AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 1

Draft

City of Sebastopol City Council regular meeting minutes

Meeting of January 5, 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 December 29, 2015.

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 6:02 p.m.

Roll call

Present: Mayor Gurney
Vice Mayor Glass
Councilmember Eder
Councilmember Slayter

Absent: 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
Police Chief Jeff Weaver

1. Interviews for openings on the Public Arts Committee (City Manager/City Clerk)

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 1

The City Council conducted the following interviews:

Name of Applicant	Time of Interview
David Gordon	6:00 pm
Alexis Persinger	6:15 pm
Robert Brent	6:30 pm
Warren Arnold	6:45 pm
Jennifer Vertz	7:00 pm

City Council Action: Conducted interviews for openings on the Public Arts Committee. No action taken.
Minute Order number: 2016-001

Mayor Gurney recessed the meeting at 7:20 pm and reconvened the City Council meeting at 7:30 pm.

Salute to the flag: Mayor Gurney led the salute to the flag.
Proclamations/Presentations: None

Mayor Gurney wished everyone a Happy New Year.

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.)

Jay Schaeffer commented as follows:

- Voiced concern of police department in town
- Stated there are good police in the police department
- Stated there is evidence of a lot of corruption
- Has evidence of outrageous stuff of abduction of boys
- Discussed the police stealing evidence of perpetrators crimes and breaking into his house without warrant
- Discussed violation of rights
- Stated this is not isolated
- Stated he has reported this officer
- Stated he gets scared driving through Sebastopol
- Stated he has been harassed from cops
- Would like an independent investigation

Colleen Fernald commented as follows:

- Discussed Jay Schaeffer and bringing these items to the attention of the City
- Grateful for opportunity to connect with Mr. Schaeffer
- Stated the issue is not just her who is suffering
- Discussed having an independent law enforcement body
- Impossible for impartial investigation on police forces
- Consequences become fatal
- Discussed negligence
- Time for changes
- Discussed upholding oath
- Discussed guns
- Discussed controlling human behaviors
- Discussed mental illness
- Discussed annulling Public Law 107.243
- Requested a meeting to discuss criminal behavior

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.*

Regular Agenda Item(s) (Discussion and/or Action):

2. Discussion and Action of Appointments to the Public Arts Committee (City Manager/City Clerk)

The City Council discussed and made the following appointments to the Public Arts Committee:

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Discussed the second page – registry of public art
- Questioned if this registry remains to be done in an extensive manner and stated it needs to be maintained
- Think some temporary installations in town are quasi-permanent

Director Webster commented as follow:

- Stated an intern did a registry
- Stated it should be updated on an annual basis
- Stated the document is on the City web site
- Needs some work and improvement

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment. There was none.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated the Council saw a pretty wide cross section of people on a variety of levels

- Found it refreshing
- Appreciate applicants throwing their hat into ring
- Discussed being in a place where art stops you in our track
- Not find in a lot cases of that in Sebastopol
- Comment by one of the interviewees felt that this body should have some level of independence from the Center of the Arts
- Voiced laudable support for:
    - David Gordon
    - Warren Arnold
    - Jen Vertz
- Different age groups
- Different background
- Broadest body of background

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed comments from interviews
- Discussed an applicant stating that the City should let the artists do their thing
- Discussed Warren Arnold: experience as a professional artist in a public realm is unparalleled among the art community in general
- Discussed Alexis Persinger: architect perspective
- unique position on the Design Review Board and a Liaison to this committee
- Discussed his term on the DRB being up and he has re-applied for the DRB and interviews will be next Monday
- Stated Mr. Persinger holds now a seat on the Public Arts Committee as rep by DRB and is looking to move into an independent seat
- Discussed Mr. Persinger is in town and wants to have more art in town
- Stated his willingness to serve is remarkable
- Discussed Robert Brent – understands his commitment to art
- Discussed Mr. Brent's support for Mr. Arnold and Mr. Brent stated that he feels the experience Mr. Arnold brings to the Committee is very important
- Discussed Jen Vertz – been in town a couple of years
- In interview – is weird and is one of us
- Brings energy to interview process not seen often
- Enthusiasm hard and impossible to ignore
- Experience with grant process
- Know how valuable grants can be to community
- Support:
    - David Gordon
    - Warren Arnold
    - Jen Vertz
- Mr. Brent strong candidate – deferred to Mr. Arnold
- Mr. Persinger has a seat currently on the Committee

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Support Councilmember Slayter comments
- Stated Mr. Persinger has a seat currently
- Stated Mr. Persinger would be representing DRB if re-appointed
- Incumbents feel committee functioning well as a unit
- Discussed turnover of members but starting to be cohesive
- Keep institutional memory of those applicants
- Supports:
    - David Gordon
    - Warren Arnold
- Mr. Brent has contributed so much to arts
- Jen Vertz – energetic newcomer
- A great deal of experience in grants and a perspective of being involved in the arts in a big City
- New member of community
- Bring in and get involved
    - Supports Jen Vertz

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated it was helpful when Mr. Brent yielded to Warren Arnold
- Supports Mr. Arnold who brought the whole notion forward of Public Art Committee
- Significant that he has worked with the group and ordinance and helped shape this and can now spend money and commission pieces
- David Gordon – ready to notch it up a bit and change the face of art in town
- Stated art does not have to be as familiar as it has been
- Get to broader and deeper experience
- Like Jen Vertz – Councilmember Eder has seen a number of the projects discussed by her
- Like her experience with grants

Councilmember Slayter moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to appoint the following applicants to the Public Arts Committee:

- Warren Arnold
- David Gordon
- Jen Vertz

Vote:

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

City Council Action: Appointed the following applicants to the Public Arts Committee:

- Warren Arnold
- David Gordon
- Jen Vertz

Minute Order number: 2016-002

Consent Calendar Item(s):

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 Eder seconded the motion to approve consent calendar items 3, 4, and 5.

Vote:

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

3. Approval of Minutes of December 15, 2015 City Council Meeting (City Manager/City Clerk)

City Council Action: Approved Minutes of December 15, 2015 City Council Meeting
Minute Order Number: 2016-003

4. Approval of Notice of Completion – Keating Avenue – Contract Number 2015-04 (City Engineer/Engineering Manager)

City Council Action: Approved Notice of Completion – Keating Avenue – Contract Number 2015-04
Minute Order Number: 2016-004

5. Approval of Notice of Completion – Sebastopol Community Cultural Center – contract number 2015-01 (City engineer/Engineering Manager)

City Council Action: Approved Notice of Completion – Keating Avenue – Contract Number 2015-04
Minute Order Number: 2016-005

Informational Item(s)/Presentation(s):

6. Informational Item: Update of Minute/Reference Orders for Calendar Year 2015 (City Manager/City Clerk)

City Clerk Gourley presented the staff report recommending the City Council review and receive the informational report.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Stated this is a very useful document for the City Council and public
- Stated any item that the City Council has acted on is listed in this document
- Stated any subject done within the past year can be found listed in this document
- Thanked the City Council and staff for all their hard work

Councilmember Eder thanked staff for this report.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment. There was none.

Mayor Gurney closed the agenda item with gratitude for the Councilmembers hard work and dedication and the help of staff.
City Council Action: None Required. Received report.
Minute Order number: 2016-006

Public Hearing(s):

7. Public Hearing – First reading and Introduction of Ordinance xxxx Amending City's landscape Ordinance to new adhere to new State standards (Planning Director/Building Official)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council approve for first reading and introduction of ordinance amending the City's landscape ordinance to new adhere to new state standards.

Councilmember Slayter discussed the urban water supplier definition and questioned if this is for everyone in the entire State regardless of the water supplier business or district.

Director Webster stated he believes that is correct even though Sebastopol is just below the threshold.

Councilmember Slayter clarified that the threshold is 3,000 customers.

Director Webster stated that the City could be at the threshold in a few years.

Councilmember Slayter questioned if for the purpose of this ordinance if that definition is irrelevant.

Director Webster stated that is correct.

Mayor Gurney opened the public hearing. Hearing no comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Slayter moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to approve for first reading and introduction of ordinance amending the City's landscape ordinance to new adhere to new state standards.

Vote:

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

City Council Action: Approved for first reading and introduction of ordinance amending the City's landscape ordinance to new adhere to new state standards.
Minute Order number: 2016-007

Regular calendar agenda item(s) (discussion and/or action) continued:

8. Discussion of status of Urban Growth Boundary Renewal (Planning Director/City Manager)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss the status of the Urban Growth Boundary renewal.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Discussed the strict time requirements for Council sponsored or citizen's initiative
- Discussed the staff's perspective – had meeting with group of citizens – give group support as legally able to do to assist them in meeting deadlines
- No issue with CEQA process if done through a citizen's initiative
- If a citizen's initiative is passed, it cannot be changed unless by the vote of the people
- Citizen's group – if unable to complete the process – Council can step in and adopt its own UGB ordinance to extend it for a period of time and wait until the next general election to have a ballot measure or a citizen's group can try again
- Stated staff can work with a citizen's group to get initiative under way
- If not possible to be completed by a citizen's group, Council take action in the fall to extend the UGB on its own and schedule it for the next regularly scheduled election

Mayor Gurney stated this was the clearest explanation she has heard and appreciated the additional option for solutions to the timing deadline and environmental review.

Councilmember Slayter questioned if staff can verify that there cannot be a Council initiated extension of the existing UGB.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated that there could be a Council initiative on the election
- Stated the idea of the UGB is it is a voter approved measure that only the voters can change
- Strong way of locking in the UGB
- Reason people promoting this type of measure is that it makes it hard to change the lines
- Temptation to do that
- City Council extension of the UGB policy by ordinance is not as powerful of a tool as a voter approved initiative

Councilmember Slayter commented if that far out into 2017, the election schedule is unknown.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Stated the Council can extend the ordinance by its own action and can extend it for two years until the next regularly scheduled election and bring back a City Council sponsored initiative
- Stated the process should be started well in advance, at least a year to meet the time lines for the 2018 election

Councilmember Slayter questioned if this was a City Council sponsored initiative on the ballot for the November 2016 election, would this require CEQA compliance and if so at what level.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Stated the Planning Director as the Environmental Coordinator would make the initial decision
- Stated there is not consensus at this time as to the level of CEQA review required
- Discussed the process of adopting the UGB and stated it the Council waited, the UGB would have the benefit of the General Plan EIR
- Discussed merging of the two items
- Discussed if the Council wanted to have a Council sponsored initiative separate from the General Plan, it is unclear would the CEQA would actually entail
- Stated it is complicated by the fact that the General Plan work is not done
- Stated a measure if approved would trump the General Plan

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Questioned if the possibility exists that with a Council sponsored initiative, the CEQA is automatically required
- Questioned if the CEQA review for the measure could be rolled into the EIR for the General Plan
- Questioned if it can be one in the same review if it is assumed that the General Plan will be adopted in 2016 and a UGB City Council sponsored initiative is 2017
- Questioned if the environmental work can be done for the initiative using the General Plan environmental work

Director Webster stated yes.

Councilmember Slayter clarified if the same review does not need to be done twice.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated that is correct unless there is some substantial difference between the General Plan sphere and what the initiative would be
- Stated that would have to be reviewed
- Stated assuming it is consistent or there ae minor differences, if the General Plan is certified, it should be good to serve as CEQA document for initiative

Mayor Gurney questioned if the General Plan EIR is done late in the fall, and the initiative misses the deadline, how long is the EIR valid for subsequent Council or citizen initiative in 2017 or 2018.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated staff would need to look at it to see if it is still valid, or if there are changed circumstances or if something is substantially different or if something in the environment has changed that is significant
- Stated if all were the same as today and there does not seem there will be those differences, an EIR would still be valid for a few years

City Manager McLaughlin stated it may need minor revisions.

Mayor Gurney stated there may be some updates needed.

Vice Mayor Glass stated there is an advantage of a citizen's initiated UGB campaign in terms of getting it done and having the actual wording and alignment of the UGB rather than having a City Council sponsored initiative.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Stated a citizen's group would need to start immediately on the process
- Stated group would have to have something set in stone right away
- Stated that the ordinance would need to be written that sets the boundaries
- Stated once they have the ordinance, they would need to start getting signatures
- Stated they would need the ordinance in hand so that voters can see what is being voted on
- Stated the one advantage is that the citizen's initiative would not have to deal with any CEQA issues at all
- Stated staff told the group that staff would help the group to the extent that they could legally help them
- Discussed the risks involved of having a measure without the General Plan being completed
- Stated the two need to be consistent as the measure would trump the General Plan

Vice Mayor Glass questioned if the City Council would be able to do a Council sponsored initiative in time for the November 2016 election.

City Manager McLaughlin commented that it may be impractical and not possible as it would involve CEQA.

Mayor Gurney discussed the staff work load and stated City staff is working on the new General Plan.

Councilmember Eder questioned if staff has seen any indicators in the General Plan process to date for any desires for major changes to the existing UGB.

Director Webster stated no.

Councilmember Eder stated it seems with the existing UGB and Measure O, and what staff knows of the General Plan process, the writing of the ordinance by a citizen's group should be straight forward and stated he presumes that the costs to the City would be the same whether it is Council sponsored or a citizen's initiative. He stated this would by-pass the need for the City to undergo CEQA. He stated if that fails, the City has the option of extending the UGB and putting it in the next regular election cycle.

Mayor Gurney clarified that the election would be 2018.

Councilmember Eder discussed Exhibit A and questioned the island indicated on the southwest portion of the City.

Staff stated that is the City's Pleasant Hill Avenue water reservoir.

Councilmember Eder discussed the annexing of Village Mobile Home Park and questioned there is that in the process.

Director Webster stated the GPAC is recommending the sphere be modified to include Village Mobile Home Park.

Councilmember Eder stated if a citizen's initiative were to move forward, it would be in the City's interest to insure that was included.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment.

Dennis Rossetti commented as follows:

- Advocated for option number 1 and 2 modified in the staff report
- Discussed the grass roots
- Stated they do not want to see the UGB expire
- Sebastopol is leader and was the first City to adopt UGB and he would like to see the leadership continue
- Would like to have a Council sponsored initiative
- Not unprecedented situation
- County in 2005 GP process – took nine years
- Timberland ordinance part of GP update
- Important issue to address in timely manner
- Housing Element updated – fast forward that
- Work with City
- SR Pet and Healdsburg was in same situation
- Used GP process to get CEQA
- Put measures before voter

- Continuity of voter approval of policy

Kathy Oetinger commented as follows:

- Been on GPAC
- Did a lot of work
- Worked with citizens from Sebastopol Tomorrow on the last UGB ballot measure
- Massive undertaking
- Cannot stand out in front of grocery store and expect to get the required signatures
- A lot of work is involved
- Group can decide how to proceed
- Discussed having PC, DRB, Council, and GPAC getting into the community and getting signatures quickly
- Stated the ordinance needs to be done correctly and have the correct legal wording without having to pay for an attorney
- Discussed what is important to hear and what to campaign on
- Urged the Council to also consider what rest of County is doing
- Discussed the City proceeding with their expertise and staff time

Jane Nielson commented as follows:

- Worked with many organizations
- Concern is there to ensure that the greenbelts are preserved
- Important for water supply
- Concerned about any greenbelt initiative in the County is set up legally
- Stated greenbelts rely on UGBs being legally enforced
- Discussed the County 2016 initiative and stated there is no guarantee the County will make the deadline for the 2016 election
- Stated it is important the city works to maintain its UGB

Ed Thompson, Tocchini Street, commented as follows:

- Eager to get involved in land use affairs
- Moved to Sebastopol because of robust set of land use policies
- State Director for American Farm Land Trust
- Discussed volunteering help to make this happen
- Stated there is broad consensus to renew the UGB
- Urged the Council to act fore with on that

Jay Schaffer commented as follows:

- Discussed efficient design of housing and site plan
- Offered to help out with whatever it takes to preserve the greenbelt
- Discussed the Village Mobile Home Park and stated he would like to see some very quality efficient housing somewhere in this town soon
- Stated efficiency includes affordability

Sarah Fain, Greenbelt Alliance, commented as follows:

- Discussed Greenbelt Alliance helping to shape rules for the Bay Area
- Thanked the Council for putting this on the agenda and having this conversation
- Discussed the willingness to protect the UGB
- Stated this is an incredible tool for making great cities and protecting open space
- Stated the want to continue doing this and stated the UGB has work for Sebastopol
- Stated the question is how to do this
- Stated they do not want to lose momentum on this
- Voiced concerned if the UGBs expire
- Discussed the importance of existing voter protections
- Stated if removed, concern of the potential implications
- Stated a Council ordinance is a great thing to show how important UGB is to the City
- Citizen's initiative should be supported as much as possible by the Council and staff

Colleen Fernald commented as follows:

- Hats off to Greenbelt Alliance and supporters
- Discussed constraints on where power lies in the City limits
- Sphere of influence is not constrained
- Define more clearly what greenbelts are
- Stated the county is oversaturated with wine grapes
- Stated areas should be included that could use areas for recycled water
- Discussed trees, bamboo, use of building materials
- Keep what we need to build and grow produced here
- Find ways to advocate and maintain

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public comment.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Citizen's initiative is important and is a vote by the citizens
- Stated there is indication that a citizen's initiative at this time could be done by the November 2016 election with the support of the City Manager and staff of what is possible and legal
- Stated we can be successful as a community

Councilmember Eder requested clarification and stated he senses a nuance that a voter sponsored initiative has more weight or does it have equivalent weight as a Council sponsored initiative.

City Manager McLaughlin comment that they are both equivalent and that both initiatives could not be changed without a vote by the people. He stated either initiative could be done, but a Council sponsored initiative requires CEQA.

Councilmember Eder stated if they are both equivalent in terms of enforceability, he supports the City engaging with the citizen's group and working to get the ordinance done and avoid CEQA. He stated if that process does not work, the City has available Plan B

which is to extend the UGB and put their own City Council sponsored initiative on the next election cycle.

Mayor Gurney questioned if this would be done with the advantage of the General Plan EIR being completed.

Councilmember Eder questioned staff if that would be the order of the process.

City Manager McLaughlin commented that is correct.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Stated this course of action makes sense
- Stated it is clear that this is going to involve a lot of work on the part of the community if this moves forward with a citizen's initiative
- Questioned if the City should move forward with the next course of action which would be to have staff draft a proposed ordinance to renew the UGB and then see if a citizen's group takes that up

City Manager McLaughlin stated the approach would be to assume that the City council or the citizen's group would prepare an ordinance that would be workable for the voters. He stated if the Council did not have enough time for the initiative, staff could make the material available to the citizen's group.

Mayor Gurney questioned the time lines.

City Manager McLaughlin commented that staff would need to prepare a draft ordinance, Council would need to review; or a citizen's group could prepare a notice of intent and start the process.

City Clerk Gourley provided the timelines for a citizen sponsored initiative.

City Manager McLaughlin stated staff can prepare a draft ordinance.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Stated the time frame seems compressed
- Discussed allowing the UGB to run the course
- Council resolution to extend the UGB
- Take up vote in 2018 election as a Council sponsored or citizen initiative
- Stated the vote of the people carries same weight
- Stated it does not carry weight when an ordinance is in limbo
- Assured success of extending time frame is reasonable
- If the will of the Council and staff can provide assistance in timely manner and citizens willing to take torch and run he is on board with that idea
- Suggested members of the GPAC, PC, Boards, and Council can all knock on neighbors doors to get signatures

- Stated a significant mobilization needs to happen rapidly

Councilmember Eder moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to:
direct staff to engage with a citizen's group to craft a ballot initiative to re-establish our UGB and sphere of influence and offer help within staff's ability and legality; and in the event that fails, the City Council can place the extension of the UGB on a Council agenda and look at a Council sponsored or citizen's initiative on a future election

Discussion:
Councilmember Slayter questioned how many signatures are required.

City Clerk Gourley discussed the percentage required.

Councilmember Slayter stated between the GPAC, PC, DRB, Boards and Council, that is about 20 signatures per person to get and seems reasonable.

Vote:

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

City Council Action: Directed staff to engage with a citizen's group to craft a ballot initiative to re-establish our UGB and sphere of influence and offer help within staff's ability and legality; and in the event that fails, the City Council can place the extension of the UGB on a Council agenda and look at a Council sponsored or citizen's initiative on a future election
Minute Order number: 2016-008

9. Discussion and consideration of letter of support to the County Board of Supervisor's protecting Sonoma County's greenbelts and communities with community separators (City Manager)

City Manager McLaughlin presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss and consider the request for a letter of support to the County Board of Supervisor's protecting Sonoma County's greenbelts and communities with community separators.

Sarah Fain, Greenbelt Alliance, commented as follows:

- Discussed community separators and the County's UGB
- Discussed protecting agricultural lands from development
- Stated the City has shown leadership
- Stated the City can show the County that the City is on board and this is a valuable tool to complement the UGB
- Discussed showing support of the County of Sonoma's renewal and expansion of community separators initiative on the November 2016 election
- Discussed separating the community separators and UGB is not a good idea and is of concern

- Stated it is no fault of the City of the possible lapse of the UGB but that it has an effect on the community separator
- Urged the Council to approve sending the letter to the County
- Stated they have found in other cities, broad voter support for community separators on the November 2016 election

Mayor Gurney stated that she is interested to see in the maps the community separators are to the east and north from the Dei Dairy to Occidental Road and not have anything to the south.

Sarah Fain commented that in the Greenbelt Alliance packet, it identifies where to protect geographically.

Mayor Gurney questioned how to get those areas in play and if the map is part of the 2016 election.

Sarah Fain commented as follows:

- Stated what is in the packet are Greenbelt Alliance's maps
- Discussed that these are places that are identified for places for expansion of community separators
- Discussed that this is opposite of saying UGB expanding
- Map – County has identified priority greenbelts and opportunities for community separators to be expanded

Mayor Gurney stated the community is interested in protecting those areas.

Sarah Fain commented as follows:

- Stated they are willing to work on that
- Discussed coming to the City and sitting down and looking at opportunities
- Questioned what the benefits to look at are

Mayor Gurney stated that would be a valuable conversation.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment.

Kathy Oetinger commented that while she was on the GPAC, she promoted language that said to work on greenbelts outside the UGB of the City and looking beyond the UGB, but stated it is not accomplished in the recent General Plan.

Denny Rossetti commented as follows:

- Stated Greenbelt Alliance has spent hundreds of hours on policies and companion policies for cities
- Reflection is that they have done a good job of protecting areas
- Discussed that this does not pertain to all the land around the City but specific parcels

- Strong indicator on ballot for renewal in fall election
- Thanked the Council for considering the letter of support
- Discussed sunset
- Hoping to see 30-50 year sunset
- A lot of potential for expansion
- Phase 2 coming out – what are the new lands we are looking at to expand to

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public comment.

Mayor Gurney stated she appreciates speakers helping the Council to understand where we are and also about phase 2 and stated she is in favor of signing the letter.

Councilmember Slayter moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to authorize the Mayor to sign the letter to the County Board of Supervisors.

Vote:

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

City Council Action: Authorized the Mayor to sign the letter to the County Board of Supervisors on community separators.
Minute Order number: 2016-009

Mayor Gurney called for a break at 9:30 pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:37 pm.

10. Discussion and action for consideration of direction to staff regarding reprioritization of capital improvement budget (Engineering Manager) – *this item was continued from the December 15, 2015 City Council meeting*

Engineering Manager Mikus presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss and provide direction to staff regarding reprioritization of capital improvement budget.

Councilmember Eder questioned if there is a figure for the examples for # 2 (smaller bicycle improvements), Item 4.

Engineering Manager Mikus stated that is about $110,000.

Councilmember Slayter stated in the CIP cost estimate for City street bike lanes (three categories), those figures are a couple of years old, and questioned if those figures include design or just construction.

Engineering Manager Mikus stated that money would include the design work.

Mayor Gurney clarified if that is for design and construction.

Engineering Manager Mikus stated that is correct.

Vice Mayor Glass stated given what has been concluded after losing the grant, and discussed that we might reapply next year to the same program, questioned if the City is seeing either that program or other programs as opportunities where the City has a 50-50 chance of getting the grant.

Engineering Mikus stated he wish he could answer that, but stated he has no frame of reference and stated he has not been in this arena long enough to have a judgement.

City Manager McLaughlin discussed the grant application process and stated the City's chances will be better this time, but there is no way to tell if the City's chances are 50-50.

Vice Mayor Glass stated she is being mindful of the comments about piece-meal construction, and questioned if the City should keep and leverage the money for a future grant application or do the projects now.

Engineering Manager Mikus suggested keeping the money to give flexibility in the future for grant applications and stated he thought this would be the wisest course.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated that the City missed the grant and wants to ensure the next application is stronger in the process
- Discussed that it should include the idea of bringing people into the downtown
- Good chance at being more effective
- Questioned if there are other monies that the City can go after

Engineering Manager Mikus stated he is not sure.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated that the voting public is frustrated
- Discussed the interest in finding money to get something on the ground
- Stated the City wants a little of everything
- Discussed the need for staff to research other opportunities
- Discussed working with SCTA for grant funding
- Stated the City has to be a more successful applicant or more demanding City

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment.

Lynn Deedler commented as follows:

- Talk of using that fund for doing the streets that are unaddressed in the Master Plan
- Concerns of that
- Asked three bicycle experts to look at those designs and plans and evaluate them

- Master Plan has not been evaluated as to value and need
- Cause for redesign
- Cited some examples: Felt it would not be good to have a bike lane going downhill on Bodega Avenue; route only good for competent and professionals; people travel at same speed of traffic and occupy center lane; traffic lanes on Morris Streets are not appropriate, sharrows would be better; Gary Helfrich, John Cicerelli, Bike Solutions, Lowell Snyder, before spend money in that direction more looking at what we need in town core.

Jonathan Greenberg commented as follows:

- Speaking of what we do with money and what Council creates and doesn't
- Discussed tax increases
- Use money to expand City positions and provide raises
- Public services expansion not been something Council has been able to deliver to public
- Opportunity to deliver something
- Web 2.0 back channel
- Create participatory budgeting system
- Polled and express opinions on what like to see done with tax money
- Perfect opportunity for that
- Parents want protected bike lanes, wanting for many years, do not have a chance to come to this meeting
- Like to see bike trails begun and things starting to be built
- Discussed gate at Burbank Farm
- Feel safe on trial that is off road and a trail needs to be built
- Absence of this trail has been ongoing for a while

Michael Boynton commented as follows:

- Support for money to be spent on bike trail
- Invaluable resource for any town to increase livability
- To spend money elsewhere is to lose opportunity to have other people enjoy rest of town

Judith Iam commented as follows:

- Value earth and possible to contact nature
- Add voice to using $200,000 buy a lot of plants (native, medicinal)
- Make people's walks remarkable
- Take every opportunity to restore to what it can be and let it be
- Not offer money to consultants
- Offer to people who can make it happen

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public comment.

Councilmember Eder questioned what is the available balance in the Traffic Impact Fund and is this $200,000 the lion's share or a minor percentage.

Engineering Manager Mikus stated he thought there was about $180,000.

City Manager McLaughlin and Director Webster commented that they thought the Traffic Impact Fund had about $700-800,000.

Councilmember Eder questioned if this $200,000 is about 25 percent of what is available of the balance of the fund.

Director Webster stated this fund is also used for a number of planned uses and not a whole lot of this money is for transportation related items.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Questioned what other planned projects would consume funding from the Traffic Impact fund
- Commend Engineering Manager for wisdom in saying not spend money just because we have it
- Bicycle Master Plan has significant flaws in it
- Discussed bike lanes on Bodega Avenue and having a ditch along it as well as portions of it being uphill and having parked cars to contend with
- Stated Engineering Manager Mikus pointed out this should be designed as system
- Putting in just spokes of a wheel and not having a wheel when done
- Highway 116 was spine of plan
- Without that a lot of other things do not make sense
- December 1, 2014 Council took action to consider $80,000 study for Class 1 off road multi user trails
- Suggested the Council consider pushing that item over the feasibility study and using some of this money to fund that feasibility study
- Clear consensus from the community that there is support for that
- Opportunity to fund that with some of this $200,000
- If funding is to be used on a local street, only one makes sense, bike lane on Morris Street between Highway 12 and Eddie Lane
- Put in a connector section
- Not sure need to spend this money right now
- Not sure have faith getting money for 116 improvements
- Not sure believe in them anymore
- Wisdom from Engineering Manager on sidewalk gap closures
- Planning/Engineering design on some of those things is a viable use of money
- Like to see some of this money put towards feasibility of Class 1 Multi user trails

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed comments of existing Bike/Ped Plan, and does not think that this is a wheel with a bunch of spokes
- Pretty comprehensive way to get around town
- May need some revisions but no reason to scuttle entire plan
- Was vetted thoroughly
- Held a number of significant meetings on this plan
- Now pushing 40% of cost of on street in town projects
- $500,000 to build - $200,000 to start
- More than cover design phase of entire system
- Pushes project forward in major way
- Discussed sidewalk gaps
- Bodega Avenue/Pleasant Hill – be great but think biggest bang for community buck is moving forward with big dream

Mayor Gurney stated if some of this money were used to do the design work, have project ready for applying for grants and that the City will not get far until we get to that point.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Way that funding for transportation projects in small cities works is not the way to design it
- Cannot afford to accomplish transportation projects without getting grants
- Not get enough revenue otherwise
- Smart thing to do is to leverage money we have
- Can apply for grant money from various organizations, won't give money if cannot match
- How much should we keep in order to be able to apply to leverage money versus how much to spend
- Is it smart right now to spend money on designing something and hope that we can get additional funds to accomplish the design or do we take some of that money unleveraged and put it into some projects
- Tend to think to leverage it is smarter
- Sit on it and apply for grants
- Accomplish shovel ready design

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Been involved in Safe Routes to School and master plan
- Extensively vetted
- Done at pace that allowed a lot of public input
- Waste to trash plan now
- Streets are the same now
- Most traffic is going across town
- East-west crossing puts people in a whole lot of hills
- Pleasant area of town is street network of town which links to schools

- Plan is valuable that it is worth ear-marking this money for local street routes and knowing it is there to apply for grants
- See where we succeed first
- Favor local street network done as complete network
- Workable plan
- Make decision to save money or do design
- Not sure why we cannot do both - design or money for grant
- Or make commitment to put chunks of money into this work each year to build up significant fund to do something for the public
- Sidewalk closures too small in value
- Could be done by a developer
- Continue on course of action, commit to dedicating more money to fund
- Agreement moving forward with design work of local streets worthy of some part of this $200,000

Councilmember Slayter questioned what the design phase would cost.

Engineering Manager Mikus stated he does not believe it would cost more than $50,000. He discussed the parallels of the CDBG ADA grant and stated funding was set aside each year to where now the City has enough money to hire an architect and is close to having sufficient funds for doing the Ives Park complex.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Clarify - intent not to abandon bike/ped plan
- One thing to look at dotted lines on map and go actually go out and ride bicycle
- Plans are all good, but sometimes reality checks are called for
- Without major routes being covered, a lot of these roads get you to a road with nowhere to go
- Not clear if riders will increase with sharrows on road
- Riding not dependent upon markings on the street
- Not know if more inclined to ride another street if there were markings on the road
- Not know if people will modify their behavior
- Discussed before and after ridership study
- Morris Street makes sense – is a missing link

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Recently road bikes all over Brooklyn
- Not thought to take bike out in traffic without sharrows and bike lanes
- Discussed the community culture of being on a bike
- Think Sebastopol is more walkable than bike able
- Not change people
- Discussed improvements of walkability

Councilmember Slayter moved and Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to direct staff to prepare a RFP for the design phase of the City streets project; then with possible balance that is put in reserve fund to leverage for future projects.

Discussion:
Vice Mayor Glass suggested clarifying that the remaining funds be put into a reserve fund to be used for matching fund needs for future projects.

Councilmember Slayter amended his motion and Mayor Gurney seconded the amended motion to direct staff to prepare a RFP for the design phase of the City streets project; and that the remaining funds be put into a reserve fund to be used for matching fund needs for future projects for Bikes on Local Streets as listed on page A3.

Discussion:
Councilmember Eder suggested an amendment to the motion to have staff prepare an RFP for the direction to staff from the December 1, 2015 Council meeting for a feasibility study for multi-use trails. He suggested giving staff both directions for both RFPs.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated the Council asked for that item to come back for discussion
- Council not allocated approved funding for this study
- Stated it is coming back to the Council in a month or so and will be a separate item
- Discussed potential other uses for traffic impact fund

Councilmember Eder questioned if it is a matter of having one take precedence over the other.

Director Webster stated no, that there is a limited amount of funds and there needs to be a conscious knowledge of the commitment of those funds. He stated if the Council makes a commitment tonight, when they look at other uses in the future, there should be a reminder of what other funds have already been to and what.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- There is a rough estimate for $50,000 for on street local street bike lanes
- There is $80,000 for a feasibility study for multi-use trails
- Balance still available in the $200,000 if $130,000 is used
- Stated it is a good idea for the Council to keep in mind funds that have been committed when determining allocation of future funding

Vote:

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

City Council Action: Directed staff to prepare a RFP for the design phase of the City streets project; and that the remaining funds be put into a reserve fund to be used for matching fund needs for future projects for Bikes on Local Streets as listed on page A3.
Minute Order number: 2016-010

Mayor Gurney asked the Council to continue the meeting as the meeting was going beyond the 10:30 pm ending time.
The Council was in consensus to continue the meeting.

11. Continuation of Discussion and Action for approval of Laguna de Santa Rosa Wetlands Preserve Management Plan (Planning Director) – *this item was continued from the December 15th City Council meeting*

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council discuss and approve the Laguna de Santa Rosa Wetlands Preserve Management Plan.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Questioned where there is a situation of black berries and willows, does this plan, or how does this plan address the situation of black berry invasion that is mingled with willows
- Stated there are areas where there is a thicket of combined black berries and willows
- Some people have advocated opening that up
- How manage to maintain willows that we want but don't want thicket

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Plan does recognize the problem of non-native black berry species and has recommendation and protocols
- Stated this is a challenging and on-going issue
- Plan identifies resources needed to improve how we manage the preserve
- Stated this will be a City Council and City department budget discussion
- City council and City department budget discussion

The consultant commented that the recommendation would be working by hand and working around the native vegetation.

Vice Mayor Glass questioned if over time it is the City's goal to get rid of black berry thickets but that it will take time to get there.

The consultant commented as follows:

- Not see entirely eradicated
- Be brought in by birds, etc.
- As long as there is an area, they will come in
- More of a question of managing it

- Discussing replacing the black berry not just removing it

Vice Mayor Glass questioned fill and channeling.

The consultant commented as follows:
- Discussed Sebastopol's history
- Protect adjacent land and structure
- Deeper channel helps keep Ludwigia at bay
- May be part of the reason for the channeling

Vice Mayor Glass questioned if it is the case that it would be very difficult for us to get permission from Caltrans to have the trail to go underneath the bridge.

Director Webster commented as follows:
- Stated that action is recommended in the plan
- Stated there is expressed support from Caltrans
- Stated the City and Caltrans will work together to see what can be done
- Caltrans was lobbied to create undercrossing – said no – stated they said if the City wanted to do it, Caltrans would work with the City
- Called for in this plan to try to accomplish that

Mayor Gurney questioned assuming adoption of the plan, what is the Council's next step to have this plan happen on the ground.

Director Webster commented as follows:
- Stated the City is awaiting word on grant application that the City filed for which is in the amount of half a million dollars
- Other grant opportunities where this project would be competitive and a good fit
- Stated City departments will need to look at the adopted plan and its recommendations for additional resources for maintenance as this would not qualify for grant funding

City Manager McLaughlin stated staff will review these items during the FY 2016-2017 budget process.

Mayor Gurney commented as follows:
- Stated that is about the money portion of the plan
- Questioned what other items need to be done such as the volunteer effort
- Questioned how that will be done

Direct Webster stated staff will look to other organizations such as the Laguna Foundation to coordinate the volunteer effort and could be possibly funded with a modest amount of money.

Vice Mayor Glass stated that once this plan gets adopted, the City could get together and meet with the Laguna Foundation and talk of how to work best with Laguna Foundation to utilize their volunteer management services. She also suggested applying for Coastal Conservancy grants for watershed restorations.

Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated he is pleased to see a lot of changes and edits
- Discussed the comments he provided to the Council
- Questioned the removal of black berries with a back hoe

The consultant comment that is an option in the plan and it would be completed by re-planting of native vegetation and heavy planting for erosion control.

Councilmember Eder thanked the consultant for making the changes and capturing a lot of the suggestions provided.

Mayor Gurney questioned if the handout provided tonight by Councilmember Eder is a recap of suggestions from Lynn Deedler.

Councilmember Eder stated it is a synopsis.

Mayor Gurney read the list of items and stated most of these are in the report and others are grouped in the report. She stated these are good suggestions and questioned if Councilmember Eder is requesting to add these as goals to the plan.

Councilmember Eder discussed the handout regarding the section of the plan that deals with black berries and erosion control of the property on the south side of the trail as someone enters the Railroad Forest and questioned if this is in the plan.

The consultant stated that are is not a part of the Preserve but that they added a recommendation highlighted in green in the report of enhancing entry points to the trail at the west end of the Joe Rodota trail.

Councilmember Eder stated this covers goal number 1 but questioned if the Council wants to be specific to add over-reaching trees.

Mayor Gurney stated the over-arching goal covers it.

Councilmember Eder questioned if goal 6 is addressed in the plan.

The consultant stated the plan does not specifically talk of that but there is ongoing maintenance that the City does. The consultant discussed silt that is often deposited on the trail and is part of the natural process. The consultant stated she spoke with Public Works about this issued and they did not identify it as problematic.

Councilmember Eder discussed the recommendation of a man made feature be created to avoid the silt build up and believe this is worth considering.

The consultant stated this has been addressed previously and is not something they are recommending. She discussed the concern of creating a pond alongside a trail would entire major design and engineering and permitting and the silt would then be deposited into the pond created. She stated similar things have been tried in the past and they are not recommending that.

Councilmember Eder discussed the shape of Calder Creek and the Ives Park Master Plan and questioned if Ives would need to go through the same permitting or is it within the City's jurisdiction.

Director Webster stated the work for Ives Park would require permitting.

Councilmember Eder commented that it is odd for the City to be spending a lot of money to naturalize Calder Creek and then 500 yards away on other side of Petaluma Avenue saying don't naturalize it.

Director Webster stated it is partly related to the character of the two areas. Ives Park – concrete channel, fenced in, no natural vegetation and in the Preserve, Calder Creek was channelized in the past, natural vegetation has grown up and is not a concrete channel like Ives Park.

Councilmember Eder stated he tried to make these goals as general possible and stated if the Council is in agreement and support, what he would like to see happen tonight is to ask that these items be compared against the latest iteration of this plan and make sure they are included in some manner as concept and then move forward one see final edit before approving the plan.

Mayor Gurney read the list of goals presented by Councilmember Eder (listed below):
Insure or consider the inclusion of the following goals in this document:
Goal #1- Beautify Rodota trailhead at Petaluma Avenue, to include:
- *Blackberry removal on south side of Rodota Trail (coordinate work with County Parks)*
- *Selectively remove excess trees planted on west end of Rodota Trail, allowing development of fuller tree canopies over trail (coordinate work with County Parks)*

Goal #2- Beautify Railroad Forest trailhead by Sebastopol Inn
Goal #3- Beautify Calder Creek viewing area at Railroad Forest Trail Bridge
Goal #4- Provide seating/rest amenities (benches/tables) for area users
Goal #5- Naturalize banks of initial stretch of Calder Creek (as is proposed in Ives Park Master Plan)
Goal #6- Protect Railroad Forest Trail from silt inundation due to overflow of Calder Creek
Goal #7- Acknowledge and preserve/display items from past history/usage of areas

Goal #8- Shield man-made development from view to the maximum extent possible with native plantings
Goal #9- Assign appropriate names to preserve areas (as needed/appropriate)

Mayor Gurney responded to the memos as listed below:
Goal 1:
In plan

Goal 2:
Entrances to be beautified
The consultant stated this particular entrance is outside the Preserve

Goal 3:
Recommended that be in the area where restoration starts
Suggested bench and signs to be added
The consultant stated it is in the plan to add signage

Goal 4:
In plan

Goal 5:
Been there historically
Discussed naturalization of the creek
More of ditch than natural creek
Making more gentle transition on banks

Mayor Gurney questioned the narrowness of the Preserve.

Councilmember Eder stated this is an idea to look at.

The consultant commented as follows:

- Recommending restoration along those banks
- Not very tall or long bank
- Rapidly turns into creek channel
- Minor work to reshape it would be one thing but would not recommend
- major reconstruction of the channel

Goal 7 – community resources (railroad tracks)
The consultant stated that this is addressed in the plan but not to the extent requested by Councilmember Eder.

Goal 8:
Councilmember Eder provided an example: Petaluma Avenue trail head is near a body shop and industrial infrastructure and if the black berries are removed it would be

exposing damaged cars and questioned how those areas can be shielded as well as the back of the Post Office Annex

The consultant commented it is their recommendation to remove black berries only in conjunction with replanting of native species that are appropriate for that site and stated that this goes hand in hand.

Goal 9:
Honoring POMO heritage
Not advocating naming all areas POMO names
Honor all people who participated in Sebastopol's past
The consultant stated this was captured and is part of the plan

Councilmember Eder commented that it is his point to try to incorporate these concepts if feasible into the plan.

Mayor Gurney thanked Councilmember Eder for providing his comments in writing as it is helpful for the Council to follow what is being discussed.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Stated he had a conversation with Mr. Joe Bitomosa (sp ?) from UC Davis
- Past President of Weed Science Society of America
- Pleased to see the edit of the limited use of herbicides in the area
- Not receive a lot of good news about hand removal
- Once work begins he would be interested in methods and procedures on infestation removal
- Tap into that knowledge would be helpful in getting results that are real and last
- Comfortable with content of plan

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment.

Eric Wyckoff commented as follows:

- Areas of concern of this document being used as codified document of the City's vision
- Words – appendix 7 b – herbicides
- Not a lot of viable alternatives to use of herbicides
- Goats, removal by hand, etc.
- Discussed report of nature conservancy
- Not lock self in of not using herbicide in future
- Compliment community in general
- Live to see Calder Creek from bike trail
- Hats off for work done

Lynn Deedler commented as follows:

- Joe Rodota could be one of the most beautiful trails in the County
- Sebastopol end is drab, weedy, crowded, not safe
- Wish overall goal to make the Sebastopol end of the trail beautiful
- Naturalize Calder Creek
- Restoration document
- Important to be in there
- Permit is free
- Can be filled up b layman
- Overseen by Department of the Army Corp of Engineer
- Easy to get permit
- A lot of small pieces of machinery to do that job
- Highly viewed areas
- Remove walls of mixes of blackberry and willows
- Create beautiful views into Railroad forest
- Include those two goals in the adoption of this plan

Judith Iam commented as follows:

- Encourage taking up citizen suggestions for beauty
- Tenants of not paving is better than paving
- Curves are better than straight
- Questioned the $50,000 for a study
- Questioned what is the hourly rate of a consultant
- Suggest looking at disparate rates from bottom to tops
- Discussed efforts for actual work that goes into making these places happen versus paying someone the sum of the magnitude of what a consultant earns
- Asked the consultants to volunteer
- Suggesting spreading funding more equitably among the populist

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public comment.

Councilmember Slayter moved and Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to approve the Laguna Preserve Restoration and Management Plan.

Discussion:
Councilmember Eder commented as follows:

- Stated he questioned if the Council wanted to add some verbiage about investigating the possibility of naturalizing Calder Creek if feasible
- Stated it is not a commitment to do anything
- Stated he understands there are permitting and engineering costs
- Stated the second item could be addressed by removal of black berries and suggested leaving this door open

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Think this is a good plan

- Thanked the consultant
- Thanked the public for input that made the plan better
- Have spent a lot of money who have advanced degrees in figuring this out
- Benefit of expertise
- Plan that works for the environment and restoration
- Not a work plan
- Issues people may have should be in work plan

Councilmember Eder questioned if the maker of the motion would amend the motion to include language to investigate the possibilities as stated previously.

Councilmember Slayter commented stated that he believes that although they are not specific, they are generally listed in the plan.

Councilmember Eder commented that he recommends against some of the items.

Mayor Gurney stated she appreciates the thoroughness and tempered response of the consultants.

Vote:

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

City Council Action: Approved the Laguna Preserve Restoration and Management Plan.
Minute Order number: 2016-011

12. Discussion and appointment of members to staff committee appointments/assignments and City Council committee appointment assignments (City Manager/City Clerk) – *this item was continued from the December 15, 2015 City Council meeting*

Due to the lateness of the hour, City Manager McLaughlin requested the Council act on one of the committees and postpone the remainder to a future City Council Meeting.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comments.

Hearing none, Mayor Gurney closed the public comment.

Councilmember Slayter moved and Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to re-appoint Vice Mayor Glass to the Marin Sonoma Mosquito Vector Control District.

Vote:

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

City Council Action: Approved re-appointment of Vice Mayor Glass to the Marin Sonoma Mosquito Vector Control District.
Minute Order number: 2016-012

13. Discussion and consideration of approval of setting City Council meeting dates for calendar year 2016 (City Manager/City Clerk)

Mayor Gurney recommending the City Council discuss and approve setting City Council meeting dates for calendar year 2016. She suggested that staff and the Council, if it is feasible, be prepared to cancel the second meeting in August, but that the cancellation will be determined closer to the meeting date.

Mayor Gurney opened for public comment.

Hearing no comments, Mayor Gurney closed the public comment.

The Council was in consensus to work towards cancelling the second meeting in August.
City Council Action: The Council was in consensus to work towards cancelling the second meeting in August.
Minute Order number: 2016-013

City Council reports:

14. City Manager-attorney/City Clerk reports:
    - Reminder: special City Council meeting of Monday, January 11, 2016 at 6:00 pm at the Sebastopol youth annex for interview and appointment to the design review board and planning commission.
    - Reminder: special joint meeting of the planning commission and City Council to discuss the general plan update, Tuesday, January 12, 2016 at 7:00 pm at the Sebastopol youth annex.
    - City Council needs to decide on a venue for the February 11, 2016 Mayors and Councilmembers meeting/dinner. The City Council provided a variety of locations to staff with the final location to be determined by the Mayor and Staff.
15. 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): There were none.
16. Council communications received: There were none.
17. Future City meeting dates/events (informational only): (see agenda)

Closed session: none

Adjournment: Mayor Gurney adjourned the regular City Council meeting of January 5, 2016 at 11:45 pm to the special City Council meeting to be held on Monday, January 11, 2016 at 6:00 pm for interviews and appointments for Design Review Board and Planning

Commission. The meeting is to be held at the Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Gourley, CMC. City Clerk