

## CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

### MINUTES FOR Meeting of September 15, 2020

As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of October 6, 2020.

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. City Council video recording are kept for a period of one year from date of 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.

SIMULTANEOUS MEETING COMPENSATION DISCLOSURE (Government Code § 54952.3): Members of the City Council receive no additional compensation as a result of convening a joint meeting of the City Council and Successor Agency to the Former Community Development Agency.

SB 751 Legislative bodies of local agencies must publicly report: (1) any action taken and (2) the vote or abstention on each action taken by each member present for the action at a meeting.

\*\*\*\*GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20\*\*\*\*  
\*\*RE CORONAVIRUS COVID-19\*\*

CITY COUNCL MEETINGS WILL BE CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS WHICH SUSPENDS CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF THE RALPH M. BROWN ACT.

*This meeting complies with the Sonoma County Health Officer's COVID-19 Order to Shelter in Place issued on March 17, 2020, and pursuant to California Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20 issued on March 17, 2020.*

#### CORONAVIRUS DISEASE (COVID-19) ADVISORY

To protect our constituents, City officials and City staff, the City requests all members of the public to follow the California Department of Health Services' guidance and the County of Sonoma's Public Health Officer Order for the Control of COVID-19 restricting group events and gatherings and maintaining social distancing.

Consistent with Executive Order N-29-20, in-person participation by the public will not be permitted and no physical location from which the public may observe the meeting will be available. Remote public participation information follows this agenda.

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.

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 remotely to its meetings that are generally scheduled for the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of every month. Your interest and participation are encouraged and appreciated.

SIMULTANEOUS MEETING COMPENSATION DISCLOSURE (Government Code § 54952.3): Members of the City Council receive no additional compensation as a result of convening a joint meeting of the City Council and Successor Agency to the Former Community Development Agency  
SB 751 Legislative bodies of local agencies must publicly report: (1) any action taken and (2) the vote or abstention on each action taken by each member present for the action at a meeting.

City Council Regular Meetings are available in real time and archived on Livestream. Important Notice  
The City of Sebastopol shows both live broadcasts and Video Archive of City Council Meetings over the Internet. Your attendance at this public meeting may result in the recording and broadcast of your image and/or voice.

- Here is the link: <http://bit.ly/sebcctv>

*There are times that the meetings may not be live streamed due to technical issues; if that is the case, the meeting will be video-taped and uploaded as soon as possible to the City Web Site.*

**Anyone using abusive, vulgar, offensive, threatening, or harassing language, personal attacks of any kind or offensive terms that target specific individuals or groups will be muted and removed from the meeting.**

6:00 PM Convene Regular City Council Meeting (ZOOM VIRTUAL FORMAT)

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Slayter called the regular meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mayor Patrick Slayter – By video teleconference  
Vice Mayor Una Glass – By video teleconference  
Councilmember Michael Carnacchi – By video teleconference  
Councilmember Sarah Gurney - By video teleconference  
Councilmember Neysa Hinton -By video teleconference

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley  
Administrative Services Director Ana Kwong  
Engineering Manager Henry Mikus  
Fire Chief Bill Braga  
Planning Director Kari Svanstrom  
Interim Police Chief Don Mort  
Public Works Superintendent Dante Del Prete

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

**Addition of Agenda Item:**

Proclamation – September 15<sup>th</sup> – October 15<sup>th</sup> 2020 as Hispanic Heritage Month.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- We have no proclamations or presentations; however, something came to my attention this afternoon that we needed to potentially add to the agenda
- Would suggest the Council add a proclamation that is important to our community and whole region
- Like to add proclamation proclaiming September 15th through October 15th as Hispanic heritage month
- Recognize that Hispanic is a dated term at this point, but that's the official terminology that's set down by the Federal Government when it became a policy, public law.
- As a last-minute addition requires a four-fifths vote to add to the agenda.

**MOTION:**

Mayor Slayter moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to add the Proclamation to tonight's agendas it is was brought to the City's attention after the posting of the agenda.

Mayor Slayter asked for public comment. There was none.

Mayor Slayter called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmember Carnacchi, Gurney, Hinton, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Slayter

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved addition of proclamation**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-196**

**PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS:**

The following was presented:

Added: Proclamation Proclaiming September 15<sup>th</sup> – October 15<sup>th</sup> as Hispanic Heritage Month.

Alicia Sanchez received the proclamation.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** During COVID 19 Virtual City Council Meetings, members of the public may submit written emails/comments for items not on the agenda either by email as a public record or by public comment during the public comment period of the virtual City Council meeting. At this time, a member of the public, when recognized by the Mayor, may speak for up to three minutes on the entire consent calendar and/or request at that time that an agenda item or items be removed for discussion. All written emails/comments will be provided to the entire City Council as a public record but will not be read into the minutes at the City Council meeting. Written emails/comments should be received by 5:00 pm of the Council Meeting Date for submission to the entire City Council prior to the meeting and will be included as a part of the record of the meeting. Please submit your comments via email for this meeting to [mgourley@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:mgourley@cityofsebastopol.org). Under State Law, unless otherwise permitted under the Ralph M. Brown Act, the merits of the matters presented under this item cannot be discussed or acted upon by the City Council at this time. For items appearing on the agenda, the public will be invited to make comments at the time the item comes up for Council consideration. Please review procedures on how to make live public comment during a city council meeting.

Public Comments Received by Email Prior to the Meeting:

A copy of the emails submitted prior to the City Council meeting have been made a part of the public record. A list of emails received are as follows and were made available to the City Council as well as placed on the city web site from the following persons:

Suzanne Lande                      Public Comment in Regards to Item Number 9

Paul Fritz commented as follows:

- Wanted to follow up on an email sent to the council several weeks ago about the use and expansion of the pedestrian realm downtown
- Just concerned that we're heading into month seven of this crisis and we still have no approved infrastructure for expanded seating for downtown restaurants.
- Since I sent my email, I haven't gotten a response from the city.
- I'm just wondering if any action is being taken? If Caltrans has been approached.
- I know Caltrans has a document for that exact use.
- It says there is a process, the city has to be the applicant, there's no fee. It looks pretty straightforward.
- If it hasn't been implemented yet or an application has not been submitted, I urge the city to do something because I think we really need to do what we can to make downtown more inviting to people.
- Right now it's a bit of a ghost town.
- I'm downtown every day with my business. I walk downtown and nothing's happening.
- I think this would really help.
- The other item somewhat related is I know Caltrans has planning grants they put out.
- Millions of dollars are available to communities to do kind of long-range planning.
- The deadline is in November. I know it's not long until November
- If it doesn't happen this year, I would encourage the city to look into this is grant program and apply to Caltrans to do wholesale reimagining what it could be for true pedestrian access and enjoyment.
- Right now it just feels like a state highway, for the most part.
- Caltrans recognizes main streets are different than state highways in rural places.
- They have many planning documents that say Sebastopol should be more pedestrian-friendly.
- Again, I encourage the city to go after those grants. This is exactly the kind of thing the grant is designed for. I think we would be competitive.

Jann commented as follows:

- My comments are on the Façade Improvement Program as detailed in the online packet.
- What is the turnaround for approvals once Design Review Board has a shot at the applications?
- For example, when a project is approved on Nov. 4th, when will the applicant be informed - and how?
- What is the turnaround for reimbursement of approved projects? e.g., if that same project were completed quickly, when could the applicant receive the rebate?
- If Caltrans or city permits are required, will the city facilitate with Caltrans and waive fees associated with the proposed façade improvements?
- Regarding page 6, item IX which says if the building is sold within 3 years of rebate funding, the building owner agrees to repay the city a prorated amount.
- This will most likely be a deterrent for many building owners in signing this application.

- Might the council instead consider an incentive approach to landlords who, like their tenants, are just trying to stay in business?
- Regarding page 5, Item V. which excludes project improvements started prior to Planning Department written approval.
- In consideration that the clock doesn't start to tick on these projects until November 4th at the earliest, this requirement ensures that many will not apply and the intended uplift to the downtown will be muted.
- For example, Retrograde's new awnings took weeks and weeks to plan, order and install. The impact is huge in the 100 South block. As this program has a June 30th term, might the improvements in the fiscal year which fall under the grant guidelines be considered for rebate retroactively?
- I would remind the council and city staff, that the purpose of the grant is to encourage landlords to allow tenants to make repairs and improvements. My question is why make it so difficult? This is a grant that comes with a ceiling and multiple controls as evidenced in the extensive and excessive terms and conditions of the application.
- The whole purpose is for the city to invest. The 25% contribution by businesses only affects the smaller projects and delays - if not deters - much needed work. It also contributes to a lukewarm feeling about the fund and the commitment of the city to its core. The window is open and has been open for the city to inspire its current tenants to hang on and encourage new tenants to invest with their city partner.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The letter that was sent after the council discussed the possible changes and advance of Caltrans parklets and public right of ways for things other than automobiles, which as you might imagine, that doesn't equate well for many staff members at Caltrans.
- That letter has gone out.
- I have continued to request information from our state Senator as well as our state assembly member.
- Where that stands right now is that we are trying to schedule a meeting with senior level Caltrans folks to see if we can move that along.
- I think the council clearly indicated an interest in that type of a program.
- Regarding the facade improvement questions, I think the council's intent was just that, to expedite this.
- I thank Jann for bringing to our attention things that could most likely be streamlined in some significant way.
- I will suggest that staff take a look at those particular items and if there's something that the council needs take action on, to let us know and we will take care of that as soon as we possibly can.
- There's really no reason why this program can't be expedited in ways that we didn't fully recognize it when we talked about it.
- Jann, thank you for bringing those things to our attention.
- I'll see what we can do to make that program a little better for everyone.

**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:**

- The consent agenda consists of items that are routine in nature and do not require additional discussion by the City Council or 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.
- The Mayor will read the consent calendar items; ask if a Councilmember wishes to remove one or more items from the consent calendar; and then open public comment to the members of the public in attendance on the virtual meeting. At this time, a member of the public may speak for up to three minutes on the entire consent calendar and/or request at that time that an agenda item or items be removed for discussion.
- If an item or items are removed from the consent calendar, the item shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tern.
- Council Members may comment on Consent Calendar items or ask for minor clarifications without the need for pulling the item for separate consideration. Items requiring deliberation should be pulled for separate consideration and shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem.

Mayor Slayter read the consent calendar.

Mayor Slayter questioned if any Councilmember(s) wanted to remove any item(s) from the consent calendar. There were none.

Mayor Slayter asked for Public Comments on the Consent Calendar Item(s): There were none.

Mayor Slayter asked clarification for item number 4 and question if that is one year from today's date?

Director Svanstrom commented as follows:

- The application expiration dates would be 'tolled'.
- Say the extension was three days from now, it would be extended by one year, so it would be three days from now and 2021 would still be the deadline/expiration. They get to add one year to it.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Gurney moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to approve Consent Calendar Item(s) Number(s) 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Mayor Slayter called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmember Carnacchi, Gurney, Hinton, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Slayter  
 Noes: None  
 Absent: None  
 Abstain: None

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Approval of Minutes of the City Council Meeting of September 1, 2020 (Responsible Department: City Administration)

**City Council Action: Approved Minutes of the City Council Meeting of September 1, 2020**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-197**

2. Approval of Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance: An Ordinance of the City of Sebastopol Adopting a Tobacco Retail Licensing/Vaping Ordinance - Ordinance Number 1131 (Requestor: Vice Mayor Glass/City Manager)

**City Council Action: Approved Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance: An Ordinance of the City of Sebastopol Adopting a Tobacco Retail Licensing/Vaping Ordinance - Ordinance Number 1131**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-198**

3. Approval Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP), Overflow Emergency Response Plan (OERP) and Water Quality Monitoring Plan (WQMP) Revisions (Responsible Department: Public Works)

**City Council Action: Approved Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP), Overflow Emergency Response Plan (OERP) and Water Quality Monitoring Plan (WQMP) Revisions**

**Minute Order Number: 21020-199**

**Resolution Number: 6311-2020**

4. Approval of Resolution Extending Planning and Building Permits in response to Covid-19 for a Period of One Year (Responsible Department: Planning)

**City Council Action: Approved Resolution Extending Planning and Building Permits in response to Covid-19 for a Period of One Year**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-200**

**Resolution Number: 6312-2020**

5. Approval of Memorandum of Understanding between County of Sonoma and Sonoma County Law Enforcement Agencies for Forensic Medical Examinations (Responsible Department: Police)

**City Council Action: Approved Memorandum of Understanding between County of Sonoma and Sonoma County Law Enforcement Agencies for Forensic Medical Examinations**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-201**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATION:** *(Please Note: Although informational/presentations items are routinely informational in nature, some informational items may contain request for actions such as support, direction to staff, follow up, or receipt of item based on the presentation/information provided.)*

6. Informational Presentation on Municipal Bonds (Responsible Department: Administrative Services/Consultant)

Administrative Services Director Kwong presented the staff report recommending the City Council receive the informational item. Provide feedback to staff to work on reviewing the City current debt service for a possibility of refunding for a better interest rate

Nicki Tallman and Rick Brandis, Consultant, provided a presentation to the City Council. A copy of the presentation is available on the City web site.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Vice Mayor Glass questioned whether it is fairly common or typical for municipalities to use bonds for matching funds for projects such as grants that require matching funds from either the feds or the state.

The consultant commented as follows:

- Discussed the State or Federal governments providing financing with the stimulus package
- Is the city wondering if it can combine bonds with that - Answer is if you don't have enough money for your project, yes, you could finance the remainder of your project.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Indicated it's a really great time for borrowing money.
- Is this a good time to borrow money, other than the fact that the economy is in total freefall?

- Other than that, it's a good time to borrow money because it's really cheap.
- I'm wondering if you're seeing very much in the way of revenue bonds happening now.
- I'm thinking about investment as part of an economic recovery package for our municipality.
- Do we need to be considering investing in things in our downtown area or our City Hall area or whatever that could be financing by revenue bonds as opposed to standard muni bonds?

The consultant commented as follows:

- The volume of bonds today includes revenue bonds.
- Most of the revenue bonds we are seeing happened to provide funding for utility projects- Water and wastewater.
- That's why there's a revenue pledge from your water and wastewater enterprise.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Right now a lot of public agencies are looking at their utility needs, their infrastructure with pipelines, with wastewater plants, and they are looking to go to the bond market for that, but as part of that, they also need to make sure they can pay for the bond financing.
- A lot of agencies have looked at their rates and charges and to see if they can generate a revenue stream for the additional debt.
- For example, if you have an extremely aged water and sewer system, you could basically generate revenue bonds, which actually do not require a vote of the people.
- You would need to have a rate study in order to justify being able to charge whatever it is to get the money back from your rates, right?

The consultant commented as follows:

- Stated that is correct
- Seeing a lot of rate studies happening now, and, again, we work with a lot of utility districts like Bodega bay and Sweetwater springs district.
- They're facing the same thing.
- How do we in this environment, raise rates and charges to finance capital improvements?
- We need the rates and charges to pay for them.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Is it common to see a revenue bond that is based on revenue that you would be receiving from charging another public agency or public entity?
- For example, if we were building -- adding onto a building, such as our library, then would the revenue from that separate agency, which actually has another funding stream, would that be considered as valid or considered properly as part of the revenue to secure the bond?

The consultant commented as follows:

- The revenue from an interagency financing structure would not be the sole source of security for the revenue bonds.
- The revenue could flow into the city's general fund, for example, but the city, in order to make improvements to the library, would structure that type of financing as a lease and use an asset, maybe the library or another unencumbered asset of the city to securitize the lease.
- The revenues can be captured and repay the bonds, but in that case, they would not be a dedicated source of repayment.



Vice Mayor Glass questioned if the lease ease type of bond was one of the exceptions to the voting?

The consultant stated that is correct – the 2/3rds rule.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- it's about public housing authority bonds.
- Now, we don't have a housing authority in the City of Sebastopol.
- We depend on the County of Sonoma for that.
- With that caveat, if the City of Sebastopol were to stand up some type of a housing authority, Is a housing bond, is that usable in something like a public/private partnership?

The consultant commented as follows:

- We've done housing bonds.
- The revenue from that project pays off the bond.
- We've never done one with a public/private partnership before.
- We know that they -- they've done it. We've seen it done. But we haven't worked on it.
- Unfortunately, I can't explain that mechanism to you and how that's done, but we could find out and report back.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Given, I think it's our final item on the regular calendar tonight, the discussions that the county is having regarding homeless services and traditional housing and all that that entails and when somebody has a house, they're no longer homeless.
- With support, many of these folks are able to function in society, be productive members.
- That's a benefit to everyone.
- The need for low and very low-income housing is very great.
- There are very few developers who can make a project pencil out using their own finances.
- So it's up to government to help solve the problem.
- If that kind of a debt service could be issued that provides up-front funding and is something that can be done in partnership with somebody in the private industry, I think it's a big question with many tentacles to it.
- I'm not sure that I need a formal report back, but, a quick email with, this is kind of what I found in half an hour or less of research, might be kind of interesting to learn.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I really appreciate that the Mayor and Vice Mayor are so into this and have good questions.
- Mine is a little simpler.
- I don't think I understand it quite as thoroughly.
- We have another agenda item later this evening where we will be talking about our shortage of funding and the qualities of our roads, including the possibility of a very major project that is, I would say, not quite half financed by the state.
- Vice Mayor Glass asked an earlier question about providing through a bond the matching funding that could have that project go forward.
- Am I understanding that's right as a possibility potentially?

The consultant stated it is.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- This is good to know.
- We're finding out maybe we have more money to work with, as long as we're willing to bond it.

The consultant stated that is correct.

Councilmember Gurney commented I'm anticipating we're talking about bonds now because all of this might come up next month when we get to the budget.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I've wanted to have this on the agenda for probably a year.
- Am on the budget subcommittee and we were talking about it.
- Part of why I wanted it on is because this is such an advantageous to do bonding because the money's really cheap.
- It's gotten nothing but cheaper since I started to want this.
- The other is looking at the insurmountable amount of money that we need in order to do some really critical projects, and some of them are our roads, some of it is our really crumbling water and sewer infrastructure, and then the other thing is the thought of having really inadequate facilities that might be able to be put together in a way that we have a bigger library, we have a bigger city hall, we own this big hunk of land that goes all the way over to the senior center, so we already have two tenants in our public property.
- There's a need for downtown parking and there's a need For downtown housing.
- I know that Councilmember Gurney has been really interested in this in the past, but this -- it's become the -- maybe not \$60 million question, but the very large dollar question is, how smart is it in this economy to borrow some money because it's so inexpensive in order to make an investment is actually going to help rejuvenate our town.
- That's the big question.
- I just wanted everybody to look at those issues because we have some really insurmountable issues like pavement and crumbling infrastructure.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There was none.

The Council thanked the consultant for the presentation.

**City Council Action: None Required.**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-202**

7. Informational Presentation on Pavement Maintenance Plan and Capital Improvement Projects (Responsible Department: Engineering/Public Works)

Engineering Manager Mikus presented the staff report recommending the City Council receive the informational item on Pavement Maintenance Plan and Capital Improvement Projects and provide direction regarding Pavement Maintenance and the FY 20-21 Capital Improvement Plan.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Thanked staff for the presentation

- Staff answered a lot of questions and a lot of information was fed into this evening's oral report
- Some of these streets actually go together, like the South end of Hansen turns and becomes Michael Place, and then Kathleen is just a little cul de sac off of that.
- It actually connects Covert to Valentine
- As you are driving it does not really have three names
- It just winds through the neighborhood and gets you across.
- I'm curious about putting those in one group.
- I don't know if the PCI would allow us to do that work or is it divided into three pieces because it has three different PCIs that aren't compatible in one project?

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- Hanson was built in two pieces.
- Partway down along the East/west section, there's a joint in the pavement.
- To the East side it was well done.
- To the West side, going towards Michael and Kathleen, it was not.
- At the time we did the slurry seal and spot digs a couple years ago, there was enough good pavement left on Hanson, that upper section, to fix it.
- Chunks of asphalt that had come out.
- There was nothing we could do to fix it short of the -- at least a six-inch regrind.

Councilmember Gurney questioned that this was not programmed.

Manager Mikus commented that's why there's a difference between part "a" and part "b" there.

Councilmember Gurney questioned is it part "a" the South part of Hanson, is that what you're saying?

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- The Northern part's already done.
- That's the part that was fixed.
- The east is in decent shape

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- It sounds like those three could be put together, Hanson, Michael, Kathleen, and it would be a significant project because it's like down to the ground, down to the Earth almost.
- Same question I think applies to Eastside and South.
- That might have been eight respondents on Eastside, but there aren't eight houses there.
- One of our considerations, speaking for myself individually as a Councilmember, if we're going to take money away from other projects and put them to Public Works top six or the top community's top six, I think we want to make sure for our dollar we improve as much roadway for as many people as possible. Not just the few.
- On roads that also connect importantly or are used by locals as bypasses, you know, that are not technically called that.
- We all know how we drive around town.
- The shortcut is an example - Jewell, willow, bypassing downtown.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- One of the things was kind of a slap in the side of the face for me in budget meetings to have Public Works Superintendent Del Prete give a report on our pavement situation and then get like a big a-ha moment.
- The big a-ha moment was that we're faced with and public works is faced with this issue of, do we fix the roads that have a somewhat higher PCI to stop them from getting to a completely falling apart PCI, or do we fix the ones with the really bad PCI?
- Some of our roads are so bad that to fix them is astronomically expensive.
- The must be is calling up and saying, I don't understand why you fixed, blah, blah, blah road, like you oiled it or did whatever, when my road is completely falling apart.
- The reason why is it may be the same chunk like a one-block piece of road, and to fix it if the PCI -
- If the PCI is really, really awful, so like this road is basically down to gravel, then the cost of fixing that for a block is astronomical, whereas the cost of just repairing something that sort of mildly bad for a block is really fairly low.
- So, the public gets really confused about, why are you fixing this road and not that road?
- Part of it has to do with the cost because of how bad the road is.
- So that's kind of the question we're dealing with here.
- So, my question is when we look at this list, are we looking at fixing roads that are astronomically awful, or is this list the roads that have, , top third, middle third or lower third PCI ratings?

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- This list of 15 that includes the citizen top six all have a PCI of less than 40.
- Most of them are less than 20.

Councilmember Gurney questioned if these are the ones that are really bringing our average down and they're going to be more expensive to repair

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- Stated that is correct
- Discussed category of concrete streets.
- Because high street and some of the side streets off of that were done years and years ago and they were done with concrete.
- That concrete's not just six inches thick.
- To fix that, you figure it's going to be per linear foot about 2 1/2 times the cost of anything else.
- The good news is the concrete's held up pretty well.
- There's only a couple of those where the PCIs is rotten.
- Most are not great but at least it's acceptable.
- They're highly traveled, though, willow, Calder, high.
- They're all the shortcuts and the roads to the parks and the schools and the post office and downtown, yeah.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Does staff have it listed anywhere the PCI for these 16 streets?
- Is that something you could look up for us easily?

Manager Mikus stated they are all low.

Councilmember Gurney questioned if staff is saying they are in the worst category.

Manager Mikus commented less than 40 and think most are less than 20.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed page 76
- See PCI of 0 – Petaluma grade roadway
- Windsor oppositely because they have the best.

Councilmember Gurney commented I remember years ago Sue Kelly saying we would need to put aside \$500,000 every year just to be able to get to what we needed, as well as doing yearly paving maintenance and all that.

Manager Mikus commented that four years ago it was about \$600,000 a year.

Councilmember Gurney stated we are way behind.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- We're gradually getting worse and worse, year by year.
- This is all something to think about in the big picture.
- I'm not suggesting an instant thing we can figure out what to do, but given what the situation is, we need to start thinking long term and how they're going to deal with this.

Mayor Slayter commented are there any overlaps between these roadways with, I'll say, less than 40 PCIs and water and sewer significant upgrades?

Public Works Superintendent Dante Del Prete commented as follows:

- A couple of them, Palm avenue has a dated infrastructure underneath that street, so that could be paved, both water and sewer replacement project.
- There's a few in the top 15

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Do you have a wild estimate if we were to say do palm, is it a doubling of the price of doing the work to do both components of it?
- Much because it's a larger trench and aging infrastructure.

Superintendent Del Prete commented that he did not have the numbers tonight.

Mayor Slayter commented if Palm were estimated to be \$500,000, it could be three times that for all the componentry, including the rebuild of the road?

Superintendent Del Prete commented the estimate for that short block of Palm is just under \$100,000 for paving.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The reason for my question should be obvious, that digging up new roadways to install infrastructure underneath, that's a fool's errand and it doesn't make any sense at all.
- You end up spending more and the project's worse by the time you're done.

- So much of this conversation is driven by the suggestion that maybe we revisit the funds for Bodega avenue And repurpose those funds for local streets, collector streets, in and around our neighborhoods.
- Given that that Bodega avenue project is a major thoroughfare for the county, regionally, does staff -- has a traffic count been done there so we know what the volume of traffic on Bodega avenue both Eastbound and Westbound coming in and out and the proportion to what we consider to be local traffic?
- I don't know the splits between visitors and local. Of course, that really varies.
- It's commuters during the week and beach goers and wine people during the weekends.

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- Did the traffic corridor safety studies.
- That's what prompted the crosswalks
- The vehicle traffic on Bodega avenue was three times the population of the city.
- We're at 7,000 and change so it was in the 20-something thousand range, vehicles per day.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- It would sure be nice if the County of Sonoma were a little more on top of regional roadways.
- The ones that go through city limits.
- It's clear that that great bulk of traffic is not of our own making and yet it's on us to maintain and fix, improve.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- The question is, how do we get the county to chip in some money there for us?
- How do we get them to pay?

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- They're busy using PG&E funds to pave roadways in rural areas and what they call the fire area.
- Never mind that evacuees drove on the road.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Wasn't that part of the Supervisor Hopkins' tourism mitigation ideas were to provide funding to mitigate the impact of tourism on roads because that's people going out to Bodega, that's tourism impact.
- I think we need to form late a better argument or presentation to our district supervisor's office about mitigating some of these costs, for all of these people going over our roads.
- If you remember back, Councilmember Gurney worked diligently to get Ragle addressed
- I don't think there was a second and certainly not a third vote on the board of supervisors for that much smaller project.
- So, I'm not holding out a lot of hope. It's more of an ethereal question.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- County chipped in \$25,000
- That doesn't get you much.
- It has to be \$400,000.

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- There have been times I've been blunt about whether they've helped us or want, and this time I have to say they have.
- They were very supportive with our effort to get the \$1.2 million OBAG grant, which is helping pay for Bodega.
- The other thing is in repeat years, through Ms. Hopkins' efforts, we've gotten some money contributed towards crosswalk.
- That's clearly a benefit for safety and tourism.
- They paid for part of the crosswalks on Bodega.
- Within the last couple of years we've had two grants of \$20,000 apiece to help us upgrade some of the crosswalks from the in ground to the raised traffic lights.
- What their money has allowed us to do is fix four to six of those as opposed to two a year.
- That's why we could do Healdsburg Avenue, high street.

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows:

- Realizing the PCI index is -- calculates road travel and thoroughfares, but some of these roads that are on this list, what I'm hearing from this staff and witness myself is they're beyond the ability to maintain.
- Perfect example is Cleveland avenue.
- You saw one of the photos. It's more pothole mix than pavement. It has erosion issues.
- My guys are out there sweeping dirt out of holes and trying to make pothole mix stick.
- Cleveland avenue is a dead end.
- Staff constantly receive questions as to when are you going to fix my street?
- Right now there's no answer.
- We're going to continue to try and keep them from getting worse or falling apart more, but I don't have an answer for the citizens when they mention that.
- It's frustrating for my staff.
- They come into the office, hey, we're throwing pothole mix on the dirt.
- What do you want us to do here?
- I think the PCI is a great tool, but I think it should be implemented on a percentage of preservation and a percentage of reconstruction so it's more balanced because we can't let the worst streets just keep going to complete disaster
- Are we ever going to rate high on the PCIs as a thoroughfare street?

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- In our case we have a small city and I would say the great majority of people who are in on this meeting know where every single one of these streets is and the condition of it, and know that if you're going to drive up Washington, you need to drive slow because you're going to lose half your suspension if you go over ten miles an hour.
- Same thing, Cleveland.
- I think the local knowledge helps, at least for me it helps me know that it's not just about what the rating is.
- It's about the experience people are having on that particular roadway.
- A no-outlet road like Cleveland, that's just as important for the people that live there.
- We certainly need to keep that in mind.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Kyle commented as follows:

- As stated in the informational packet on this topic, historically the majority of pavement project funding has come from quarter cent sales tax from the general fund of \$150,000 per year.
- Recent years have had the money use general balance fund expenditures.
- When the citizens approved these sales taxes in 2004 and 2012 the language specifically included street repairs as proper usage of these funds.
- To be honest I'm not too surprised.
- I've seen this Council not generate revenue for the city but create fighting against that bad guy Airbnb, taking on big tobacco, and in the middle of the night passing parking ordinances.
- But in reality, past the optics of these decisions reducing potential occupancy tax, tobacco sales tax and increasing the enforcement of our police does not generate revenue.
- So, to hear that one-third of our city streets rate is very poor, it's also not surprising to me.
- Street maintenance is far less an exciting task for this council to take on.
- Our Council can hardly put down that we kept your streets functioning to put on campaign materials.
- One would think despite the irregularity of street maintenance and the decades of combined experience of just three councilmembers alone share, we wouldn't be in the position we are today with one-third of our streets rated very poor.
- As stated in the packet, multiple revenue sources are available to the city for transportation, safety, paving to the tune of \$200,000 annually, but regardless of the small list of accomplishments, the packet provides for projects from 2015 to 2017, no other major projects have been presented over the last three years.
- Here we are with one-third of our streets rated as very poor.
- In March of this year covid-19 swept the world by storm.
- Immediately it was clear the shutdown that continues to this day was going to affect revenue for our city.
- I for one want to see this Council begin the hard work that the city elected them to do, reduce the budget.
- Take actions to actually help increase revenue instead of exploring debt options after spending nearly the entire balance of last year's sales tax revenue that could have been used on the one-third of our streets that are rated as very poor on a firm to survey local businesses so maybe 16 businesses could access a loan.
- A loan that this council declined to elect any interest refuse new from and then fund future outreach for this firm about the loan program as well as additional outreach not initially planned.
- I suggest the public explore the minutes of the September 1st meeting regarding this decision.
- The math is simple.
- This Council spent easily \$120,000 to offer a total loan of \$150,000 with no projected revenue offered as evidence toward the decision to spend this money.
- During a pandemic with 25% decrease in revenue while one-third of our streets are rated as very poor.

#### Council Deliberations:

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- As I understand it, staff is requesting direction on how we want to proceed with our limited funds and outsized wish list.



- I suppose the big question is, first, is delaying the Bodega avenue project, something that we're interested in. If so, how do we want to prioritize the other potential projects.
- I think that, honestly, for me, this feels like something that one reasonably brief discussion of, without a lot of time to really dig into it, it's a little difficult for me to feel comfortable providing direction on something that is so important, such a quality of life issue in a compressed time frame.
- That's kind of my initial thoughts.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I have a question that's going to help me about the Bodega avenue project.
- With the one-year delay, moving the OBAG money, what could we do right now if we did something right now about Bodega avenue?
- Would it be design work?

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- We have a grant award pending for the design work.
- But we haven't been awarded the money yet.
- it's been influenced by the covid-19 thing.
- It's a CDBG grant from the community development condition -- commission.
- the tie-in is the ADA sidewalk.
- The design's about \$200,000, the grant's about \$150,000.

Councilmember Gurney commented when will we find out?

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- They've had huge staff turnover.
- There's been a problem there.
- Stuff just hasn't been getting done.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- If I'm understanding correctly, if that grant is awarded, our next step on Bodega avenue is going to be design work anyway and we could move with that grant and have OBAG waiting in our future.
- I'm trying to understand all this complicated five-year scheduling things.
- I'm interested in looking at these streets on the list that Public Works provided.
- I'm influenced by our citizen responsiveness to the survey as well as what we know these streets are like.
- So, one is the part of Washington and then the Hanson -- part of Hanson, Michael place and Kathleen court, because they were all together.
- I think we need to do something about Cleveland and lighting because Dante is saying, we can't just put money to do the surface thing because we can't just let everything get worse and worse.
- It has to be some balance between maintenance and reconstruction.
- So those are the ones that look most interesting to me right now.

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- If we want to put off the \$450,000 for Bodega, that's a number we know.

- That allows us, if we make that decision, if that's what we want to do is change that path and put the money towards paving, that allows us to go on in the next couple of weeks with our CIP.
- The CIP doesn't look at particular streets.
- It looks at round numbers for paving.
- That gives you a little time to have a conversation and debate on just what streets you want included in that.
- Once the CIP gets approved and we have a sense that's the way it's going to go, the other good news is we have already bid documents prepared for slurry seals and spot repair and two-inch overlay that could be adapted to go for six-in grind and repave.
- We could be working on the general documents where all we'd have to do when the council finally decides is add the list of streets.
- Do we want to do this and then maybe the second stage, after you've had time to decide which streets you want?
- The big question that I posed, it's all about Bodega avenue.
- Are we going to repurpose those funds or keep the course and keep amassing funds to do that large project?

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed the ADA curbs
- I understood that as it was part of the Caltrans project and we were required to do it.
- Now you're saying we're not and we could postpone that.
- Second of all, if I'm understanding it, the grant funds, they only can be used on that Bodega project, correct?
- So, we have to amass enough so we're ready before we run out of time.

Manager Mikus commented that is correct.

Councilmember Hinton commented that our revenues are still going down.

Manager Mikus commented as follows:

- We don't have a written contract.
- It was an agreement we made that if they did the paving with the bike lanes, we'd do the curb ramps.
- I don't know that has a finite number it has to be done by.
- If we put it off a couple years, I don't think it would be a huge headache.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- We just saw a bond presentation before this.
- Everybody has high hopes, but maybe we should be looking at a bond to get caught up here.
- Makes sense to me.
- I sat on the budget subcommittee so we've obviously seen some of this already, but I didn't plan to make a decision tonight.
- I thought it was more, get the information.
- Obviously, we're going at this with the budget shortly and then we have all this to kind of get some community feedback in the meantime and kind of make some decisions.
- Maybe a budget subcommittee is my thinking.

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- I just wrote down some notes here with regard to the ADA project and, like Henry had said that, you know, originally that was supposed to be paid for by Caltrans so they were going to come through and do it all as part of their ADA upgrade.
- That makes it easier for elders, to navigate our city.
- So, initially we traded that for the bicycle lanes.
- So, at that point, we gave bicycles the advantage over the elders, disabled and pedestrians.
- In my opinion, they got preference.
- Now it sounds like without much discussion we're going to, again, put the elders, the disabled persons and the pedestrians on the back burner in order to facilitate automobile traffic.
- So, I'm a little concerned.
- We're not really discussing, especially with our residence getting so much elder in our community.
- It's really beneficial to them with the ADA project.
- So, I would not be for postponing that.
- I think at least initially getting started on some of that and some of the more critical intersection where there is a lot of pedestrian traffic will be better than maybe taking the money off Bodega if you wanted to do some traffic -- some automobile lane repaving.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I don't have the numbers in front of me, but as I understand the agreement with Caltrans to do the ramps in exchange for the restriping, which they were going to restripe anyway following their paving project, and that actually -- if I'm remembering correctly, it was in the range of two to one in the city's benefit.
- I don't remember exactly, but I know there was a bit of A benefit to that.

City Manager Mclaughlin commented as follows:

- I just want to clarify that the agreement with Caltrans for the ADA curb ramps was for the city to take responsibility for that.
- Just as Caltrans has agreed on many occasions to do certain projects in the future, settling lawsuits and the light.
- Oftentimes they don't come with a particular time commitment or there's a very broad time commitment to do that.
- The reason the striping was done when it was done, was not a choice over ADA curb ramps.
- It was that Caltrans was going to do that project anyway.
- As long as they were going to be restriping, it made sense to redo the bike lanes at that time because of the road resurfacing.
- So, there's no particular time commitment that the city has made with respect to the ADA curb ramps.
- There also wasn't a choice to put them off in lieu of doing the bike lanes.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Agrees with Councilmember Carnacchi
- Getting those, particularly the higher traffic ones, should be a priority for the city.
- Having a conversation surrounding that is exactly what we're doing.
- For us as the policymakers to direct staff that that is a priority of the city council, then it becomes a priority for the staff.

- I would agree that the delay of those improvements is problematic for exactly the people that you note.
- The counter to that, of course, is that we have sidewalk gaps.
- The Bodega avenue corridor is exhibit "a" in sidewalk gaps.
- We have a major housing -- housing facility up on Bodega avenue that is seniors.
- How do they get to the local market because there are sidewalk gaps?
- In other words, they have to go over them like a goat and that's difficult.
- I wish we had \$15 million to spend on it.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I just wanted to address something my colleague just said.
- The point of putting this on this agenda was so there would be much discussion about it as opposed to not much discussion.
- So, and this kind of slap, as I said, slap in the face information that -- from listening to Superintendent Del Prete, it was like an a-ha moment for me like, oh, all road fixes are not equal.
- Because it seems like what public works is doing may seem very inconsistent to the public but actually there is a lot of information there that you have to understand in them making their decisions.
- I have a number of thoughts about this and one is, I was thinking of this as being informational because we are in this kind of crazy situation where we're doing our budgeting incrementally this year because our revenue is a moving target.
- We're about to adopt a new, more final budget but then we're only a couple months away from midyear budget review.
- I think midyear budget review - we are probably going to be looking at how things turn out in November is going to probably impact the amount of money -- stimulus money that's going to be available for state and local government as infrastructure investment -- or stimulus projects.
- So, things may look really different in January as opposed to what we're deciding now.
- Because there may be more grant money or more stimulus money for local government that is about investing in infrastructure.
- That's like a really big policy question that we don't know what that's going to look like for a few
- I'm really wanting to rely more on what our staff recommends as priorities.
- I think we need a lot more thought about this.
- However, I think we need a strategy as opposed to micromanaging our staff and telling them, do this street, do this street, do this street.
- I think we need to agree on what the policy priorities are.
- Like is the priority to get the really, really bad streets done first?
- Are the priorities to make it so that we're closing sidewalk gaps so that we have pedestrian opportunities for people that live in a senior housing complex, or is the priority to make it so downtown is more accessible and walkable and less dangerous to other people?
- Or is the priority to deal with people in the neighborhood who can't, you know, whose houses are getting stuck in -- or whose cars are getting stuck in potholes, or is the priority to invest in preventing our pavement that is relatively okay from turning into that really, really bad stuff?
- It seems like those are kind of four different things to be looking at.
- I think we need to be discussing that when we go to the budget at our upcoming council meetings and we're talking about budget.
- This idea of putting this on the agenda was for people to understand the magnitude of the problem and the kind of policy decisions that we need to make in terms of what the priorities are.

- I don't necessarily want to tell staff how to fix this little block of street.
- I want their input on what they think are the most critical priorities, and then I want us to frame what we think are our priorities in terms of results.
- What are we prioritizing given the magnitude of what the problem is?
- Thinking this is information that we need to be thinking about and have stuck in the back of our brain as we discuss the CIP.
- This is information that we need to be thinking about and have stuck in the back of our brain as we discuss the CIP, and the upcoming budget meetings which are going to be in an upcoming council meeting in a few weeks.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think that's fine to have conversations about policy, as the Vice Mayor organized it, however, I don't think that we can take 6-8 months to have a intellectualized conversation, we are in a situation where our businesses are falling apart, and we need to address urgent issues with some responsible timeline.
- Not just talk, not just policy talk but actions that are going to provide some sort of recipe -- rescue or stimulus, or whatever it is.
- For me, I'm interested in the budget subcommittee, thinking over bonding and do we want to bond, are we financially secure? Is it a good move for us?
- Those are our financial insider expert people, the budget subcommittee, but the policy discussion has to come to the council so we can be decisive and nimble and organized in our approach to the supervisor and board of supervisor and getting things done rather than just being as slow as we are.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I think that what I'm hearing is that we are not ready this evening to provide direction, other than I think that we all have ideas that we want to work on.
- Need to contact the County - we are the conduit for the residents to the staff.
- That was the reason for the citizen's survey, that is something that I suggested.
- I think that it's still instructive for us to know that the perception of our resident's lines up with what we are perceiving and what staff analysis is of our shared.
- If staff is okay with where we are leaving this, which is somewhat up in the air, thinking like we need maybe a further discussion about the CIP, with additional information regarding priorities as we see them as policy makers.
- The user experience for our residents, I think that that's what I'm hearing.
- I'm not hearing a lot of information, or of direction from my colleagues that is do a, b, then c.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Will budget come back with CIP
- Not want to see the two items on one agenda

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Following this discussion, my thinking is removing them from the same hearing, the fatigue sets in and the CIP almost always follows the budget hearings and I think we are seeing the impact of that where, maybe the CIP is not received the focus that it deserves.
- Maybe we discuss the budget and the CIP in another meeting, knowing there's overlap, but not largely.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Hope we have sufficient time to have an exhausting conversation.
- We need to be decision makers here.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I think what we are saying is what we need to do is probably devote two or three or more hours just to the CIP, and look at things in a more holistic way, and if I were to -- I don't know.
- If it doesn't, I have not heard, anybody, any council member come out and say, I would rather do a than b.
- I think I'm getting a sense that maybe the, the -- working in the direction that maybe the Bodega avenue project may not be the highest priority for the council, but I'm not willing to say that, we have not voted or had a discussion regarding that specific issue.
- It's not direction to you. I understand that is difficult.
- I'm not seeing a need for a decision this evening that cannot wait until the CIP discussion which is not that far away down the calendar.
- I think that we are organized tonight to organize the policy discussions, and we have four different points we can pursue and we need to get through that conversation, it will guide budget decisions and it will guide CIP decisions, it will have to relate back to goals and objectives.
- We need to tie this together so that we finish the conversation and make decisions.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Agenda policy discussion
- Four points to pursue
- Get through that conversation
- Guide budget and CIP discussion
- Relate back to goals and objectives

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Pause is appropriate
- Not fully vetted
- Decision premature

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I would like to say, I think the part of this is like this Rubik's cube of trying to figure out timing and grant monies.
- If we have this grant money out here, how long before it runs out.
- Where are we going to invest in this next year and then we will still be okay with that grant not running out if we don't do the work?
- I think we need staff to really show us some graphically, some kind of critical path on yeah, we absolutely got to do this thing in this year, or else we are DOA.
- That's an additional thing to consider.
- Like the OABG money and those things.
- I think I had thought that this information was important to advise the council on what the dimensions of what we need to be considering, when we talk about the CIP, it's additional information.

Mayor Slayter commented staff will have a discussion with the agenda review committee certainly from engineering and public works, see what we can do as far as scheduling. At this time Mayor Slayter closed the agenda item.

**City Council Action: No action taken**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-203**

Mayor Slayter called for a break at 8:09 pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:24 pm.

**PUBLIC HEARING(s):**

8. Public Hearing on Comprehensive User Fees (Planning Director/Administrative Services Director)

Administrative Services Director Kwong presented the staff report recommending the City Council receive the report, conduct a public hearing, and approve the Comprehensive User Fees.

Terry Madsen, Consultant, provided a presentation to the City Council.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- The consultant mentioned this and I recall doing this each year
- He is recommending \$182,000 in new revenue
- Is this due to increased fees
- What was or increase last year

City staff stated it is well below the \$182,000

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- So second question, when I look through the fee study, there's no Side-by-Side comparison.
- So we cannot see what fees are for example in the building.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Stated the side by side is on page 94
- Discussed digitizing fee
- If an applicant supplies files in appropriate formats, and they are already digital because they are files, is that fee required.

The consultant commented as follows:

- Stated in that case we would think that the digitizing fee would not apply.
- If you received a digital submittal, most of your fees are really the underlying idea is if applicable.
- The way the credit card transaction fee only applies, if you want to pay with the credit card, the digitizing fee would apply to hard copy submittals.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- It's perfectly logical.
- The County and the City of Santa Rosa have gone largely to digital planned format submittals for building projects.

- With covid, it's exclusively, you have to make an appointment to drop pieces of paper off.
- We are a bit behind the curve on that level of submittal.
- But if your delivery paper copies, the old way, the thumb drive. The files on it.
- This is before digital -- so everyone understands, the old fee schedule is a product of well, of itself, we have never really come through and took a level of review for this comprehensive soup to nuts study that informs us about actual cost and the percentage recovery.
- It's always been a bit of a, i will say a black box, it's just kind of an unknown, where we were with it.
- This is something that I know the Vice Mayor and I have been asking for, for a number of years.
- I'm glad it's here and I'm glad it's this comprehensive.

Mayor Slayter opened the public hearing.

Kyle commented as follows:

- Population has increased 2% over the last 20 years, no, no, no growth policy has driven out the ability for families To raise children here, that is most evident in the lower public-school enrollment that we have seen over the years.
- One may argue regardless of the high densely residential zoning that took place in the most recent update, part of it is in response to the cost of permitting fees.
- I found it shocking that the proposed increase from \$77 an hour, to \$137 an hour, this is a 78% increase, considering this hypothetical hourly rate of a full-time employee at \$137 an hour, this employee is making \$284,960 a year.
- That is a 30% increase over the highest paid city employee.
- I'm a huge advocate for the city exploring options to increase revenue, but stifling growth and the development through increased permitting fees is likely to reduce actual revenue from property tax increase from reassessment by projects not actually perceived.
- I recognize the city is subsidizing this type of permitting as an investment, one that is likely measurable in returns and I hope this council will explore that type of analysis before making a decision. ‘

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Slayter closed the public hearing.

#### Council Deliberations:

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I just want to reiterate; part of my concern was what the speaker just talked about.
- Which is, the building permits and the design review increases.
- There are also really weird increases like public art review and sandwich boards for our merchants downtown.
- it just feels like, it's really difficult at this point in time to just do across the board increases, even if a study, um, is recommending that, when it's not necessarily our community values.
- So, I recall a couple of years ago, when we were talking about ADUs and doing building, we had specifically reduced fees to spur more ADU development, and i don't know if the study took it in to consideration can.
- You know, trying to go line through line for values.
- I remember the housing subcommittee, which mayor and the vice mayor chaired, that was part of the recommended things that we put in there.



- So, I'm just concerned this is pretty steep.
- And to just take one big swoosh and I'm sure it really represents what we have talked about as a council before, about, about keeping building fees low for certain projects that we want to, you know, like housing.

Mr. Madsen commented as follows:

- What I can say is that these are Editorial comments.
- They are my opinion only. Please take them for what they are worth.
- What you are looking at here is service based fees.
- Your service-based fees typically represent a fraction of your total costs of development.
- So, if somebody says, you know, I paid a fortune in fees, frequent -- which any of us who pay fees say that.
- Frequently what they are thinking about is maybe fees to connect to a school district, fees to connect to a water system.
- Fees to connect to a sewer system. What we call impact fees.
- We did a study of nine communities in the valley, not your area, but it really is common among California.
- If we did it in your area, I believe we would find the same thing and we did a typical housing project. So, a 2,000 square foot tract home. 80% of the fees that get paid on that tract home, are impact or mitigation fees.
- Not these service-based fees.
- So these represent a small part of the total fee payment and an exponentially small part of the cost of development, when you consider land, construction costs and that kind of thing.
- There's a jump, that is absolutely true.
- But what I would say is that jump in the hourly rate, your hourly rate is really a regional outlier to the low end.
- I could see how the math would be interrupted that way, that's not now the math works.
- What we say is that we are trying to recover an hour of service time but we don't have 2080 hours to give in service time.
- We have a reduced number of you hours to provide services, and so, that's why the hourly rate has jumped.
- What your new hourly rate is, is what somebody would pay for similar services, in another community or if you looked at comparable in the private sector like an associate planner type position, then it's going to be that similar rate.
- It's not going to be the \$77 rate.
- We are happy to receive any sort of feedback about you know, specific line items that matter, or any other feedback that you have.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I can give you just a current snapshot of what some of the additional fees well outside what these types of permit fees are.
- And for my day job, I just am finishing up a project had that is a new accessory dwelling unit in Santa Rosa, the school district fees, two different school districts. Bellevue elementary and Santa Rosa schools for the high school.
- Those fees for those two new residents' fees, was \$5,100.
- It gets to what was stated earlier about generational equity.

- Should existing properties who have paid in to a system - are new properties somehow made exempt from paying in to those same systems.
- It's a difficult question.
- We are trying to incentivize ADUs here I have to say the City of Santa Rosa, while the city is supporting it, their staff is lagging.

Vice Mayor Glass commented how much did our consultant do a comparison of our various fees versus similar, regionally similar agencies?

Mr. Madsen commented as follows:

- We did look around.
- We were given a list of agencies that can be considered like or close enough regionally.
- So, we took a look to make sure that we didn't think we were taking you somewhere bizarre.
- Every agency will look different in terms of their fees.
- What I can tell you, there were not outcomes here that scared us from a practitioner's perspective, you might have a neighbor that charges significantly less than you.
- Correlation to their actual cost of service.
- They may have just gone 15 years without a fee update.
- We try and be cautious about scaling ourselves to the neighbors, but we still think am I making you bizarre.
- There was nothing here that indicated to us that we would be taking you outside the realm of reasonable and rational, even within your region.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that these are service fees and not mitigation fees.

The consultant stated that is correct and that for mitigation fees, while you are not being asked to consider them this evening, in a typical community that does collect mitigation fees for a new development like the mayor was describing, frequently they may be 75-80% of the total fee picture.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think I heard you say that we are a regional outlier on the low end as to the hourly rates that you worked in to these formulas in your calculations.
- So we are an outlier on the low end?

Mr. Madsen commented as follows:

- If you look at the numbers that are forming your fixed fees and maybe even your deposits that planning hourly rate of \$77 an hour, that is the low end of California communities to date.
- If they are costing out and establishing deposit-based fees, they are going to, again, this is editorial, but it's based on my experience, they are not going establish a \$77 per hour rate for that skilled laborer that is providing a professional service.
- And, your applicant on the private side is not going to pay \$77 an hour for their architects and planners and support staff.
- The City really has similar compensation scales today when you look at the total package of salary and benefits.
- It's a similar compensation package and the rates should have some realm of similarity.
- The \$137 feels more within in line with what we expect to see for an associate planner than the \$77.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Stated we are updating ourselves so we are not unrealistically, unprofessionally low to our own detriment.
- Questioned if that is correct.

Mr. Madsen commented that is correct.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Stated in fact, we are subsidizing the costs of many of these activities.
- Our existing residents are subsidizing costs.

Mr. Madsen commented as follows:

- Discussed phased in approach.
- Did consider recommending a phase-in approach, on this one in particular, I didn't think a phase in would work well, even if you capped your phase-in at 10% a year, it would take you a decade to get there.
- Because you would be at 7 or \$8 a year increase and the gap is large.
- Because I would not be taking you to any sort of outlier status and because of phase increase challenges, it made more sense to adjust the hourly rate to the current amount.

Councilmember Gurney commented this makes sense.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- It's a philosophical issue.
- I think there was sometime where government started maybe 50 years ago or so.
- It's a model rather than having your taxes paid for government services.
- We switched to loading fees.
- No matter what you think about it philosophically, I tend to be a person that think your taxes should be paying to the government.
- That's not the level we are operating on in America today, so the cities of revenues in other arenas.
- We sustain ourselves unless we are charging for these activities the same way everybody else has been charging for them.
- We just can't afford to give away the store, that's the way it's run right now.
- it's the service to be made of the detriment.

Councilmember Hinton commented just to clarify, this new fee structure - by passing this will it wipe out the old ADU discount that we put in place a couple years ago.

Director Svanstrom commented as follows:

- For ADUs, we have actually simplified the process, both as part of new state law, and part of it by the city policies.
- We no longer require design review, we don't have a planning permit requirement for ADUs.

- The only case is as we recently adopted because state law said we had to have minimal setbacks. we require design review if you want to have windows in those areas, we want to do it for privacy concerns.
- It's a much-simplified process.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I was wondering about that and I could not quite recall it.
- It's still graduated per square footage.

Director Svanstrom commented for impact fees, under state law, there's no impact fees but mitigation fees such as for schools.

Mayor Slayter commented it is still graduated for square footage.

Director Svanstrom commented there are no impact fees for ADUs smaller than 750 SF .

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The school districts for an accessory dwelling, and it's not, it's not the city, it's not a permit fee, it's just simply a mitigation fee for the school district and whether or not that is fair.
- it does seem like it's a detriment to the production of housing that regionally from a policy perspective that we desire.
- We have so many school districts.
- For design professionals, it can be a bit of a challenge to chase down which district a project is in.

**MOTION:**

Mayor Slayter moved and Vice Mayor Glass seconded the motion to adopt the resolution approving the comprehensive and regulatory user fee schedule as presented by staff and the consultant tonight.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmember Carnacchi, Gurney, Hinton, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Slayter  
 Noes: None  
 Absent: None  
 Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved Resolution approving comprehensive and regulatory user fee schedule as presented by staff and the consultant tonight.**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-204**

**Resolution Number: 6313-2020**

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

9. Discussion and Direction on the Roles and Responsibilities of Home Sonoma County Regarding Homelessness in Sonoma County (Requestor: Mayor Slayter/City Administration)

Mayor Slayter presented the agenda item recommending the City Council City discuss and provide direction on policy issues regarding the roles and responsibilities of Home Sonoma County and:

1. Authorize the Mayor to sign a letter reflecting the City's positions which would include the following:
  - a. The Home Sonoma County Leadership Council should include one seat for each jurisdiction.

b. Direction on consideration of contributing to the costs to properly fund an effective lead agency that reports to the Home Sonoma County Leadership Council.

c. Home Sonoma County Leadership Council should be supported by a manageable advisory structure of subject matter experts who provide meaningful input on policy decisions.

d. There should be a commitment to better align funding allocations, particularly for federal and state funding allocated for County-wide purposes.

2. Appoint a Councilmember to join a new Ad Hoc Committee with representatives from each City to collaborate on making changes to Home Sonoma County, including the Leadership Council.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The community development commission, it's a county department.
- This is a board of its the superiors.
- They are sitting on their very same chairs.
- It is the lead agency right now agency for -- that is made up of a number of individuals from different entities around the county.
- So descriptor here is we have entitled agencies, in our case, that is the city of Santa Rosa, the city of Petaluma and the County of Sonoma, each of the agencies is automatically granted a seat in the leadership council.
- In our case, in Sonoma county's case, two seats devoted for the board of supervisors and one for the city of Santa Rosa and one chair filled by the member of the Petaluma city council.
- There's a requirement that there's individuals with lived experience, which, in this instance, means that people who have been homeless And experienced it and lived that lifestyle.
- Those are the main players.
- In our case, our interests are represented by assistant city manager of Rohnert park, largely through self-appointment.
- That individual is taking on the responsibility of representing the balance of the county all seven other cities.
- Then also we have been told that the leadership any non-entitled agency.
- In other words the City of Sebastopol, less than 30,000 people.
- Our interests are looked at by the board of supervisors.
- We have happened to have the leadership council.
- What about say, Cloverdale, we have to wonder how their interests have been looked at.
- It's a specific example that i pulled out of the air.
- A decision-making body and the entire reason for this commission or this body to exist, this leadership council to exist Sonoma county exists, from a county wide regional perspective.
- Knowing every city has their own unique circumstances when it comes to homelessness, and challenges and in a lot of ways, it's an issue that crosses city and county lines with impunity, and so, this item, the staff report is largely something that was provided by that assistant city manager in Rohnert park who has been the defacto representative on the existing make up of that board.
- This is something is that was presented in the mayor's association, and I think the city's manager group talked about it.
- There is also the mayor's group that on our weekly meetings in the last few months that we have been having has also come up.

City Manager Mclaughlin commented as follows:

- We have been discussing the fairness aspect of this for quite a long time.
- if you look at page four of your 18-page staff report, you will see what is requested of the city council tonight as far as action is concerned, and number one on the list is a recommendation that each jurisdiction should have one seat at the table.
- I will say from the city manager's point of view that has been consistently all the cities ask basically from day one despite the appointment of the city manager in Rohnert park, all city managers have felt in fairness there should be one seat for each jurisdiction.
- What is asked of you this evening at the same time, there's an understanding that likely there's going to be some costs to be spread around amongst those jurisdictions if we are going to have an effective lead agency with that representation.
- There's a more manageable advisory structure as well.
- That goes to the nuts and bolts of how this group has been operating.
- Primarily at the bottom, request number two this evening is besides the letter I just kind of outlined is that the council appoint a council member to join a new ad hoc committee with representatives from each city to talk about the subjects in much greater depth and to return with a recommendation.
- The other thing I will mention for perspective is, it was a hotly discussed topic pre-pandemic.
- I believe it was the last live mayor's and council mayors meeting that at a mayor's board meeting is basically the same issue discussed at this time that is kind of side tracked a bit by pandemic.
- But it's brought by the mayor's group by as far back as late winter that it was something that needed to be looked at.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I just wanted to plug in more information but so, going back I think it's two years ago now, or so, that maybe it's more than that.
- Discussed the decision to restructure the advisory group that was running the home Sonoma county type program at that time.
- At that time who was kind of the advisory group running it were the nonprofits that were all, the grant recipients or the recipients of funding for homeless programs.
- So, it was a little weird because the people who were receiving the money were governing themselves.
- Board of Supervisors decided it was self-serving and so, yes, they would recuse themselves when they would vote on something that was going to themselves
- it was like not really a very optimal structure.
- Then, there was advice that they create this technical advisory committee and the new structure was such that, that the mayor and our city manager has described.
- It has two members of the Board of Supervisors
- The other thing that everyone needs to understand is there's basically three agencies, three entities in the county that actually received money from HUD which is the Federal Agency that provides funding for home -- for like homeless services and for housing.
- HUD being the urban development -- anyway.
- Those three entities that actually do get money are the County of Sonoma, the city of Santa Rosa, and the city of Petaluma.
- They actually have homeless, and social service kinds of functions within their cities, because or within their organizations because they are big enough.
- The little guys like us, we don't have a social services department.
- We don't have a housing department or a welfare department or anything like that.

- We didn't sit at the table, so who administered all of these kind of social services, housing services, etcetera.
- In our jurisdiction, was the County.
- Except for the County is not really listening to us
- They are not talking to us; they are not getting information from us.
- That was why they came up with the idea of getting away from the self-dealing, with the nonprofits administering it and trying to bring some representation from the cities in.
- Now, the new proposal is that we actually have governance from the cities
- We are still not going to be at like HUD recipient agencies.
- Will the City have to be advocating to the county for any kind of funding from them.
- How much are we going to fund this, when all the funding from the feds is going to the county and the two other cities, right?
- They are asking for some funding from us, but all of the funding is actually percolating to the three other agencies that does not include us.
- So, we need to be advocates for ourselves.
- I think this model starts to make more sense and it makes more sense from the perspective of the smaller cities.
- But we need representation to be part of the mix in my opinion.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The County received \$9 million for homeless issues.
- To date, the city has seen zero of that.
- Even though it was kicked to the county.
- What the cities are doing is backfilling from general fund to do things like subsidize park village.

Vice Mayor Glass commented the City received some HEAP funding.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

- The need to have a seat at the table is, I think, apparent.
- What this item is, with all that background, I have experienced confusion on this issue personally as well as trying to describe it to people.
- I am hopeful that everyone kind of understands that at this point, on some basic level, the mayor's group and some of the leadership of the existing committee, you may guess who doesn't want things to change.
- Is asking each city to weigh in with opinions on four particular items and anything else that we find relevant.
- So I think it probably makes sense for us to simply work through them, before we do that, with all the staff report and information is we need to hear from our public before we move forward on any kind of decision making.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Oliver Marks commented as follows:

- I'm running Sonoma county homeless.com.
- A lot of information there, and that was very interesting what was just discussed with all the layers of bureaucracy, I'm strongly for the smaller per speck tough of Sebastopol.

- For the county to be more responsible for the management of the homeless throughout the county.
- So, I refer to Sonoma county homelesses.com and the Santa Rosa Website, citizens for action.com.
- There's a lot of information on the Tom I can that may be useful for your discussion.

Rei commented as follows:

- I'm glad the Council is bringing this group home Sonoma county to your discussion and um discussing being a part of the ad hoc group for a couple of reasons.
- It's already been around for a couple of years so, it would be nice to see action happening for the small towns and weigh in on emergency aid program, the state homeless emergency aid program and getting monies from that for the city, if it be for emergency services or for the police services or mental health.
- Secondly, just with regards to making a decision about a council member being on the ad hoc group.
- Doesn't it feel like it's the right time to do that?
- You know, we have an election in two months with two seats potentially turning over.
- So, it seems that, that part of this agenda item would be best saved for after the election in December to look at that seat being filled.
- So, it's actually working with the next council in to the new year.
- I don't know what I wanted to say with that.
- I'm concerned that the leadership council has Julie combs on it, I don't know if anybody can speak to that.
- I thought she was dual resident in another country too, and i don't know how she weighs in on that in the community.

Kyle commented as follows:

- The recent encounter and lack of communication regarding -- speaks to how disconnect our county is with the both the county and the relationship with homeless services.
- They are taking place throughout the county.
- I believe the narrative that we have not received anything from the county is short sighted and instead, I prefer to see the council see this as an opportunity participate in shared governance and take an active part in making serious change in how we address homelessness and mental health in our county.

Jill commented as follows:

- I think it's appalling the amount of money that is spent and lack of accountability.
- I had think that Sebastopol should be receiving funds, discussion with them regarding if Sebastopol inn is purchased, to detail how the city, what type of monies the city would receive for mitigation for you know, all the police activity that could possibly occur and they said that yes, they definitely could do it.
- That's only one vote.
- I think it's a great step forward.
- I hope that it comes to fruition.

Council Deliberations:



Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- There was a question about Santa Rosa, who's sitting in each of the two seats.
- This is the current chair of the leadership council and the other individual, the other council member that is appointed by the Santa Rosa city council, Olivares, Julie combs has resigned for city council, and so that is the status of that, and I didn't note any other questions.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I do have a question and I'm hoping we can get a clearance on this.
- This community, as a group, as it exists in its current form, have involvement in the county's discusses about the Sebastopol inn?
- in its new form, would it be discussing that potential purchase?
- I think you have hit upon an important point there with what, where, what authority rests with which group.
- The CDC is the lead agency is also the CDC that is responsible for making the application of the grant for the project Home Key, which is the purchase of existing facilities.

Mayor Slayter commented the Home Sonoma County did not have a discussion regarding the Azura or the Sebastopol Inn, that is simply based on conversations that I have been briefings that I have been a part of.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- Said a technical committee related to this, would she continue in that role and then, part of the ask on the agenda is to try to appoint if they were to add each city having an extra seat.
- So we would have two representatives.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The seat that Eunice currently sits on is the technical advisory committee that I'm not sure is functioning at all.
- So they are basically a non-entity at this point.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- So you think they are dissolved?
- That was appointed by the county, do you think it will just dissolve.
- What is being proposed here is being advocated by don Schwartz from Rohnert park.
- I remember the conversation from over a year ago, yes.
- This, you know, as far as who has jurisdiction over it would continue to have jurisdiction over it.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I suspect is still the board of supervisors because it's, they are the agency getting the majority of the money.
- Leadership -- so the structure now is the controller of the money, and then there's a technical advisory committee which seems like they are more policy oriented, and they make a recommendation to the sups, but I still think that everything that they say has to move up to the sups and is -- and the sups allocate funding, it all has to be approved by the sups is my understanding and then underneath the leadership committee is well, underneath the leadership council is the technical advisory committee.
- Don came out of the technical advisory committee.

- In the technical groups were as far as I could see, was kind of weird.
- I was on the data committee, they had me going to meetings.
- Talking about how they are going collect data.
- That's, I mean, that's kind of what I do professionally.
- The technical advisory committee is just kind of faded away, because it was such an oddly used -- and advising the CDC.
- That's the way I get the structure.
- My understanding is what Don is proposing.
- This is not adopted by anybody; all he is asking for is for us to look at buy this model and advocate for this to the board of supervisors.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Spending hours and hours of policy without action.
- Assignment tonight at least according to the staff report is to send somebody to this ad hoc committee that's going to talk about what changes are recommended by that representative group and then it comes back to all of everybody to confirm or adjust that recommendation.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- This is a suggestion is all this is from somebody who is been involved.
- You know, so whatever that is worth.
- You know, experience certainly informs us.
- Our appointment is for having a place in a table that is an interim group that is going to help --
- Help design the final suspect.

Councilmember Gurney commented once that restructuring recommendation is made, the council will have a chance to discuss it and finalize it and move to an appointment of a representative committee assuming that we prevailed on that point.

Mayor Slayter discussed the four suggestions.

1. Authorize the Mayor to sign a letter reflecting the City's positions which would include the following:
  - a. The Home Sonoma County Leadership Council should include one seat for each jurisdiction.  
**(Council concurrence)**
  - b. Direction on consideration of contributing to the costs to properly fund an effective lead agency that reports to the Home Sonoma County Leadership Council.  
**(Council concurrence - Advocate Funding from County)**
  - c. Home Sonoma County Leadership Council should be supported by a manageable advisory structure of subject matter experts who provide meaningful input on policy decisions.
  - d. There should be a commitment to better align funding allocations, particularly for federal and state funding allocated for County-wide purposes.
2. Appoint a Councilmember to join a new Ad Hoc Committee with representatives from each City to collaborate on making changes to Home Sonoma County, including the Leadership Council.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Consideration is each member jurisdiction and whether or not this is formed as a JPA, akin to the library commission.
- Which is an independent body like Sonoma clean power, which San Independent body.
- Do we want a seat at the table?
- I think it's clear that we would.
- We will just do this through the items.
- We will form some sort of a letter that I will sign summarizing all this.
- We are spending on issues related to homelessness.
- We don't have housing agency.
- We don't have social services.
- We don't have those kinds of things getting funded.
- Whether or not it was the police department, it could be public works or any number of city departments.
- We are already backfilling.
- We are already subsidizing homeless services.
- For me, if we are going to take part in this, then maybe we actually need to help support it, but at the same time, we need to state that like all small cities, our revenues are modest and that any kind of a fee needs to be appropriate.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- Why I say that is because they have \$9 million and we got very little.
- There was a lot of talk from our public about if the Sebastopol inn happens and how many homeless spots, we will have in our town compared to the rest of the county.
- I don't know the stats on that.
- If we are taking an extra burden, I think we should get extra back-funding and not offer it up going out front.
- We need to ask the county for the support.
- I said that on the meeting.
- We need to push them for it.
- We don't have the money and yes, of course, it's a priority for us.
- We do Park Village.
- I would like to leave that out of the letter at this point and try to get a piece of that \$9 million.
- We deserve it.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think there's a flip side to that presentation, which is to say yes, this has to be funded and here's all the ways we already do support it through our services in what we are covering because you are not giving \$9 million to us.
- Big cities have all of your HUD money, so, how ever else we contribute or however we do contribute has to address our issues appropriately.
- Because I think we have a lot to assert rather than just leave no statement, and not saying anything. We should assert, we do a lot. And you need to pay us. You need to support us.
- You need to recognize what we are contributing.
- It also has to be proportional; this was an issue in the discussion of Sebastopol inn, we are a little city and getting a did disproportionate number of people.
- Calling out our existing good efforts toward the issue.

- We need better services and we need the money distributed, so we are actually, we have relief where we need it.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I agree with what everyone has just said and I think we don't want to say nothing.
- I do think we want to assert the amount of money that our city has already been spending on homelessness and in particular, we have probably spent more per capita, than any other small city, with what we have put in to park village.
- Continue to put in to park village. We are contracting with a nonprofit to manage that for us.
- So, I think that anything that we say here, the way had this is stated, it's almost like we are going to be subsidizing the county CDC, well, excuse me, I don't think that the money should not be going that direction.
- I think, any statement that we make needs to say, something along the lines of, the, there needs to be an analysis or acknowledgement of each jurisdiction's current investment in expenses that are being spent on homeless services and a reckoning of the non-HUD qualified agencies getting their fair share.
- I think that, that it -- stating that it's important to and I don't have a suggestion -- I mean, this is something that would need to have a lot of analysis and discussion on the part of any kind of an advisory group, ad hoc, whatever it is.
- Size of community, proportion of efforts, existing efforts, all of those things need to be used in the calculation.

Mayor Slayter commented the other thing to think about is that most homeless services are going to be in municipalities as opposed to in rural areas.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- even they are in a little clustered, what is essentially a small urban area, they may not be incorporated.
- Mostly, we are talking about services needed in urbanized areas.
- With only 3 of the 9 cities getting of any of the money of 2 of the 9 cities getting money.
- This does not make any sense.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- That gets in to another question that I think i would like to let the powers that be that we sent the letter to understand, is our position on the municipality revisory councils.
- The fifth district is right now the leader in establishing those to speak for the unincorporated communities.
- Whether or not those advisory councils are potentially included in a leadership structure, is, that's kind of a hot button issue for some of our colleagues in other cities and so, I think that it would be good for us to take a position on that.

Councilmember Hinton concurred.

The Council discussed the size of members.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Also, item c, Home Sonoma leadership council should be supported by manageable advisory -- who provide meaningful input on policy decisions.
- It's a question that leads to the interpretation of is this an independent agency with its own staff that is able to provide the technical advice beyond what the current overworked CDC seems to be providing?

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- So, this leads to the question of analysis and who is best suited to provide the analysis of the issues that then leads to whatever technical advice is required?
- And other communities have weighed in with opinions of, that the CDC at this point is the lead agency should fund an analysis, a county wide homeless analysis done by an independent third party and I'm not even sure what that looks like.
- That may be instructive, but it may be too early to make an opinion on something like had that, I would like to leave the door open for the ad hoc, for the proposed ad hoc to take, as the group that is looking at the issues, for them to take a more in-depth look as to whether or not that kind of county wide analysis of homelessness is needed and if it would be useful.

Vice Mayor Glass concurred.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Should be a commitment to better, so we talked about the funding.
- So, then the final suggestion here is if an ad hoc is empaneled, if we have a suggestion for a member to represent us at the ad hoc, and it's all that is.
- This is not any kind of a permanent seat.
- This is not empaneling somebody as a board member or anything like that.
- That the point, the -- I will just volunteer somebody, and that would be the vice mayor.
- Because I know that, as somebody who has experience with the technical advisory committee, and the dysfunction, and also the function, I'm sure there were had some good things that came out of that.
- And somebody who has been kind of embedded in the issue for a number of years.
- I will, I will throw that out on the table.

Mayor Slayter volunteered Vice Mayor.

Councilmember Gurney seconded volunteer

Vice Mayor Glass willing to do it for a while and would like to see system become more functional

**MOTION:**

Mayor Slayter moved and Councilmember Gurney seconded the motion to authorize the Mayor to send a letter and approved appointment of Vice Mayor Glass to the ad hoc committee.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmember Carnacchi, Gurney, Hinton, Vice Mayor Glass and Mayor Slayter

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved Mayor to send a letter and approved appointment of Vice Mayor Glass to the ad hoc committee.**

10. Discussion and Consideration of City Council Position on Resolution(s) for the League of California Cities Conference and Expo being held virtually October 7 – 9. for Voting by Designated Representative(s) (Mayor Slayter/City Administration)

City staff presented the agenda item recommending the City Council provide direction to voting delegate or alternate(s) in delegate's absence regarding City's position on Resolution Packet for the League of California Cities Annual Business Virtual Meeting scheduled for Friday, October 9, 2020.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Vice Mayor Glass questioned who were the five cities that supported the resolution.

Mayor Slayter read the supporting cities as follows:

- Hawaiian gardens.
- Lakewood.
- City of Ontario,
- City of Rancho Cucamonga
- city of Roseville.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Some of the whereas, criminals use platforms to post notices of dates, places and times for followers to meet to commit crimes.
- Online platforms, no longer function simply as forums for the posting of third-party content but rather use algorithms to promote content and connect users -- does that answer your question?

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There were none.

Council Deliberations:

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I think the three things that the resolution is asking for, one, online platforms must establish and implement a reasonable program to identify and take down content which solicits criminal activity.
- And three, an online platform that willfully or fails in the duties is not immune from the enforcement of state and local laws that imposes criminal liability.
- Online criminal activity and the fermenting of often times hate, to me this -- we need to support things like this. Because it's a slippery slope.

Vice Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I actually am really supportive of the idea of online platforms taking legal responsibility and liability for posting or posting inaccurate and illegal information.
- I have a real problem with that, and I tend to agree with the mayor.

- But on the other hand, I'm a bit worried about this, and how it's being implemented and how it's being advocated for, because when I look at that list of cities, that list of cities kind of makes me nervous.
- What's the intent there?
- I don't think that people should be soliciting illegal activities online.
- Exactly what do they mean by that?
- Who is that directed at?
- What the action is, it's a yes or no, to simply call upon the U.S. Congress to amend a section of the communications decency act of 1996, so, it's one of 50 states, city league, association.
- Asking for Congress to address this.
- That's the ask.
- I'm in favor of supporting it.
- I think the benefit outweighs my curiosity about the supporting cities.
- I just wonder if there's political suppression that is the purpose here.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm thinking if you can circulate among people you knew statewide and inquire about it on the floor.
- They are trying to come up with ways for people to kind of do it virtually, and if it's the will of the council for letting the attending council members to do the circulation and come up with you know, a more well informed position on this.
- If the council wants to just let the mayor and vice mayor and council member do that.
- Decide among ourselves, I think it's something that we can probably do.

**City Council Action: No formal motion. Council consensus.**

**Minute Order Number: 2020-206**

#### **CITY COUNCIL REPORTS:**

11. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports (Continued):

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Somewhat related to that, obviously, I want to report that the loan program which the council approved at the last council meeting.
- Commission, and city admin worked through the loan application approved a final version of that yesterday.
- It should go live on the city's Website.
- On this Friday, it will be up for ten days.
- It's a preapplication to screen applicants, we have the entire process in place the credit union is doing the finishing touches on its paperwork.
- We will be reviewing that shortly.
- But the loan program is ready to go live.
- That has been expedited.
- As far as covid-19, the only thing I can report is to repeat the newspaper articles learn a little more about this topic in a couple of days.
- You may have read in the news today, that the county public officers changing the way that she reports and calculates And reports the covid-19 test results to be allegedly in alignment more with the state and how the state reviews those results of that will be probably pretty soon the County of Sonoma will be ready to move up to the next level.
- We are presently at the widespread virus spread label, level I believe.

- We will be moving up a notch in the fairly near future.
- So, you can expect more businesses openings to take place when that happens.
- Topics that have been flying around the city manager's group, both locally and statewide, is the general topic of what to do about Halloween.
- Some counties have actually issued health orders already about Halloween.
- Basically more or less calling it off shall we say.
- We don't think our health officer will be issuing an order about Halloween.
- About the only thing that we would have to wrestle with and we already have been reviewing this as a staff with the police and fire chiefs has been the question of closing down Florence since we have authorized now for several years the closing of Florence, with a big Halloween -- that they have experienced.
- We think that we have an obligation to let them know what we are planning to this year.
- I do had think that it is largely, if not solely a chief of police/fire chief decision on this.
- Especially with regard to interpretation of health orders and safety concerns.
- Staff has already consulted with one another about that.
- We will be planning on advising for its avenue that it will not be closed this year.
- I think if trick or treating is not completely officially discouraged by health orders it will surgery be greatly discouraged at least, so, we can expect that a lot of people will not want that to happen.
- Due to safety concerns and having to make a decision, i think that's the route that we are going to be going, we will not be closing Florence avenue this year.
- Other than that, I don't foresee any particular Halloween issues that the city would be directly involved in, it would be a good idea if our public health officer would issue an order, we may hear more about that, like I said, with our weekly meeting with her on Thursday morning.
- The police department and -- in the past couple of years the police department has handled that mailing and we have asked our interim police chief to find that mailing list, etcetera, and to prepare such a letter already.

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

Councilmember Gurney reported as follows:

- As the liaison to lantern, I can report that they are looking to find new board members, looking to a one-year, five year and sort of ten-year strategic plan.
- I think that they will be very interested in tonight's discussion about ponds.
- Also, the meeting yesterday, we had a similar presentation on water upgrade saves program from Chris Kohn, and a long discussion about the future of public transit goes back to a report that is called ties.
- And right now, I just can't remember what that stands for, TRANSIT SOMETHING, SOMETHING: And the report had several phases to it and the board reviewed all those and decided to create a new ad hoc committee to discuss how we want them to organize the community wide, county wide conversation on the future of public transit and chair Goran appointed me to that ad hoc, along with Chris Rodgers, Kathy Miller, those are the big cities, Petaluma and Santa Rosa, and Logan Harvey from Sonoma.
- I mean, I don't want to go in to details now, but we all understand revenues is dropping, Covid are changing patterns.



Vice Mayor Glass reported as follows:

- Quickly, it was a board meeting that is a health action, that yesterday, and a discussion of moving forward new people getting on the board, etcetera.
- One of the key programs within health action, has been map your neighborhood.
- Skip has been asked to be on the board, skip of our map your neighborhood program.
- He is wearing a city attorney hat right now; I will be reporting back.
- Skip and me, and how we can be related to it being 501c-3, how we can be board members as opposed to advisers.
- We need to get it straightened out, lots of good progress there in terms of building a coalition between West county community services, West county clinics.
- The fifth district supervisor.
- Map your neighborhood.
- Russian river agency out there.
- So, a lot of people getting together to talk about how to advocate for health and wellness and safety for West county.
- Thinking about how to promote particularly safety in West county in light of the fires and all of the other disasters going on.
- I think that will be really important to put it together in one big voice.
- What would the little bit i know about the current morphing of health action is that there's some really, really great ideas and great memberships.
- It really feels like it's going to be a tremendous community benefit.
- Off the 101 corridor.
- More money for West county.

13. Council Communications Received

14. Future City Meeting Dates/Events (Informational Only): (See Agenda Below City Web site for Up to Date Meeting Dates/Times)

**ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:**

Mayor Slayter adjourned the meeting at 10:36 pm.

Meeting was adjourned to the Next Regularly Scheduled City Council Meeting which is scheduled for Tuesday, October 6, 2020 at 6:00 pm. (VIRTUAL ZOOM PLATFORM)

Respectfully Submitted:



Mary C. Gourley  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC