

**City Council**

Mayor Patrick Slayter  
Vice Mayor Sarah Glade Gurney  
John Eder  
Una Glass  
Robert Jacob



**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 1**

**City Manager**

Larry McLaughlin  
lwmclaughlin@juno.com

**City Clerk**

Mary Gourley  
mgourley@cityofsebastopol.org

**City of Sebastopol**

**DRAFT**

**CITY OF SEBASTOPOL CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**Meeting of October 20, 2015**

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 September 10, 2015.

**6:00 pm CONVENE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING, Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425  
Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Slayter called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Mayor Slayter  
Vice Mayor Gurney  
Councilmember Glass  
Absent: Councilmember Eder  
Councilmember Jacob  
Staff: City Manager-City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
City Clerk Mary Gourley  
Building Official Glenn Schainblatt  
Engineering Manager Henry Mikus  
Fire Chief Bill Braga  
Planning Director Kenyon Webster

Superintendent of Public Works Richard Emig

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG:** Mayor Slayter led the salute to the flag.

**PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS:** None

**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 thirty 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.

Michael Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Discussed crosswalks on Highway 12 and stated they are a failure as well as the crosswalks on Highway 16
- Discussed Murphy Street – crosswalk lights no longer working – buttons do not work
- Asked the City to approach Caltrans and demand those crosswalks be painted again with white stripes
- Lost a neighbor at this crosswalk there because of the sun
- Ask Caltrans to make City safe
- Think of how those crosswalks are lit
- Discussed drainage system on Barlow building
- Drainage going onto the sidewalks
- Discussed Wilton Avenue drainage
- Discussed drainage spill off and running into southbound Highway 116 because sewer system cannot handle flow

Mayor Slayter requested staff to look into the crosswalks.

Donna Fisher commented as follows:

- Representing SANE and neighbors who support their efforts
- Continue efforts to work cooperatively with City
- Allowing Rotten Robbie to operate business in full compliance
- Discussed commitments of Use Permit for Rotten Robbie
- Discussed expansion of gas station and addition of car wash
- Discussed environmental, health and safety items

Rich Emig stated repairs for the crosswalk are pending and should be completed soon.

Colleen Fernald commented as follows:

- Discussed Andy Lopez case - April 20, 2012
- Discussed the Kelly Task Force and independent auditor
- Discussed corruption of law enforcement
- Discussed having evidence of crimes

- Discussed task force as meaningless unless cities are included
- Discussed activities of ex-husband
- Stated she could not even get a search warrant from local law enforcement
- Discussed death of her daughter
- Discussed denial of psych evaluation for her daughter
- Discussed denial of independent attorney for her daughter
- Stated corruption is rampant
- Questioned where oversight is
- Discussed concern with Police Chief
- Demanded surveillance for phones from the law enforcement
- Stated Police Chief stated he asked the CIA for equipment, but indicated the CIA and did not have anything
- Asked for meetings with Council and City Manager

Abigail Evans, Chair of Sebastopol World Friends, commented as follows:

- Discussed the Sister City programs
- Announced they will be having a second annual Sister City Friendship dinner
- November 7<sup>th</sup>
- Enmanji Temple Memorial Hall
- 6:00 – 8:30 pm
- Displayed fliers for the event
- Community celebration to which everyone is invited
- Benefit scholarship fund for travelers

Mayor Slayter requested this item be included on the City web site.

Haddy Brown commented as follows:

- Conservation Science Manager for Laguna Foundation
- Success of clean up that occurred last weekend
- 100 volunteers turned out and removed 20 cubic yards of garbage
- If not been removed, would have ended up in Laguna
- Huge success
- Critical need for ongoing management of Preserve

**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.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Vice Mayor Gurney moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve the Consent Calendar Item(s) Number(s) 1, 2, and 3 as listed below.

**VOTE:**

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

1. Approval of Minutes of Regular City Council Meeting of October 6, 2015 (City Clerk)

**City Council Action: Approved City Council Meeting Minutes of October 6, 2015.**

**Minute Order Number: 2015-156**

- 2.. Approval of Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance 1080 to Amend Ordinance Number 992, Requirements for Water and Energy Conservation in New Construction, Major Additions, Out of Service Area Agreements and Annexations (Planning Director/Building Official)

**City Council Action: Approved for Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance 1080 to Amend Ordinance Number 992, Requirements for Water and Energy Conservation in New Construction, Major Additions, Out of Service Area Agreements and Annexations**

**Minute Order Number: 2015-157**

3. Approval of Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance 1079 regulating the establishment of 'formula' business uses in Sebastopol. The ordinance would create restrictions and procedural requirements regarding specified "formula" businesses – generally retail stores or restaurants, sometimes franchises, which have standardized décor, services, uniforms, etc., which make them substantially identical to other businesses elsewhere in the United States. The purpose of this ordinance is to protect the unique character of Sebastopol, maintain diversity in its businesses, and ensure that the city's businesses serve the needs of the community. The proposed ordinance would prohibit some types of new formula businesses in the downtown area, and require Use Permits in certain circumstances for new formula businesses in the downtown and other areas of the City (Planning Director)

**City Council Action: Approved for Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance 1079 regulating the establishment of 'formula' business uses in Sebastopol. The ordinance would create restrictions and procedural requirements regarding specified "formula" businesses – generally retail stores or restaurants, sometimes franchises, which have standardized décor, services, uniforms, etc., which make them substantially identical to other businesses elsewhere in the United States. The purpose of this ordinance is to protect the unique character of Sebastopol, maintain diversity in its businesses, and ensure that the city's businesses serve the needs of the community. The proposed ordinance would prohibit some types of new formula businesses in the downtown area, and require Use Permits in certain circumstances for new formula businesses in the downtown and other areas of the City**

**Minute Order Number: 2015-158**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATION:**

4. Informational Presentation from Brian Vaughn and Jay Macedo, Sonoma County Department of Health Services (County Representatives) on Sonoma County's Proposed Local Tobacco Retailer License (TRL) policy and the County's interest in working with local cities to explore developing a common county-wide TRL strategy that can be effective in reducing youth tobacco rates while also being sensitive to the concerns of local retailers (Vice Mayor Gurney)

Mayor Gurney welcomed and introduced Brian Vaughn and Jay Macedo, Sonoma County Department of Health Services, who provided a presentation on Sonoma County's Proposed Local Tobacco Retailer License (TRL) policy and the County's interest in working with local cities to explore developing a common county-wide TRL strategy that can be effective in reducing youth tobacco rates while also being sensitive to the concerns of local retailers.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Very impressed with the cities of Healdsburg and Sonoma
- Questioned if the County were to do this, would it apply to the unincorporated areas only
- Important for all cities to participate for all-around uniformity
- West County has some worst statistics in Portrait of Sonoma County

County Representatives stated there is updated data that will be coming out soon that they will send that data to the City once they receive it.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated the statistics look poorly for students and health practices as a collective community
- Stated we are a different culture and may be more permissive in something that might indicate we need to work on things more seriously
- Questioned what other City was interested as indicated in the presentation
- Discussed the revenue stream and questioned if the license fee goes towards information and education County wide or would any part of that fee go to a City if that City has adopted an ordinance

County Representatives replied as follows:

- City of Cotati is looking to update their no smoking ordinance
- Stated a City could collect the fee
- Stated the County can help out with enforcement or conduct compliance checks
- Stated there are discussions of how to partner to use the system
- Discussed not using multiple systems
- Stated the City of Sebastopol currently has 17 tobacco and e-cigarette retailers, but stated probably about 14 of those currently would get a license under this ordinance
- Stated it is a cheap license to get
- State the cost of entry is small
- Stated some sales are more of convenience
- Stated enforcement can be streamlined and simple for City in terms of number of retailers

Councilmember Glass commented she was curious how other cities that have already implemented this are using their revenue streams and how they are implementing enforcement.

County Representatives stated the fee is used for education for retailers and can be used for code enforcement or compliance.

Councilmember Glass questioned if that money would include an education program in schools or is the fee set for implementing the program.

County Representatives stated the money could be used for educating the public as well, but it would need to be focused around the requirements in the actual ordinance and the TRL program.

Councilmember Glass questioned if this is not actually educating people about tobacco.

County Representatives stated that is correct.

Councilmember Glass questioned how other cities are implementing enforcement and questioned if the County is helping in that regards.

County Representatives replied as follows:

- The County Health Department can help to conduct compliance checks to ensure the retailer is in compliance
- Stated the City can conduct the law enforcement aspect as well as code enforcement
- Stated it is illegal to sell to minors and the retailer can be cited for that
- Stated the Tobacco Retailer License allows for local control and the City can suspend a retailer without having to do an actual citation

Councilmember questioned who does the citing in fellow small cities.

County Representatives replied as follows:

- Discussed compliance checks
- Stated the County has a Youth Tobacco Purchasing Survey which can result in violations
- Stated this is used as part of the code enforcement
- Stated it is an extra tool in the tool box without having to rely on law enforcement
- Stated the City could suspense the license without citing the business
- Stated it is a power given to the City by the Tobacco Retailer License Ordinance

Mayor Slayter commented on the retailer license fee and questioned what the fees are proposed.

County Representatives commented as follows:

- The fees vary, but the County is proposing \$630 a year and the City of Healdsburg is \$450
- Stated it is determined on what activities to include
- County trying to do strong enforcement
- Education and compliance checks
- Fee can be adjustable on needs of City

- County is partnering with Sheriff's department
- Discussed conducting sing operations

Mayor Slayter questioned if the additional revenue by price setting goes to the retailers, have the retailers calculated the additional annual revenues for the fees for the licenses and is not the license for the retailer essentially being paid for by the increased fees and therefore, it is a pass through from the retailer to the buyer.

County Representatives replied as follows:

- Stated the County does not see it that way
- Stated the County has worked with a tobacco taxing economist who has indicated the amount of smoking is off set by the increased revenue
- Stated the retailer makes more money by adding the additional fee but it also reduces cigarette smoking

Mayor Slayter questioned if vending machines still exist.

County Representatives stated not in the United States, but they do still exist in the world. They discussed mobile vending and sampling of tobacco products and stated this ordinance helps to prohibit that so that there is no grey area. They also stated this helps to add additional provisions to close loop holes or clarify the City's position.

Mayor Slayter stated that for Sebastopol, if the annual fee is \$500 and there are 15 retailers in Sebastopol that is not a whole lot of funding and not enough money to do anything at the local level. He stated being such a small City, Sebastopol does not have the resources to do educational programs and questioned if, through the grapevine, there are other cities interested in having the County run the program.

County Representatives replied as follows:

- Stated that they have heard through the grapevine yes that there are other cities that would like the County do run this program
- Stated it has been discussed of what this could look like as a County run program
- City sign on and approve process

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Jacob Rich commented as follows:

- Native resident of Sebastopol
- Outreach Coordinator for El Molino High School
- Youth are our future
- Community's most important investment
- Glad Council is listening and open to the Tobacco Retailer License
- Great opportunity to demonstrate value for protecting the health of our youth
- Ordinance has been proven effective
- Stated to date, the local high school district has the highest female teenage smoking rate in County and higher than State average as well

- Youth in high school district especially at risk for tobacco and tobacco related illnesses
- Discussed tobacco education but not nearly as important as getting rid of vending machines or making sure restaurants are smoke free
- Getting rid of marketing on television
- Education is not as effective as tobacco retailer license
- Opportunity to address local challenges
- Local institutions approved resolution and support of ordinance: West Sonoma County Health Care District, Palm Drive, Graton Day Labor, etc.
- Stated this is thinking of prevention and community health of our youth
- Read letter from high school students

Donna Fisher questioned regulations for advertising in a community for cigarettes.

Michael Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Does it include rolling your own tobacco
- Can you buy cigarettes on line
- If they want it they are going to get it – creation of a black market

Mayor Slayter asked the representatives to address the comments from the public.

County Representatives commented as follows:

- Advertisement is a right
- Discussed first amendment rights
- Discussed space for advertising
- County is looking to incentivize taking away advertising
- Incorporating with healthy retailing work
- Lowering fee for retailers who voluntarily take away advertising – try to build into program moving forward
- Any tobacco classified as tobacco
- On-Line Sales/Purchase:
  - Gray area – is legal
  - TRL does not prevent every kid from smoking
  - Provides additional barriers
  - Can go to several other places to get tobacco
  - Youth less likely to do that
  - Good portions of the kids will not do that
  - Convenience and experimentation
- Black Market
  - Is Possible
  - When New York increased their per packet to \$14.00 minimum price, it was youth focused and was effective

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Thanked the County for coming to the City Council meeting tonight

## City Council Meeting Minutes of October 20, 2015

**DRAFT**

- Stated she was sorry the Police Chief was not in attendance as he knows this community and could address the statistics
- Discussed the opportunity for input
- Interested to have this come back
- Wise to have Supervisors handle this ahead of the City
- Take advantage of what works well for the cities of Healdsburg, Sonoma and Cotati
- Consider in December or January

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Interested in pursuing and participating in this
- Makes sense to collaborate with County
- Get economy of scale
- Hard to do enforcement when such a tiny City
- Good way to put all together
- Husband smoked and is no longer with us
- Huge impact on his health
- Started at 14 and tried to quit
- Hard for people to quit
- Need to prevent kids from doing it
- Stated he regretted starting at 14
- Could never get over the smoking addiction

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Interested in moving item forward
- Statistics of local kids – is not a healthy thing
- Bad here in West County
- Speaks to our need to move it along
- Responsibility to move it along
- Heartened by breadth of proposal
- Idea that e-cigs are classified as a potential tobacco product is very important
- Heartened to see it in here
- Have had discussions as Council in how our ordinance relates to e-cigs but that it was so new, there were no legal opinions out there yet
- Maybe the regulations have moved beyond that
- Had concerns of them not considered as cigarettes
- Highly additive product is now potentially classified as tobacco product is great
- Sebastopol has been at an “A” grade rating from the American Lung Association from our No Smoking Ordinance
- Largely work of Councilmember Shaffer
- Reminder of where we all came from
- Thanked the County and look forward to this item returning

**City Council Action:** Thanked the County for their presentation and was in consensus to have this item return to the City Council in December or January

**Minute Order Number:** 2015-159

**PUBLIC HEARING(S):** None

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

5. Approval of Resolution Supporting Legislation to Reduce Gun Violence (Mayor Slayter)

Mayor Slayter presented the report recommending the City Council approve the Resolution Supporting Legislation to Reduce Gun Violence and discussed highlights of the resolution.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated this is a message of support for legislation to reduce gun violence
- Grateful the Mayor brought this item forward
- Suggested sending a copy or the other cities in Sonoma County and urging our friends and colleague to do the same

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Glad the Mayor brought this item forward
- Discussed Australia example at the last meeting
- Interesting Country of Australia has similar gun violence issues and then changed laws
- Discussed the dramatic and massive change in number of deaths declining
- If we believe we cannot tackle this problem, we are wrong – we can still take action to return to our democratic democracy

Mayor Slayter also discussed as well as national identification.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There was none.

Mayor Slayter moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve the Resolution Supporting Legislation to Reduce Gun Violence.

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmember Glass, Vice Mayor Gurney and Mayor Slayter

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmembers Eder and Jacob

Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved Resolution Supporting Legislation to Reduce Gun Violence.**

**Resolution Number: 6060**

6. Discussion of Potential Requirement for Community Impact Reports (Planning Director)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss the potential requirement for Community Impact Reports.

Councilmember Glass discussed the staff report which stated that the CIR is similar to an EIR; however, the purpose of it is informational rather than to set standards and requested clarification.

Director Webster commented that CEQA is an informational tool and that in most cases, a CIR is an informational report.

Councilmember Glass commented if in the way a CIR works, would it interact with the use permit or design process.

Director Webster commented that is correct. He stated to be meaningful, it ought to be linked to those processes and have findings in the development approval that relate to the issues the CIR would look at. He stated otherwise it would be informational if it was not tied to an approval or a denial and that may confuse people.

Mayor Slayter questioned if there are parts of the CIR that are the highlights of what a CIR typically asks for that our existing review process does not ask for.

Director Webster stated the economic impacts were excluded from CEQA in State legislation and that was something that used to be studied routinely and no longer is.

Mayor Slayter questioned if the impacts would be addressed as community wide impacts such as business that is adding to our economy or sucking it dry.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated a lot of CIRs were created when businesses like Wal Mart were coming to small towns
- Stated it would address what is the impact
- Stated it would address what the business would do to existing businesses
- Stated it would address what is the net benefit to the community
- Stated it would address external affects that are not being accounted for (such as people going on food stamps for not being paid enough)

Mayor Slayter questioned if there are other highlights that we are not doing that the CIR would ask for.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Fiscal impacts on jurisdiction of development
- Result in net economic benefit to City itself or have negative effect
- Is not in Sebastopol's general review process currently
- May have sense of the impacts but they not have been looked at

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Cautioned in the process of preparing a CIR, jurisdictions have to be careful that some things that are studied may not relate to the decision (such as pay rates)
- Look at what impacts the City as a whole
- Not everything CIR studies is something that leads to the approval or denial of a decision
- Stated sometimes that is misunderstood in the community
- Stated a CIR may be a process to form the basis for Council to make the final decision

Director Webster commented that there may be an issue of concern for the Council or Planning Commission, such as wages, that the jurisdiction has no authority to act upon and stated this may be a false expectation of what the jurisdiction can approve or deny. He questioned if those topics should be studied if the City has no authority over them.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed the formula business ordinance
- Discussed the use permit process for the formula business ordinance and the numbers of questions posed (does it do x, y or z)
- Questioned if the same ground covered in the CIR is now in the use permit process for formula businesses that has been established tonight

Director Webster stated that is correct and that there are findings relating to CIR type topics in formula business ordinance.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There was none.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented if there is not a CIR to see how the project relates to the community, what process a project proponent would need to go through.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated it would be up to the City if it wants to create a process such as a CIR
- Stated some jurisdictions tell applicant to retain someone to do study with parameters that meets the City's approval
- Common for Cities to commission the study and be in control of it but the applicant would pay for the study
- Stated the City does this with CEQA reports for the City
- Paid by applicant and commissioned by the City
- Policy decision by the Council to have that structure

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed goals when it comes to regulations for business - Sustain existing business community and economy
- Welcome new and needed business that will contribute to our community
- Opposite of welcoming businesses that will drain our community
- Interested as part of welcoming new and needed businesses that will contribute to the City a process that is not as onerous as to discourage economic development
- Achieved quite a bit of what looking for with new formula business ordinance
- Interested to hear that there used to be an economic topic in the EIR
- Incorporate into EIR process rather than making separate thing
- Complicated and outside singular process if not within the EIR process
- Does not see a lot of attendance tonight on this issue at this meeting
- Not cast of thousands beating down our door on this item
- However, when the Council gets to a sticky problem everyone turns out and is concerned

- Discussed this is the difficult work of defining our criteria to just say no when appropriate and say yes when appropriate
- Hope community understands this is what the Council is engaging in now is getting criteria
- See as defining this is as an information gathering process to make legitimate and well-reasoned decisions as what is in our economic interest and what is not
- Look at criteria as a whole
- Like to be thinking of this some more
- How and whether this is the right thing to do to collect appropriate information to implement polices we put in place
- These kinds of processes are used in larger venues when talking of big business
- Think as City we are concerned if and when CVS moves to other side of town we end up with businesses that are replacing CVS in that shopping center, that we look at what enhances us economically
- Not want to see locally owned businesses impacted
- Sustain existing economy, grow and make it vibrant
- Hear from other Councilmembers and see what they think
- Review options using the criteria just discussed

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Concurs with Councilmember Glass
- Big topic to dial in tonight
- Not know our criteria or what this would focus on
- Feel vulnerable for our business community
- Economy is vulnerable
- Want greatest success we can have that includes the West County
- Councilmember Jacob provided input and read portions of the letter to the audience
- Important to move forward in the design phase of this requirement so we can understand what we are looking at
- Helpful and valuable to the project that is coming in to know where we would understand much better how it would support our economy
- Discussed avenue to have to do considerable amount of outreach to our business community to engage them in that conversation from the start
- Good project that could start now with a subcommittee
- Come in 2016 calendar

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Issue that he is seeing that is problematic is the additional requirement of yet another report that a potential applicant would need to fund and defend possibly
- Think we are quite far the down the road of being in the place that we want to be for local control to design our community to have it grow in a way we see as positive rather than negative
- Initial take is having a CIR not necessarily in favor of moving forward with CIR process
- Interested in increasing the requirements where appropriate and what that level of appropriate level is, he is not sure

- Need to figure that out
- Roll any additional requirement into exiting review process
- Ask those questions in that process
- Single document that is more easily understood by those reviewing it as well as residents of town
- Using requirements in the formula business ordinance use permit process
- Requirements already in place
- Probably in position of greater strength than we realize
- Discussed the idea of a Council subcommittee
- Staff pointed out Planning Commission might be initial body
- No real strong feelings one way or another

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Do want to study this
- Can't wrap CIR into formula business
- Has to be separate
- Weave things together more tightly tonight
- More to do to figure out approach

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed criteria for the use permit process
- Questioned where are we getting information to measure the criteria

Vice Mayor Gurney moved and Mayor Slayter seconded the motion to create a City Council Subcommittee of Vice Mayor Gurney and Councilmember Jacob to meet with staff regarding a timeline and work with staff and return this item to the City Council at a future City Council meeting.

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmember Glass, Vice Mayor Gurney and Mayor Slayter

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmembers Eder and Jacob

Abstain: None

**City Council Action: to create a City Council Subcommittee of Vice Mayor Gurney and Councilmember Jacob to meet with staff regarding a timeline and work with staff and return this item to the City Council at a future City Council meeting.**

**Minute Order Number: 2015-160**

7. Discussion and Consideration of Wayfinding Sign Program Proposal (Planning Director)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss the Wayfinding Sign Program Proposal.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated she was on the subcommittee that approved the original concepts
- Stated she is sorry that the material that was done then was not included in the report

- Stated that material is quite valuable
- Stated the subcommittee made a decision and selected something
- Stated the City should make some use of that
- Discussed the presentation of sign litter
- Presented areas in traffic flow of 10-12 different signs
- Sorry the project was shelved but excited to hear of extra components

Mayor Slayter commented that the SDAT also commented in their SDAT report that the City has plenty of asphalt and signs.

Sue Labouvie, Studio L'Image, commented as follows:

- Proposed three different scenarios and proposals
- Can be restructured if the City wants to do all three components
- Discussed making signs that re more pedestrian oriented
- Involved in ped line program
- Program to help unify downtown area
- Skeleton of what proposed
- Like to hear ideas and then come back with more defined program

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Business owner's downtown wanted signage for pedestrians, people driving by to get that hip business look
- Businesses would appreciate that directional marker for people who are touring around town
- Discussed idea of parking once and walking

Mayor Slayter questioned if Caltrans has finished the revisions to their encroachment permit process.

Director Webster stated for wayfinding he believes that they have.

Mayor Slayter questioned if there are any potential grant programs to fund installation of a program like this.

Director Webster stated not that he is aware of but staff would be on the lookout for those opportunities.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Stated she would think that the Gateway Signs would be an appropriate to use TOT money
- Wondering if there is any opportunity County grants available for tourism initiative
- Consider using TOT money for this project

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated he is not aware of any County grants but would be on the lookout for them
- Stated it would be logical to use TOT money for some of this project

- Stated it would be a benefit to visitors
- Discussed the One Way street confusion people who are not familiar with Sebastopol may have
- Benefit also to pedestrian oriented visitors

Councilmember Glass commented that the sign program should promote the idea that people are in our City and that they are patronizing our businesses and restaurants.

Director Webster commented it is an opportunity for enforcing the city's identity whether it is a standard or quirky identity.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed unification
- Work on unifying our bifurcated downtown
- Stated the City has double the size of our downtown
- Stated people still call Barlow the Barlow and Downtown separate
- Stated they are not thinking of this as the urban core
- What do to get everyone circulating around

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Signage could be designed in way that would slow down traffic
- Signs identify business area
- Include north and south areas of town
- Telling people coming into small town, downtown area and there is traffic here
- Signs should say be slow, in the downtown area
- People would see people waving to people
- Checking out businesses or who is on the sidewalk
- Effective at localizing traffic
- Giving it is own ambiance
- Appropriate with ambiance of town
- Great effect where people entering area would understand they need to go slowly

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There was none.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Modest revision if doing all three
- Stated Councilmember Jacob submitted comments and was in favor of moving all three components along
- Stated he is also in favor of all three as a package
- Stated he likes the use of the TOT money to fund some of this
- Questioned if the Council needs to identify a funding source

Director Webster commented that if the Council is in consensus with all three components, he will work with the consultant and bring back a revised proposal and identify the funding source at that time.

Vice Mayor Gurney moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve all three components of the proposal, request a revised proposal with all three elements be returned to the City Council at a future Council meeting with the appropriate funding identified.

Discussion:

- Councilmember Glass commented as follows:
- Discussed the funding source
- Stated as a member of the subcommittee, she does not want to see the City stray from its budget in the middle of the year before having gone through mid-year budget adjustments
- Stated the City is now six months under current budget
- Stated she would like to revisit this after we know where we are in terms of revenue and expenditures
- Suggested sticking within the current budget except if have untapped fund source or if the funds will be out of TOT money that does not significantly impact the current budget
- Stated she will support this if that happens
- Does not want to let the budget situation get out of control

Vice Mayor Gurney stated the Council can address that issue if this comes back in January.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Stated he and staff met with the Finance Director
- Stated there is a sufficient time lag to replenish the Traffic Impact Fee fund
- Stated there are no adverse impacts to using the traffic Impact Fee funds
- Stated he believes this addresses Councilmember Glass' concerns

Mayor Slayter stated he likes the choice to use TOT monies

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmember Glass, Vice Mayor Gurney and Mayor Slayter

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmembers Eder and Jacob

Abstain: None

**City Council Action:** Vice Mayor Gurney moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve all three components of the proposal, request a revised proposal with all three elements be returned to the City Council at a future Council meeting with the appropriate funding identified.

Minute Order Number: 2015-161

**CITY COUNCIL REPORTS:**

8. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports:

- City Manager McLaughlin stated that he and staff met with representatives from the KOWS community radio station and that an agenda item will be coming to the Council November 3<sup>rd</sup>

9. 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)
- Councilmember Glass reported out on the October 8<sup>th</sup> Mayors and Councilmembers Meeting/Dinner and stated that she participated in the Board meeting where it was discussed the idea that the Mayors and Councilmembers have the ability to move things forward and that they would like cities to discuss and support the idea that the Mayors and Councilmembers take up to 2-3 specific issues to work on and try to move them forward. She stated she personally supports that idea. She stated that the Mayors and Councilmembers at the Board meeting discussed this issue and she stated she personally supports the Mayors and Councilmembers taking on issues that are specifically about the jurisdictional ability for City to function as the City. She suggested the Mayors and Councilmembers review issues that have to do with us a municipality to move issues forward thwarted by State, county, etc. She discussed the power of a united front by municipalities, stated this is an appropriate use of Mayors and Councilmembers but stated she was not sure of the specific issues and not sure if our City will agree with other cities ideas. She stated the Council would need to agendize an item to discuss potential ideas as a Council that they would like to see the Mayors and Councilmembers work on and move forward.
  - Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows: Stated the Council saw an example tonight of some issues that are regional such as information and education and suggested these can all be discussed together at a Mayors and Councilmembers meeting and have a lively debate or discussion and stated this would be a meaningful event to attend. She stated it is important to get the issue out to the general membership and not just the Board or City Selection Committee. She stated there may be issues where the City may have a different experience than County and it is important to dial in on our perspective and experiences. She stated there needs to be further discussion of this and what we recommend would go forward.

Mayor Slayter stated they need to be specific items and items that are big that involves the opinion of all cities. He suggested not doing busy work.

Mayor Gurney provided a handout from the SCTA/RCPA Meetings and highlighted certain items.

10. Council Communications Received: There were none.  
11. Future City Meeting Dates/Events (Informational Only): (See Agenda)

Mayor Slayter adjourned the regular City Council Meeting at 8:10 pm to the closed session.

**CLOSED SESSION:**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Slayter called the meeting to order at 8:15 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Mayor Slayter  
Vice Mayor Gurney

## City Council Meeting Minutes of October 20, 2015

**DRAFT**

Absent: Councilmember Glass  
Councilmember Eder  
Councilmember Jacob  
Staff: City Manager-City Attorney Larry McLaughlin

PUBLIC COMMENT (Prior to adjournment into Closed Session, the public may speak up to 3 minutes on items to be addressed in Closed Session).

Michael Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Stated he spoke to members of SANE
- Stated this is a matter of code enforcement
- Stated the City is lax in code enforcement
- Noticed business are popping up everywhere with signs
- Majority are not going through the proper channels to do that
- Sandwich board signs are all over
- Consider how Sebastopol as a whole needs code enforcement to enforce different codes

12. CLOSED SESSION: Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation  
Name of case: Sebastopol Alliance for Neighborhood Empowerment (SANE) v. City of Sebastopol  
Authority: Govt. Code Sec. 54956.9

REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION: There was no report out.

ADJOURNMENT OF CLOSED SESSION: Mayor Slayter adjourned the closed session meeting at 8:45 pm to the regular City Council Meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mayor Slayter adjourned the regular City Council Meeting of October 20, 2015, at 8:46 p.m. to the next Regular City Council Meeting to be held on Tuesday, November 3, 2015 at 6:00 pm at the Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Gourley, CMC, City Clerk