed flicker
- Discussed brightness
- Discussed not seeing night sky or stargazing
- Useful to learn from community that has undertaken street light
- Discussed Davis, CA
- Stated citizens spoke up
- In response, City agreed to replace with lower intensity lighting 2700K color temperature
- Encourage City Council to say no to PG&E plan to replace street lighting with very white lamps
- Consider lower intensity

Bridgette commented as follows:

- Read a prepared statement
- Discussed being environmental stewards
- Discussed HPS containing mercury
- Questioned how would they be handled
- LED have no standard or specs for manufacturing
- Many cities holding back from doing this project

- Stated the CPUC believes current life time savings may be over or under estimated by 50 percent or more
- IEEE – LED reduce melatonin 5 times more than current light
- Melatonin most potent antioxidant hormone in body
- Causes insomnia, depression and leads to people using drugs
- Future pollution of ground water
- Impaired judgment and slow reactions of sleep deprived people
- LED – classified as hazardous waste
- Say no thanks PG&E
- Like LED Traffic Lights
- Thanked Rich Emig and the City Council

Dave Hubert commented as follows:

- Discussed looking online on this subject
- Saw night mares of different cities
- Not be subject to that in Sebastopol
- Checked out Santa Rosa – pretty bad and nasty and blue
- Putting in 4000K street lights
- Matter of quality of life
- Have control over quality of life
- Living here to enjoy ability to have control over life
- Been in touch with Board Member of Dark Sky Association
- Received information
- Very little difference now from most manufacturers between 4000 versus 3000
- Stated he is surprise to hear that it costs that much more
- Stated the City of Davis got rid of theirs
- Stated that PG&E bought a lot of fixtures that hold 4000 for this retrofit program
- Questioned if 3000 can be ordered today from CREE
- Stated we can learn lessons from the City of Davis
- Discussed money lost on this project

Alan Horn, lives and works in Sebastopol for last 20 years, commented as follows:

- Reject this program
- Changes will block out night sky
- Blocks Sebastopol from seeing wondrous night skies
- Not block from what God intended us to see
- Want to see night skies
- Propose Sebastopol EMF become advisory committee to City Council on all matters pertaining to high tech issues similar to this
- Suggested the Council engage in this teaching/learning relationship as opposed to an adversarial relationship
- Stated EMF has experts and knowledge
- Stated it would be wise to consider consulting with EMGF on these matters

Louse Stanfield from Santa Rosa, commented as follows:

- Stated this program is ill-advised and avoidable
- Urged the Council not to opt in
- Discussed Santa Rosa's retrofit

- Believe this was to the detriment of Santa Rosa
- Encourage Council to take field trip to Santa Rosa
- Discussed more glare than old style sodium based lights
- Eyes adapt and readjust from areas of experience of brightness to darker spaces
- Hazardous to drivers and pedestrians alike
- Discussed squinting of seeing LED headlights
- Discussed LED streets lights
- Stated this will diminish safety
- Discussed residential LED street lights
- Discussed light trespass issues
- Unacceptable intrusion into private lives and enjoyment of homes
- Reject PW recommendation to Opt in
- Vote No

Patricia Dines commented as follows:

- Appreciate questions that the Council is asking
- On right track
- 4000k – easy to say no to
- Discussed quality of life
- Warmth of current lights
- Horrifies if bright white
- Understand temptation to save money
- Concern of LEDs
- Culture loves to rush into new technology
- Concerned of EMF
- Not know LED really improves safety
- See enough evidence to be cautious
- EMF network is very useful
- Discussed the Take Back your Power movie
- Basis of life is vibration
- Voiced concern and stated this is not worth the risk of harm to both the health of the City and the enjoyment of the attitude and feeling of the town

Wes commented as follows:

- Pointed out unique charm of Sebastopol
- Pleasure to live here
- Not bought in to high tech
- Painful to look at LED lights
- Doing what tactical lights do – intended to blind someone
- Feel blinded when looking up
- Stated this is a safety concern and issue
- Praise Council for doing due diligence and considering all the evidence and listening to the citizens

Sandi Mauer, EMF Safety Network, commented as follows:

- Thanked PG&E for answering questions
- Thanked staff for getting answers
- Stated they feel their concerns have been taken seriously

- Spent hours of research and writing to understand this information
- Most people who spoke tonight covered many of the issues that LED presents
- Discussed rate payers paying costs
- Stated the customer will pay
- Most important thing to note is the fact the CPUC regulates PG&E
- Stated there are highly uncertain lists, costs, energy savings, 50 percent more or less than claimed, report out of PCUC is due out in March
- Like to reject offer
- Went to Santa Rosa and looked at the lights
- Blue and painfully bright
- Not good for people or wildlife
- Bring back to table and find another way to save energy
- 4000K not approved and stated only 2700 are approved
- LEDs listed as verified as transmitting radiation but CREE and PG&E both say they do not

Nancy Hubert commented as follows:

- Lucky here in Sebastopol
- Have City Council aware and listening
- Discussed a lot of learning from disasters that have happened in other cities
- Look and learn from mistakes other cities have made
- Discussed blue lights – problem with blue lights is that it damages the eyes as it bounces around the eyes
- Longer wave length does not bounce around as much
- LEDs are very direction and have a narrow focused beam, are very focused which may be part of the problem
- Stated she lives with HPS that shines into bathroom at night
- Needs a black out curtain to shut this light out
- However it does not pierce and hurt the eye, but LEDs do
- Can cause permanent retinal damage
- Not want this retrofit

Mayor Gurney asked PG&E to respond to the comments from the public as follows:

- Life expectancy
- Replacement costs
- Lights that turn off and on when approach
- What happens to old fixtures

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Discussed the warranty perspective
- Stated the HPS dims over time - (70 watt operating 50 watt after five years)
- 100,000 hours life time for LED
- Costs – if under warranty during the ten-year period, it is free to PG&E  
After that, do not know what the costs will be

The contractor from CREE commented as follows:

- Discussed the 100,000 hours lifetime for LEDs versus maintenance on HPS
- Changing lamps every two to five years for HPS
- Close to twenty years for LEDs

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- Discussed recycling
- Stated they recently won an award for their recycling process
- Every aspect is recycled
- Thorough recycling and nothing goes to the landfill

The contractor from CREE commented on the light phenomenon of it going off and on when someone walks up to it and stated there is none unless the fixture has a motion detector attached to it.

Mayor Gurney called for a break at 7:45 pm and reconvened the meeting at 7:50 pm.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed the table provided
- Asked for a column that showed the 3000K and a lumens for each
- Understand the difference the wattage, Kelvin, Lumens, watts
- Without those two columns, in the dark

Mayor Gurney suggested to include 2700 K as well.

Mr. Bollard commented as follows:

- PG&E can come up with LED fixture in watts that provided for 3000K in amount of lumens
- Not know if completely doable
- Discussed what watt and product is available

Mayor Gurney stated she would also like the costs included in the spreadsheet.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated when he ran for City Council, he had a laundry list of priorities, and one of those was to retrofit lights with LEDs for carbon foot print
- Spent an hour on phone with City of Davis – with their experiences
- Stated if the program is restricted to 4000 – it would be a deal killer
- Stated the City of Davis though 4000 was great when they were installed
- Stated the City of Davis owns all their street lights
- If working with PG&E, there are a lot fewer options
- Discussed citizen complaints
- Retrofitted with 2700 K 19 watt light fixtures
- Lowest milliamp rating you can get
- Discussed buying lamp heads for light poles
- Balance the needs for everyone
- Not want to turn place into residents that do not like living here anymore
- Stated City of Davis stated if they did this again, they would have done it with lower wattage
- Discussed shielding
- Discussed technology
- No decision is better than a bad decision
- Hard to support this program

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Concerned with reducing carbon footprint and energy
- Discussed her home receiving an international award for energy reduction – zero energy house
- Important to reduce energy
- Need balance
- Look at energy consumption
- Look at costs to City
- Get warm light
- Same lumens as getting now
- Not worry about flicker
- Get analysis that shows break even or better
- Deal breaker – not in warm light spectrum right now
- We are PG&E customer
- Thinking of this program as the City hears of outcry's in places like Davis and Santa Cruz
- PG&E may want to think of revising the program

Councilmember Slayter discussed the comment of 21 million pounds per ton of CO2 reduction for retrofit.

Mr. Bottari stated that is across the service territory annually of 21 million pounds or 10 ½ tons.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Single automobile average in US emits 4.7 tons
- 2 automobiles emit same amount of CO2 as entire savings of this program
- Need to reduce CO2 no matter what
- Comfortable with doing a test program
- Would like to see a couple of the lights installed on the streets to be evaluated
- Information is voluminous this evening
- Discussed having Sebastopol experience and see what it is they would actually be getting
- Stated until that is done, he is not comfortable saying yay or nay
- Discussed going to the JC area at night and walked the area
- Stated it is a nice thing to do to understand and experience what it is to talk under these types of lamps
- Stated his wife could not tell the difference
- Stated the greenest buildings are the buildings we have already, not the ones coming
- Greenest autos are ones already constructed
- Not willing to give a no vote but want to see the lights in the City as a test program
- Discussed the comment that it was alluded to that the City could install our own lamps on PG&E poles

Mr. Bottari stated he does not know the answer to that tonight, but will look into it.

Councilmember Jacob commented as follows:

- Stated PG&E does listen to its customers
- Discussed having a 3000 option later
- Discussed continuing to meet emission requirements
- Suggested PG&E listen to the community and make changes
- Stated there is not enough information here tonight

Councilmember Jacob moved and Councilmember Eder seconded the motion to continue this item until the City receives more information on this item.

Discussion:

- Mayor Gurney commented as follows:
- Stated that would be a wise move
- Discussed the possibility of a test program
- Stated it was suggested that the test area include each Councilmember's home
- Discussed the creation of the spreadsheet to include 4000 – 3000 – and 2700
- Stated she agrees with all comments
- Stated there needs to be more investigation on the package that is being presented tonight
- Stated she would like to see more flexibility and more self-determining in the package
- Stated a test project would be an interesting experience, but not sure how practical it would be

Councilmember Jacob requested leaving room for the City staff to manage the test site.

Mayor Gurney stated she would like the motion to include preparation of the spreadsheet for future consideration.

Councilmember Eder suggested amending the motion to include the possibility of the City to provide their own lamp heads on PG&E poles if it is provide to be available and affordable.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Does not believe that it needs to be a part of the motion
- Staff can look into that now
- Stated she wanted to clarify that staff is not recommending that the City Council accept the program, but directed Council to make the decision

Councilmember Jacob amended his motion and Councilmember Eder seconded the amendment to:

- Postpone switching to LED lights until such time lower 3000K or lower Kelvin option is available
- Request spreadsheet of PG&E as discussed
- Direct staff to work with PG&E to find solution for test site possibilities

Discussion:

Councilmember Slayter stated he is not saying yes or no on the program, but is tabling the discussion until such time that the Council gets the information it is looking for.

Mayor Gurney concurred stated the Council is waiting to make a decision until such time that it receives more information.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Eder, Jacob, Slayter, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Gurney  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved postponing of the switching to LED lights until such time that a 3000 Kelvin or lower option is available  
Request PG&E to provide spreadsheet as discussed  
Direct staff to work with PG&E on solution for possible sites for testing of lamps  
Minute Order Number: 2016-040

**PUBLIC HEARING(s):**

6. Public Hearing – To consider a Municipal Code amendment to revise Chapter 2.24 to revise membership of the City Planning Commission, to add an Alternate position in addition to the seven current members. (Planning Director)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council approve for first reading and introduction an ordinance amending the Sebastopol Municipal Code to revise Chapter 2.24 to revise membership of the City Planning Commission, to add an Alternate position in addition to the seven current members.

Councilmember Jacob commented as follows:

- Discussed the staff report where it indicated this position will be similar to the way the Design Review Board works
- Stated there is concern in the past of how DRB has worked
- Discussed additional time for meetings due to length of conversations
- Voiced concern with adding this new position to the Planning Commission and restricting them from participating

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Discussed how an alternate position functions on some boards
- Stated the alternate sits in the audience or to the side
- Stated the alternate only participates when someone is missing
- Stated on DRB, the alternate is involved in the discussion
- Stated it could be a concern to the alternate, that the position would be less meaningful, their contribution would be less, or it would not be as fulfilling a role if they were not allowed to participate

Mayor Gurney opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public hearing.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated it is important that the alternate be able to participate
- If they are silenced the whole time, it is not a meaningful role
- Stated the issue with the DRB was that it was more personality related
- Stated long conversations or meetings are a problem for any group
- Stated it is recognized that meetings are much faster if there are fewer people
- Stated that is the nature of meetings
- Stated in this circumstance, there would always be a full commission and that is what is most important

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed his experience while he was on the Planning Commission
- Discussed a member was undergoing health issues
- Stated that member was not at many meetings sequentially
- Stated recently that pattern has been repeated
- Stated the need for an alternate is fairly clear
- Stated it is not uncommon for a body of seven to have members (1, 2, or 3) at a time to miss meetings
- Stated the Planning Commission is a volunteer body
- Stated people have families and lives, and it is not uncommon to miss meetings
- Stated he sees a need for an alternate
- Stated this makes good sense
- Discussed the verbiage in the proposed ordinance
- Stated that language needs to be highlighted as this is what the Council is trying to do
- Stated he is in favor of this position

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated he missed the Joint Meeting where this was discussed
- Stated if an alternate position is created, he is confused as to the level of participation of the alternate
- Missed joint meeting
- Discussed being an alternate on jury duty
- Stated the alternate is non-existent until chosen to replace the juror who could not perform
- Stated they were not allowed to deliberate until then
- Stated this line has been blurred at DRB
- Stated he does want to get that line restored
- If do create this position that would need to be acknowledged
- Stated an alternate would not be as exciting as a full time Board Member and that they are there for a purpose

Mayor Gurney moved and Councilmember Slayter seconded the motion to approve for first reading and introduction Municipal Code amendment to revise Chapter 2.24 to revise membership of the City Planning Commission, to add an Alternate position in addition to the seven current members.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Eder, Jacob, Slayter, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Gurney

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

**City Council Action:** Approved for first reading and introduction Municipal Code amendment to revise Chapter 2.24 to revise membership of the City Planning Commission, to add an Alternate position in addition to the seven current members.

**Minute Order Number:** 2016-041

7. Public Hearing - To consider a Municipal Code amendment to revise Chapter 13.06.070 (B) to (1) Limit outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by persons it serves to no more than two days per week; or (2) Reduce by 25% its total potable water production relative to the amount produced in 2013 (Superintendent of Public Works)

Superintendent of Public Works Emig presented the staff report recommending the City Council approve for first reading and introduction an ordinance amending the Sebastopol Municipal Code to revise Chapter 2.24 to revise Chapter 13.06.070 (B) to (1) Limit outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by persons it serves to no more than two days per week; or (2) Reduce by 25% its total potable water production relative to the amount produced in 2013.

Mayor Gurney opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Jacob moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to approve for first reading and introduction of Municipal Code amendment to revise Chapter 13.06.070 (B) to (1) Limit outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by persons it serves to no more than two days per week; or (2) Reduce by 25% its total potable water production relative to the amount produced in 2013.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Eder, Jacob, Slayter, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Gurney  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved for first reading and introduction of Municipal Code amendment to revise Chapter 13.06.070 (B) to (1) Limit outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by persons it serves to no more than two days per week; or (2) Reduce by 25% its total potable water production relative to the amount produced in 2013.**

**Minute Order Number: 2016-042**

**REGULAR CALENDAR AGENDA ITEMS (DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION):**

8. Discussion and Action of DRAFT Review of Urban Growth Boundary Ordinance (Planning Director/City Manager)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss and act upon the DRAFT Review of Urban Growth Boundary Ordinance.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Council to weigh in on draft ordinance tonight
- Stated the ordinance was done in consultation with staff, Green Belt Alliance, and interested citizens
- If citizen's group chooses to use ordinance and take it to move it forward, they are free to make changes if they see fit, even if they are contrary to what the Council discusses
- Stated the map is a key document

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed the comments in the community that if a citizen's initiative had a certain percentage of signatures, the measure would become law
- Or the citizen's group could propose and qualify an initiative
- Stated if qualified, it would go on the ballot

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Provided clarification to the signature process

- Stated the group would need to have 10 percent of registered voters or 15% of registered voters and ask for a special election
- Stated in this case whether or not the 10% or 15% were qualified, it would not matter as the group is working to qualify this for the November 2016 election
- He stated the group could ask for a special election if they wanted to go that route
- Stated it is moot at this point
- Stated as of right now, if the signatures are qualified by a certain date, it would go on the next regular election

Councilmember Jacob questioned why the Council could not just put this on the ballot themselves similar to the sales tax ballot measure.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Stated the Council could do that
- Stated the Council had this discussion at their January 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting
- Stated if the Council sponsors this measure, the requirement is that CEQA would need to be complied with
- Stated that is a lengthy process that could affect the timing for the election
- Stated the CEQA makes ordinance more vulnerable to a legal challenge
- Discussed the CEQA work being done for the General Plan EIR but that it would not be completed in time to be utilized for this measure
- Discussed doing a separate analysis
- Stated if the measure is proposed by a citizen's group, it does not need to comply with CEQA
- Makes process easier, faster and less likely to legal challenge

Councilmember Eder stated is it the impression that if the citizen's group qualifies this measure and gets it on the ballot versus the City Council putting it on the ballot, it cannot be overturned by a future City Council.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Stated that statement could also be made a provision of a Council sponsored initiative as well
- Stated it is not applicable if it is passed as a regular ordinance
- Council can pass own ordinance but that it would be subject to CEQA
- Stated it could be subject to modification and repeal
- Stated a Council sponsored initiative could make it only changeable by a subsequent vote of the people
- Stated the only difference is how it gets there

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment.

Marsha Sue Lustig, Calder Avenue commented as follows:

- Representative for Citizens to Review UGB for 2016
- Discussed this being comprised of neighbors in community organizations
- Read a prepared statement
- Discussed preventing sprawl
- Stated the last UGB was successful
- Discussed extending the UGB
- Stated she agrees and participated in drafting of UGB

- Suggested a few modifications
- Vindicated successful measure
- Discussed additional parcels – not recommend those to be included
- Allow parcels to produce additional land if needed for affordable housing
- Identifying those now without potential negotiations could lead to impacts that could harm the initiative process
- Recommend against including those parcels
- Discussed small expansion of UGB and discussed strengthening any expansion language
- 10 acre limit for how much land could be acquired outside of existing UGB for 25 years
- Excited and ready to get rolling

Terry Shore, Regional Director, Greenbelt Alliance, commented as follows:

- Supports renewal of Sebastopol's UGB  
Use language as presented
- Partner in newly formed community group to gather signatures
- Lend resources to communicate and assist wherever possible
- Once signatures are submitted and verified, they would urge the City Council to vote to adopt the measure or place it on the ballot for a City-wide vote
- Either approach ensures that voter protections for UGB will remain continuously in affect for life of ordinance
- Endorses following updated provisions:
- Maintain existing boundaries along with Sphere of Influence per General Plan Update to date
- 25 year sunset
- Support the exemptions for affordable housing, schools,, light industrial
- Discussed review by the Planning Commission and City Council
- Discussed a UGB Fact Sheet

Kerry Fugett, Sonoma County Conservation, commented as follows:

- Supportive of Council moving forward with the UGB renewal
- Would like to partner with the group
- Committed to using resources to gather signatures
- Would like to place the UGB on the ballot
- Important for voters to weigh in on the renewal
- Would like to lock this in
- Discussed door to door surveys and stated there is strong support
- High margin of support
- Thanked the Council for helping to support getting this measure on the ballot

Councilmember Slayter discussed the two parcels mentioned and questioned if this is DuFranc and Hurlbut on the north end of town.

Director Webster commented it is Hurlbut Avenue and Tomodachi Park parcels which is the change from the Measure O map.

Councilmember Slayter questioned if DuFranc is already a part of the map.

Director Webster stated that is correct.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed there was conversation where the property on Hurlbut was in question of being one or two parcels
- Pleased to see shrunk back to one parcel
- Questioned if this is in line with what the GPAC is recommending

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Was some different opinions
- Council range of discussion on this issue
- Consultant looked at and came back with this

Councilmember Slayter questioned if the citizen's group moved this forward, would this map include the Hurlbut and Tomodachi Park parcels.

Marsha Sue Lustig, citizen's group, commented that the Park is not controversial, but that the Hurlbut one could be controversial.

Mayor Gurney stated the Council could have a conversation tonight about the map, but the group could do with the map what they want to do.

Councilmember Jacob commented as follows:

- Great opportunity to review and have discussion
- Strongly in support of citizen's group outcome
- Discussed not wanting to have to renew this for another 20 years
- Questioned if this is 10 years off of GPAC timing and not five years

Director Webster commented as follows:

- General Plans can be updated at any time
- Stated it has been 20 years for Sebastopol
- Stated some cities do it more frequently
- Stated 15-20 years is the guideline

Councilmember Jacob questioned if 25 years will get this off the GPAC rotation, and if so, how we will we know what it will be in 25 years.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated if the GPAC was updated in a 20 year cycle and this puts it on a 25 year cycle with a valid EIR upon which a campaign could be launched in year 21 and have it handled.
- Stated this year the timing has collapsed
- Stated the City does not have the calendar or money related to the UGB

Councilmember Slayter stated that unless it is legally required, he does not see why it should sunset.

Mayor Gurney stated she is wondering the same thing.

Director Webster commented that it should not be forever.

Marsha Sue Lusting commented as follows:

- Stated this would have to be checked out about it being open-ended
- Stated is it not intended to never add land
- Stated that goes against the philosophy of the measure
- Stated the group can look into it though

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed the one parcel
- Questioned if this had gone back to GPAC (Staff stated no)
- Stated she consultant reviewed the notes and records of the Council discussion
- Stated the consultant thought this most appropriate
- Stated it is not totally clear to her

Mayor Gurney stated this is how Ben interpreted the discussion.

Vice Mayor Glass questioned if this parcel is the parcel where at a meeting, there were a couple of speakers who requested this parcel be in the UGB for purposes of affordable housing.

Staff stated that is correct.

Mayor Gurney questioned if there is consensus of the Council that the proposed draft ordinance and map are acceptable.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Would like to have conversation of inclusion of the Tomodachi Park property
- Stated this is owned by the City
- Stated annexation seems imminent as the process has begun
- Stated it should be included in the UGB as soon as it is annexed
- Not sure how UGB and newly annexd property dovetail

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Potential annexation will move slowly through City and LAFCO
- May or may not be done by time measure is passed
- If approved and Council make findings to make exception to current UGB, it would be a non-issue
- If not, it would be desirable for the new initiative to accommodate it

Councilmember Slayter commented that he would like to see Tomodachi Park included and the property on Hurlbut has the necessary protection should it become available for affordable housing to include it into the City.

Mayor Gurney stated she would support the map as done with these two additions.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Support map as done – see hard line go around Tomodachi Park which will eventually – like to see included in Sphere of Influence today
- Property on Hurlbut excluded
- If identified as a potential affordable housing site, that there is still an opportunity even if it is not included in the UGB
- Stated that it sounds like all support adding Tomodachi Park to the map

- Discussed Hurlbut and stated the citizen's group is saying that they do not need to be on the map
- Suggested it be removed from the map
- Discussed a mechanism in place to allow it to come in

**City Council Action: None Taken. Council consensus to support the draft ordinance and support change to map of removal of the Hurlbut property.**

**Minute Order Number: 2016-043**

Councilmember Jacob departed the meeting at 9:03pm.

9. Discussion and Action of Future of Sonoma County Waste Management Agency  
(Engineering Manager)

Engineering Manager Mikus presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss and act upon the Future of the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency.

City Manager McLaughlin provided further information as follows:

- Discussed actions taken by the City of Rohnert Park and City of Sonoma
- Stated there is support for this from the City Managers
- Stated however, City of Rohnert Park stated no to supporting a one year extension.
- Discussed the City of Petaluma not going through the matrix but approved the one year extension
- Stated the Sebastopol City Council has gone through the matrix and does not need to review it again tonight
- Stated staff has guidance from the previous matrix
- Stated this item may return if one City says no
- Recommended the City Council not review the matrix tonight, but support the one year extension

Councilmember Slayter questioned if one City says no, there is no extension.

Engineering Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- Stated an extension would require an amendment to the JPA agreement
- Stated every member has to pass a resolution supporting the amendment
- Stated it is not subject to vote of the SCWMA Board

City Manager McLaughlin stated that it requires a unanimous agreement.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment. There was none.

Councilmember Slayter moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to direct staff to support a one year extension.

Discussion:

Mayor Gurney questioned if the current agreement ends 2017 and the extension would have it end February 2018.

Staff stated that is correct.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Eder, Slayter, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Gurney

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmember Jacob

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved direction to staff to support a one year extension.

Minute Order Number: 2016-044

10. Discussion and Action of Approval of Request for RFPs for Bike Lanes on Local Streets (Engineering Manager)

Engineering Manager Mikus presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss and act upon the Request for RFPs for Bike Lanes on Local Streets.

Mayor Gurney questioned if staff can lay out a timeline of this project if this is approved tonight (what happens when).

Engineering Mikus commented there are tentative dates in the proposal. He stated staff hopes to have it issued as quickly as possible, with bid results in March, evaluation of bids and interviews, and an award of contract agenda item to the Council by the beginning or middle of April.

Councilmember Eder discussed that the staff report which refers to 9.2 miles of bike lanes but stated the background in the RFP refers to 12.8 miles on the State Highway and requested clarification.

Engineering Mikus commented that the RFP does not include for the other miles on the State route.

Councilmember Eder questioned if these are two separate projects that are underway and the local streets project addresses the 12.8 miles.

Engineering Mikus stated the 9.2 miles if for the local streets and that the 12.8 miles are the total miles of both projects together.

Councilmember Eder commented it is unclear of how this is broken in sharrows and Class 3 routes and stated it is unclear what the distinction is between those two.

Engineering Manager Mikus stated it is signage, not markings on the pavement.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated he pulled out the highway design manual which defines a class 3 bike route as a route shared with pedestrians, or motor vehicle traffic and a class 2 is a lane for one way bike travel
- Stated it is his impression that sharrows and class 3 are one in the same

Engineering Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- Stated sharrows are markings on the pavement
- Stated class 3 is signage on the side of the road

Mayor Gurney discussed the color coded map prepared by Councilmember Slayter.

- Councilmember Eder commented as follows:
- Stated in his research, sharrows were more effective if placed in the center of land and not off towards the parking area
- Stated research done where there is signage that says share the road, it is found that when a bicycle is painted on the street, it is more effective in reducing vehicle/bicycle conflicts

Mayor Gurney questioned if the notion is to print share the lane on the road rather than have yellow signs is more effective.

Councilmember Eder commented that in his research he found that printing a bike icon stating use of full lane on the street or word bicycle in the center of the lane and or sharrows in the center of the lane are much more effective.

Mayor Gurney stated she wants what is more effective.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment. There was none.

Councilmember Slayter moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion approve the Request for RFPs for Bike Lanes on Local Streets.

Discussion:

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated the Council has discussed having forums to find out what the community wants
- Stated he is surprised this is moving forward
- Discussed class 1 trails ship sailed
- Surprised doing this without accomplishing outreach
- Months ago made commitment
- Not followed through

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed wanting to do community forms
- Stated the subject was not dialed in
- Does not want to undo a plan that is already in place
- Stated there were several Council meetings discussing the community forums
- Stated it was an idea that went nowhere
- Stated it was talked of several times and did not take hold

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Stated she is in agreement to have community forums
- Should be taking a look at more about what is it that our community feels it needs in terms of pedestrian and bike planning and opportunities
- Think this particular plan is already in the works and should move forward
- Not getting traction of having a forum
- Not moving forward with that
- This project was already in the pipeline
- Supporting this RFP
- Interested in notion of figuring out a way to do forums

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated there are a lot of people who cannot make it to a City Council Meeting and there are those who do come and have three minutes to speak
- Stated we need a forum similar to the forum on the hotel that was conducted
- Stated the community was invited; a meeting was held; and the City received valid opinions from people rather than a sampling of three people in the audience at 9:30 pm at night
- Invited
- Stated he thinks we are moving forward and not having all the information we need

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated the City has moved way too slowly on this
- Stated if the City had a shovel ready project, it could be applying for grant money
- Discussed the March deadline for application for grants
- Stated more information on this is in her SCTA report
- Stated the City has no shovel ready projects
- Stated we need to be shovel ready when other monies come available

Councilmember Eder questioned if there is a perception on staff as to the availability of grant funds being available for these small types of projects and if so, how competitive are we.

Engineering Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- Stated the last application did not address the disadvantaged housing
- Stated it was a key part of the grant application to respond to a number of questions
- Stated those questions were answered but not in great depth
- Stated staff will do better in the future
- Discussed lump sums of some grants where the City receives allocations each year
- Stated this may be another avenue to look at

Mayor Gurney stated staff needs to be more aggressive of going after money.

Engineering Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- Stated in reading the record, part of the City's bike and ped plan is in the County's plan
- Stated this began in 2008 and has been quite a process of public input
- Stated he has heard citizens were not pleased with the process

Councilmember Slayter stated this plan has been in the works since 2008 and was amended in 2011. He discussed the feasibility study and stated that this moves the project forward. He stated the Council has been hearing that we need bike lanes, and this will get us bike lanes. He stated this does not stop staff from doing additional projects, or stopping staff from having other projects considered, designed or constructed.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Eder, Jacob, Slayter, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Gurney

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmember Jacob

Abstain: None

**City Council Action:** Approved the Request for RFPs for Bike Lanes on Local Streets.

**Minute Order Number:** 2016-045

**CITY COUNCIL REPORTS:**

11. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports:

City Clerk Gourley stated she will be out of the office Wednesday-Friday.

Councilmember Eder questioned when Form 700s are due. City Clerk Gourley stated she believed her deadline to the Council was March 25<sup>th</sup> to ensure they meet the State Deadline of April 1<sup>st</sup>. Mayor Gurney requested the City Clerk to send out a reminder.

12. City Council Reports/Committee/Sub-Committee Meeting Reports: (Reports by Mayor/City Councilmembers Regarding Various Agency Meetings/Committee Meetings/Sub-Committee Meeting /Conferences Attended and Possible Direction to its Representatives (If Needed) on pending issues before such Boards):

Mayor Gurney Reported on the Following:

- SCTA/RCPA
- Health Action Liaison Meeting
- Stated she would like these reports attached to the minutes

Water Sub-Committee Reported on the Following:

- Stated they met with Daily Acts
- Discussed the details of what Daily Acts will be doing
- Public Building for water catchment project
- Investigate Library, City Hall and the Youth Annex

13. Council Communications Received. There Were None

14. Future City Meeting Dates/Events (Informational Only): (See Agenda)

**CLOSED SESSION:** None.

**Adjournment:** Mayor Gurney adjourned the regular City Council meeting of February 16, 2016 at 9:50 pm to the Regular City Council Meeting to be held on Tuesday, March 1, 2016 at 6:00 pm, at the Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Mary Gourley, CMC, City Clerk



**Sarah Glade Gurney**

Vice Mayor

**City of Sebastopol**

7120 Bodega Avenue

Sebastopol, CA 95472

[www.cityofsebastopol.org](http://www.cityofsebastopol.org)

Report from Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol's Representative to the SCTA and RCPA  
For the City Council Meeting of February 16, 2016  
Re SCTA/RCPA Meeting on February 8, 2016

Please see the prepared Agenda and Packet at [www.SCTAINFO.org](http://www.SCTAINFO.org) for detailed information.

**REMINDER TO COMMUNITY: Caltrans has completed its work on the Laguna Bridge on Hwy. 12 for the past construction season. The lane switch to the new bridge was not completed due to delays; it is now projected to take place in late May 2016, once work recommences.**

1. All Consent Calendar items were approved.
2. **SCTA Items: 4.1.1.** FY 2017 Transportation Fund for Clean Air [TFCA] Call for Projects if open for eligible applications, with a deadline of 5 PM on March 14, 2016. In the past few years, these types of projects have received funding: trip reduction, bicycle lanes, arterial management, clean air vehicles and infrastructure. Sonoma County jurisdictions will receive up to \$584,390 to implement air pollution reducing projects. I provided this information to our City Manager/ Attorney along with my encouragement to Staff Henry Mikus to consider submitting an application on Sebastopol's behalf. **4.1.2.** Cap and Trade, Low Carbon Transit Operations Program [LCTOP] The Board approved the proposed distribution of funds per the existing population-based formula, supporting Petaluma Transit, Santa Rosa CityBus, and Sonoma County Transit [which serves Sebastopol] for FY 2015-16. This item included expanding transit service on Route 24. I stated that riders requested longer hours on weekdays and weekends, as well as additional stops. **4.1.3.** One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 [OBAG2] will provide at least \$27,650,000 in funding to Sonoma County starting FY 2018-19, divided between Safe Routes to Schools, Federal Aid Secondary, Priority Conservation Areas, Regional Planning Activities [SCTA] and STP/CMAQ eligible projects. **4.1.4.** The Measure M Annual Report was received and

approved [hard copy at City Hall, also on line]. 4.1.5. An update on the state highway projects was provided by Staff, details re Sebastopol's Hwy. 12 above. In the discussion of the SCTA items, Sebastopol and Sonoma concurred that our communities needed regular shuttle service to the SMART train. Given the status of the SMART project to date, it was suggested that Windsor and Cloverdale may also feel like outliers to the train system and want some interim service to accommodate their residents.

3. **RCPA Items:** 4.2.1. The Board approved a letter of support for the Water Bill Savings Act, by Senator Mike McGuire, details on line. 4.2.2. The Board approved a letter of support for the work of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District [BAAMQD] to develop and implement a Refinery Strategy to address the harmful emissions and toxic impacts from petroleum refineries. This item was also viewed as a social justice issue. 4.2.3. The RCPA Deputy Director recited a lengthy Activities Report, available on line.



**Sarah Glade Gurney**

Vice Mayor

**City of Sebastopol**

7120 Bodega Avenue

Sebastopol, CA 95472

[www.cityofsebastopol.org](http://www.cityofsebastopol.org)

TO: Sebastopol City Council for February 16, 2016 Meeting

RE: Notes from Council Liaison Meeting, Health Action

### **City Council Liaison Ad Hoc Meeting Notes**

February 1, 2016

8:30-10:00am

DHS Health Policy, Planning and Evaluation Division

490 Mendocino Avenue, Santa Rosa

Wisteria Conference Room

**City Council liaisons in attendance:** Gary Edwards (Sonoma), Sam Salmon (Windsor), Sarah Glade Gurney (Sebastopol), Eric Ziedrich (Healdsburg), **Absent:** Gina Belforte (Rohnert Park), Susan Harvey (Cotati), Gabe Kearney (Petaluma), Ernesto Olivares (Santa Rosa), Carol Russell (Cloverdale) **Others attending:** Scott Alonso (DHS), Beth Dadko (DHS), Donna Legge (Town of Windsor), Jen Lewis (DHS), Brian Vaughn (DHS)

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Beth welcomed the group and they made introductions. A special welcome was made to new liaisons: Eric Ziedrich from the City of Healdsburg and Gary Edwards from the City of Sonoma.

- Beth reminded the group about the Ag and Open Space 2016 Matching Grant Program. Windsor is pursuing the grant to expand Kaiser Park. Sebastopol is also pursuing to expand the Laguna Preserve.
- Beth briefly showed the new [ChangeLab Health in All Policies documents](#).

### **Coordination Updates**

#### *Affordable Housing/Building HOMES*

- Jim Leddy from the Sonoma County Community Development Commission has presented to most city councils. Petaluma and Cloverdale are still unscheduled. Beth will follow up with Gabe and Carol.

#### *Universal Access to Quality Preschool*

- Kellie Noe from Cradle to Career has presented at the Rohnert Park City Council and Santa Rosa City Council. She will follow up with the other cities to schedule presentations and/or study sessions.
- Gabe was not present to update about Universal Access to Quality Preschool being a topic at an upcoming Mayors and City Council Members Meeting

#### *Tobacco Retail License (TRL)*

- Brian shared that the County TRL is back on the Board of Supervisors' calendar for March 1.
- The group requested to focus on local regulation of marijuana at the next meeting.

#### *City Manager Meeting*

- Based on feedback from this group, Brian Vaughn is on the February 18 Joint City Manager Meeting agenda. They will discuss Universal Access to Quality Preschool and the TRL. The goal is to make sure that the County consults with City staff on issues with regional impact before going to the Board of Supervisors.

### **Policy Advocacy Planning**

*Local Policy Alert System*

The group discussed the concept of the Local Policy Alert System that cities can alert Health Action about items coming before council that could use more voices to speak to health impacts. Please notify Beth if there is an issue in your respective communities.

#### *State and Federal Legislation Platform Coordination*

Scott Alonso, DHS Communications Coordinator, shared information about the 2016 Sonoma County State and Federal Legislative Platform. The group discussed the idea of Health Action reviewing the County's platform, identifying areas of alignment, and officially endorsing certain issues/priorities. County lobbyists could then advocate for these issues not only on behalf of the County, but also Health Action. Beth did an initial DRAFT analysis of the platform that could use review. Eventually, it would be ideal for Health Action to not act in a retroactive way, but to inform the development of the County's legislative platform.

Action: Beth will follow up with the County Administrator's Office to inquire about the possibility. The Mayors and City Council Legislative Group may also be an important group to consult.

#### **2016 Work Plan Development**

The group reviewed the 2015 Work Plan and reviewed accomplishments:

- Meetings with City Managers complete: David Mickaelian (Healdsburg)- 1/31/16, Damian O'Bid (Cotati)- 12/1/15, Darrin Jenkins (Rohnert Park)- 12/10/15, Sean McGlynn (Santa Rosa)- met with Jaime Peñaherrera (Com Eng Dir) and Serena Lineau- 1/12/16
- The City of Rohnert Park adopted a specific health goal
- Cities supported each other to discuss affordable housing and the TRL

The group brainstormed about the 2016 Work Plan. The group wanted to continue focusing on affordable housing, the TRL, and universal access to quality preschool. The group also wanted to continue work to develop a local health lens and have influence on state and federal policy. Finally, the group voiced the importance of partnering with local Health Action Chapters and figuring out a way to give voice to the community at city council meetings.

Action: The group will finalize the work plan at the next meeting.

#### **Health Action 2017-2020 Action Planning Process**

Jen Lewis provided background and a timeline for the 2017-2020 Action Planning process that will take place in 2016. There will be opportunities for the City Council Liaisons to provide input throughout the year. The group didn't have adequate time to discuss infrastructure and support needed at this meeting, but will follow up with input via email.

**Next Meeting: April TBD- Beth will send out Doodle poll**

Potential Agenda Items: Aging Together, Follow-up on Housing and Preschool, Lytton Tribe of Pomo (equity), fluoridation, sugar sweetened beverages, regulation of medical marijuana, round-up (pest control), support for SMART to Cloverdale