

- In terms of RVs, people can rent RV spots.
- That's why we have KOA campgrounds that charge fees.
- It is highly unlikely that people coming for lunch or visiting for two to three hours will be ticketed.
- It is ridiculous to think that this parking ordinance will impact our tourism in our community.
- What impacted our tourism which was converted to homeless housing.
- It's outrageous that we're being asked to support more transients when we permanently lost a hotel in our downtown area.
- The people living in the RVs are adults. They're not babies. They are adult men for the most part.
- They can make choices
- I find these discussions of where will people go, making these men into babies and disrespectful towards the unhoused communities.
- You say they want dignity. Let's treat them with dignity and let them make choices.
- We all follow laws whether housed or unhoused.
- People can decide what they want to do. That is what adults do.
- Thank you for passing this ordinance.
- I hope to see it implemented adds quickly as possible.

Ludmilla commented as follows

- Thank you all for your discussion and work about this.
- I see that the people here really are well intended but I feel ill-informed as the effects.
- As a person I was housed for almost three years in or somewhat sheltered in a small utility trailer that I lived as my living quarters, okay?
- The biggest problem I had was where do I put it because I couldn't leave it
- I was actually more concerned about police or community messing with my thing and having it towed or moved away, so I kept it on my vehicle.
- Now, when I was working as an in-home support providers in the City of Sebastopol, after a community that I had been in where I had been on private land was destroyed, I had my trailer hooked up to my vehicle and so I took it to work and I parked it in front of my client's work when I was helping her in her house.
- So according to this ordinance, that would be illegal.
- Supposedly, I would need to park out of town and hire an Uber to come in and work for \$15 an hour as a home supporter?
- Anyways, so it would put an undue burden on people that don't have enough income.
- I want to say a big, big vision I have, what I would love to see and what I would love to support is a permitting system that is county wide or even City wide, just in any jurisdiction, okay, where a person who has a trailer, has an RV could apply for a permit to be able to park in the county or in the jurisdiction.
- And then you know who I am. I filled out an application. I'm not an unknown. I'm not there to steal your children, pee in the back of your store or do some random nonsense. I'm certainly not there to do drugs.
- I'm a person who is who I am. I have an ID. I'm working. I'm in the community for a reason and I'd be happy to pay an annual fee. Then you know who I am.
- I do want to say the components of finding a home aren't just about finding a structure.
- I have never asked for a handout.
- A lot of it is being welcome, having a feeling of safety, a belonging, love, esteem and growth
- Just taking that away from people, telling them they're not even welcome to park on the street is going in the opposite direction.
- That is harmful.

Kyle commented as follows:

- Tonight's discussion is another iteration.
- Nothing about what is proposed tonight changes the ordinances of this nature are laws against poverty.
- RV bans come down to a lack of support and true understanding of those who are vehicle dweller.
- A true understanding of who vehicle dwellers are to begin with.
- Our City's lack of progressive growth and affording housing has priced nearly my entire community, childhood peers from being able to remain within our community.
- Long-time residents have been priced out of the housing market and many are then forced to park in RVs parked on our streets.
- Many RV residents are just that, our residents.
- These are our neighbors, our childhood friends, people that have participated in our economy for decades prior to a financial downturn that is now living on their streets.
- Proposed ordinance is a targeted attack on the City's residents who can't afford the increasing rent prices in one of the most expensive regions in the country.
- Homelessness is the worst manifestation of the widening poverty.
- Forward thinking policymakers and advocates are examining the causes and solutions of poverty and homelessness.
- Increased income and employment are key strategies in ending poverty and achieving economic justice and are critical in preventing and ending homelessness.
- Social justice and economic justice go hand in hand.
- If instead of seeking or enacting new laws that criminalize homelessness our leaders would seek policies that achieve quality and living wage jobs for all who can work and an increase in low-income high density housing market, actualize progress and preventing homelessness is possible.
- Finally, just to speak of the financial aspect, if Council were to approve this ordinance tonight and fund it, they will be indicating that they're willing to spend more money on the enforcement of parking laws on the unhoused than they are on spending on mental health crisis intervention workers such as being utilized under a cahoots type model that provides actual support services for those in need.
- Currently there are already relevant ordinances in our City.
- The Committee for the Unhoused has indicated are not being actively enforced.
- Reasons given previously related to lack of staffing as well as leniency.
- If instead a fiscal audit of police activities as they currently are taking place, it might be the reallocation of current resources to the enforcement of vehicle registration, 72-hour parking as well as other ordinances that don't directly target the unhoused might be possible.

Zack commented as follows:

- I just want to say that I also would speak in favor of passing the restrictions.
- It is a first step forward in getting some control over the situation around the City limits.
- Speaking of the City limits, there have been things brought up from those of us out in the unincorporated areas before because there are real concerns about the spillover away from the City limits and no coordination as far as we have heard from Sonoma county with updates to the surrounding unincorporated areas which are all over the City, the very tiny City limits of the City of Sebastopol.
- I think one Councilmember mentioned only a few people are aware of that.
- But in fact some 40,000 people live in the unincorporated Sebastopol City limits.
- So at least the areas around town, something to definitely watch along with passing the ordinance in town itself.

Oliver commented as follows:

- I'd like to commend the Chief for all his really hard work on the ordinance, which I put in a public comment.
- I recommend that you go forward immediately with that. I think it's excellent.
- As I said in my written comment, Sonoma County has an enormous budget for the homeless and we seem to be reinventing the wheel over and over again and agonizing over all of these existential problems for the homeless which is a loose term for a lot of people who are all crammed in together for various reasons.
- Substance abuse, mental illness, obviously hardship.
- As Kyle said, there are people who have lived in this area for decades and by right should be living in Sebastopol and if there was any justice for a time after that.
- We have the COC member lady who was formerly homeless on Morris Street who should know how much money is pouring out of the county into homeless support.
- It is just not working. So that's a huge issue.
- Just separately, been Sebastopol talking about tourism and public streets, in December we had a high speed accident of a car driving into a trailer.
- It is fortunate the people who were living in it weren't in it. It is unsafe to be living on the street.
- So we've got all these huge problems.
- As far as parking permits, Morris Street is the ideal place to park an RV if there wasn't all of the homeless RVs there right now.
- You would think that would be simple for the Council to figure out that they would make more money for the City if they allowed parking for RVs along Laguna Park Way and so on and so forth.
- But that's the definition of insanity to keep inviting more and more people to come and live on the streets of Sebastopol while worrying about the tiny budget that we have here and the lack of tourism and the fact that there aren't people that want to buy art and people can't come because there is no parking.
- One final point with my last 30 seconds, when they closed the Sebastopol Inn after the County confiscated that, it was literally full of fire evacuees that summer.
- We don't have that anymore.
- So logically if there is another major fire or earthquake or anything like that, the Council should be able to say state of emergency as they're doing right now and turn off the parking ordinances while people are bringing in their RVs to escape or can't be on the streets because they just got burnt out.

Courtney commented as follows:

- Obviously, you have all seen me here before many times. I'm a homeless advocate.
- I love the idea Martin Luther King, creative all truism, get creative in trying to mitigate these social problems.
- There is a lot of science behind it. There are people who study this. There are degrees. There are programs where people can learn about ecology, social problems. This is one of them.
- I like safety nets. I think that I always like to figure out what's the kinder way to do things before I really try to lay down the laws.
- I would like to see us take an approach that's as least Draconian as possible.
- Although, I understand that at this political level with these many people involved, negotiations are what needs to happen.
- The amount of vitriol that I see from the public, I just pray to God that I will never ever experience abject poverty.
- I hope that we can be a little bit kinder and also smart
- I like the idea that Kyle was saying earlier about a CAHOOTS model.

- Like let's not burn our police officers.
- Let's let them really focus on things that don't have to do with mental health and financial hardship or fleeing domestic violence or, you know, can we devote our social workers to this and let our police officers deal with matters of serious public safety?
- Why are we burdening them with things that they don't need to be burdened with?
- Something to think about.

Maggie and Mike Jensen commented as follows:

- We're both local business owners. We own a business on Morris Street. We have a consulting firm with over thirty employees. We have been on Morris Street for over a decade.
- But since the encampment established itself, over the last year we have had multiple repeated vandalism and theft on our business, siphoning gas from our construction trucks, breaking and stealing tools, stealing computers.
- While we're compassionate and realize a lot of that needs to go into the solution for this situation, we are in complete favor of this ordinance, and we feel it should be moved forward with immediately.
- As business owners, we can't sustain multiple attacks on our business and crime.
- It just isn't possible.
- We will have to move our business out of Sebastopol if this keeps occurring.
- In addition we have two kids in high school and the proximity of the encampment to the high school, I just really can't believe our kids are harassed walking to our office and the drugs and the crime within I don't know how many feet of the school is just really, really, really unacceptable.
- So as a mother and a business owner, we're in favor of passing this ordinance.

Mia commented as follows:

- I would just like to thank the Chief for developing the parking ordinance.
- I am in support of the proposed parking ordinance, and I'm urging the Council to please vote yes tonight.

Jill commented as follows:

- I just want to say first of all thank you for bringing forth these parking restrictions.
- I have been in support of that for a long time. I'm thrilled to see these.
- Also wanted to thank the committee for bringing them forth.
- I really appreciate the common sense approach to this.
- I just have dealt with so many issues, having a business over near Morris Street and being on the board for five years at the community center, I can't tell you the number of hours I have spent in meetings with you all and everyone else regarding the issues that we have had here with the vandalism and employees being frightened and all of those are volunteer hours that I put in.
- I am so thrilled to see this, and I think it would reduce the amount of money the City is spending on issues that have been created by the folks who have been living on Morris Street.
- I think that if we have to figure out how to afford this, it seems as though we could find out we could find the money to pay for homeless advocates and we were able to find someone to put the port a potties on the streets.
- Do we have to continue to pay for the honey buckets and everything else if we are not having the encampments.
- Maybe they won't be burned down like they were over the feed store.
- I think that it's optimistic to worry about tourists with RVs coming here having run the visitor center earlier, I have a pretty good idea of the visitors that come here.

- I think that if we don't get control of the transients that are in the City, tourists are not going to find our City appealing to come to.
- So I think we need to be realistic and understand this issue has gotten way out of hand, which is why we're here tonight and I'm so grateful that it's being taken care of.
- The other thing is I keep hearing discussion regarding poverty and the homeless when statistically homelessness is mostly driven by drug addiction, mental illness and former incarcerations.
- I routinely follow the police blotter that shows there have been a number of arrests and calls to Morris Street for parole violations in various altercations.
- So I just want to make certain that that is also known. It is not just about poverty, but traditionally it is mostly men who live on the street like this.
- Not all obviously with the kind lady that's been helping us to understand her situation tonight.
- But I think that we do need To move forward with these parking restrictions, and I am super grateful for them and thank you.

Arthur George commented as follows:

- The Council does seem to be on a clear path toward breaking up the encampment on Morris Street and allowing for some form of overnight sleeping, particularly addressing the concerns as to vulnerable women.
- We have a lot of points here.
- One, as to permitting, residential permits, it would seem that a computerized self-enrollment computer system as used for state campgrounds might be utilized here.
- There are probably programs that could be purchased off the shelf. Computerized self-enrollment might be supported by permit fees. It might track prior applications in accord with the limitations that the ordinance calls for. This would eliminate additional personnel costs.
- As the Council considers the ordinance, some easy fine tuning could be to abandon the prohibition on all commercial streets pertaining to RVs, both mayor Slayter and Council person gurney raised the concerns about RV visitors parking their Winnebago's or other brand of vehicles on main street for eating in a restaurant, buying the book at copper fields and Council person gurney talked about gateways.
- We don't want to prohibit them from parking downtown and ask the police to overlook because that's a Winnebago. That's a luxury conversion. That can't be a homeless person. That's not who we're targeting.
- We don't want the police to be making those kinds of decisions.
- So the easy way, the easy solution is to abandon that prohibition.
- The Council seems to have wandered a bit afield from trying to address Morris Street to tackling the problem downtown, which doesn't exist.
- Addressing Council person glass question where do the RV dwellers go during the day, the Chief suggested out of down.
- It would prohibit them from using the library for education enrichment or using computers to seek employment, lodging, human services.
- This is counterproductive and cannot be what the Council intends.
- Again, we do not want to be driving these folks out from all manner of use downtown.
- I would ask that the Council really look at that issue, target what needs to be down but not reach so far field that it's leaving everyone unhoused and commercial travelers from the downtown area.

Robert commented as follows:

- I want to thank the Chief.
- I know this is not an easy thing to do and I appreciate you did such a fine job on short notice to pull this together.

- I think the Council should pass it tonight as written, pass it tonight.
- We need to keep the clock running now and move it along.
- Passing it as written, you're going to find out very quickly how many people will say, oh, that's very nice.
- Sebastopol was a real holiday for two years.
- Now we're going to go to Santa Barbara or someplace else.
- But we will find out very quickly what will happen among those people who don't want to just park overnight safely because they have another reason for being in Sebastopol and those who will go look for a Sunnier better place to be that hasn't yet passed such an ordinance perhaps.
- But I think we should pass it tonight and then we'll see what happens and we can adjust it in the future.
- And when we're talking about money issues, I have to say that I am personally very familiar with only one situation on Morris Street, but one which would have brought tens of thousands of dollars, probably hundreds of thousands within two years into Sebastopol's revenue base.
- Twenty-five jobs for people who don't already have jobs here.
- So there would have been way over minimum wage jobs, probably double or more minimum wage jobs that could have gone to people, probably some who are homeless and looking for a place to rent to live.
- We're losing out on that. We have lost out that.
- Six, seven months ago people came in, wanted to rent a place, you know, on Morris Street, had over twenty-five high paying jobs.
- People would have eaten in the restaurants, bought their food, brought their clothes, whatever to live here.
- People who were living across the street could have had a job. But no. The owners came and in the end tore up the vehicle and said no.
- That's seven months already we have lost a multimillion dollar operation that was opening near Northern California, you know, branch up here in Sebastopol. We lost that.
- How many more are there up and down that side of town that we have lost?
- I think, you know, we're talking about money.
- You are talking about an enormous loss of revenue here for the town and the jobs that would give people a home again instead of just a place to live and a Port-A-Potty.
- We need to care about them in a meaningful way with dignity.

Monique commented as follows:

- I am a long-time resident of Sebastopol.
- I support the ordinance as written by Committee for the Unhoused.
- Thank you for all the work that went into that to you and everyone else who had a hand in it.
- I would ask the Council to please pass this ordinance tonight.
- I think it's a good first step in addressing this issue of people without fixed residence.
- I clearly understand that social services are needed for them as well, but they also are needed for people who are housed.
- I think we have social struggles in our society that are beyond the scope of this Council to fix.
- I would really appreciate the ordinance being passed and i think it's another matter as far as helping our society through its struggles.

Vanessa commented as follows:

- I had a question I had been hoping to get answered.
- I e-mailed but haven't received a response.
- To the point that Councilmember Glass made regarding the site that was approved can house 25 RVs.

- Yet, there is probably now 40 plus trailers on Morris Street.
- So I just think it's a safe assumption that there will be overflow on Gravenstein Highway North all around the RV site especially because there are campers and RVs hanging out there until this site is ready.
- So I just would really like to hear how that's going to be addressed especially since during the town hall with the school, after hours of parents expressing concern we were told over and over your children will not be going through the site.
- There will not be a safety hazard to your children because they will not be walking through the site to get to their school.
- This past week, my Five-year-Old was dodging feces, tools, drills, nails, needles, et cetera -- not needles, but nails.
- Now that I'm hearing what's happening on Morris Street, I'm getting more concerned about what the area around the school is going to look like with overflow.
- There will be probably upset with how the site was pushed through.
- We understood that the process was like that because there was this sense of urgency to clean up Morris and to clear Morris Street.
- I think if you push through this village but then you don't do anything about Morris Street, it will create even more upset because that was what we were told.
- The whole they think so was the lack of process and how everything went was in the spirit of cleaning up the public health safety hazards that were happening on Morris Street.
- Those are my two big questions.
- Also just the surrounding areas of the site which I believe somebody else mentioned this is unincorporated, especially the school, which is in close proximity to the site.
- If vehicles and RVs are parked at the school very close to the site that is unincorporated how is the City going to be a part of that and how are you going to help manage that is a question.

Vicky commented as follows:

- I just wanted to ask the City Council to pass this ordinance.
- I feel like we need some control over the out of control parking that's happening in Sebastopol, our small town at this point as the RV we've traveled all over the U.S.A and stopped in many towns out of the way.
- We have never had any problem spending time shopping or getting supplies.
- I think there is a big difference between tourists traveling through a small town and stopping for a few hours than there is compared to the unhoused living in their RVs on our streets.
- So I really urge the City Council to pass this ordinance to get control over what's happening in Sebastopol.

Robert commented as follows:

- There has been a lot of good conversation tonight.
- I came in not really knowing much about this. But I hope to say I think the Council will amend the ordinance.
- I do see that it is necessary. There is a problem.
- However, I think that what's before you is overly restrictive, inhuman with unintended consequences than what are discussed.
- I really feel that not allowing there to be really any public parking for those in their vehicles during the day is just unacceptable and just not right.
- Sebastopol is a caring community and we should do more.
- There needs to be a place for people to go during the day in their vehicle and use services.
- There's been some comments and some suggestions that I really liked.
- Those from Lee, Suzanne and Arthur.

- So some of those suggestions that I support is removal of the blanket restriction during the day from parking in public spaces both in residential areas and commercial areas.
- I think some sort of hourly limit would be compromised, but the blanket restriction is overly restrictive and as people mentioned, there is a lot of people who use RVs technically as their daily driver.
- I know a lot of families with conversion vans or VW bus type vehicles.
- To think that would be illegal to park that just seems absurd.
- I'm sure that something could be done to change the ordinance to remove that restriction.
- I would say the idea of residential permits doesn't make sense to me as well.
- I think the current ordinance has two weeks.
- I think something longer term makes more sense.
- There is a lot of people that don't have driveways.
- As I'm sure you are aware, there is a new state law that you don't need off street parking.
- So there will be a lot of people that just have a residence but have a car that fits the description of an RV even though it is not a huge, oversized thing.
- It is a regular car or regular van.
- I would also say I think there could be revision to the 72 hour rule that exists now.
- To remove that problem of just moving a car a couple inches.
- Why not change the rule that, you know, a vehicle must be moved one hundred feet, two hundred feet, some distance to move that loophole.
- I think something could be done there to make the 72-hour rule or something similar to that more effective.

Hearing no further comments Mayor Slayter closed the public hearing.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment as follows:

- I will work through these and answer them if I can and ask staff to answer those that I cannot.
- First question, what provisions for residents to load and unload RVs for trips?
- That is one of the exceptions that is noted in the draft.
- Chief, can you get us to that promptly or recite it for us what that exception looks like?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Stated that is correct.
- It is on page 7, and it is under 10.76.050 section be recreational vehicles parked or left standing on a street that to allow performance of a homeowner, tenant or out of town visitor for a period not to exceed 48 hours.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment as follows:

- Residential parking, would it be possible to or practicable I suppose is a better term to sort of have a blanket allowance for residents who live here who have property who are legally registered owners of RVs to not to need to go through the permit process and sort of have a blanket allowance for residents who own RVs?
- Is that practicable?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I think that it's doable.
- It will require that the vehicle registration be registered to them at that address so that any officer or personnel who run that vehicle shows that it comes back to that address.

- It certainly is something that is able to be accomplished.
- I think the part that we run into the difficulty with is guests are showing up as far as needing that permit.
- So you have to have a permit section in place for that that extends beyond what the draft without the permit would allow for.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment as follows: Have there been any coordination with the county on enforcement in the unincorporated surrounds?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- The county has their own different avenues they go through for parking enforcement and things of that nature and i have no enforcement authority outside of this area.
- So that coordination has much more red tape to go through the county and will lead us down a path that will never accomplish anything.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I have done a little inquiry about that myself and unfortunately have come to the same conclusion, that the county bureaucracy and the red tape there is significant and problematic.
- I'm not saying that isn't something we should continue to pursue.
- Maybe at an elected to elected level we could have those conversations with our supervisor.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment as follows

- What happens with the existing portable rest rooms and trash receptacles in those facilities?
- Will they continue or will we realize a cost savings in that space?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Those were installed there because of the need.
- There was unsanitary conditions that we hoped to abate in providing those Port-A-Potties.
- I think we would have to assess it after the ordinance is in place to see whether it's being abided by and whether those unsanitary conditions no longer exist.

Mayor Slayter commented if they no longer exist and there is no longer a need for those facilities, then that's a cost savings?

Staff stated that is correct.

Chief Kilgore commented there would be a cost savings in the need for roadway repair where vehicles have been leaking and causing damage to our roadways as well and other matters that public works has attended to regarding that as well.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comments as follows: Has staff done any research about self-registration software as something that would lessen the staffing needs?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- So the issue with self-registering is that there is still a need to confirm and verify that someone lives at the address where they're putting that information into the computer system.
- So the purpose of the permitting system is to create a verification avenue that people can be verified and so they would have to provide some type of verification such as A driver's license, government ID, billing,

utility Bill, something of that effect and a letter if they're renting or a guest of someone who resides there, they would have to provide a letter from the home owner as well.

- So a computer system, as mentioned, is not something that will reduce staff work.
- In fact, it probably will be equal to the same amount of staff work because of verifications that are needed.
- There is a bit of a distinction between the use for the state parks, which is an entrance fee kind of situation and a booking of a camp site versus a parking permit.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment as follows: The question about the area that is in the surrounding to the RV Village site and what happens with overflow.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- The answer here is what we discussed earlier in the meeting which is commercial industrial zones have a potential prohibition on the parking and it would be up there as well.
- The same prohibitions unless we create some other special kind of A zone and some perimeter around that.
- That's the way the overflow would be handled is that under these drafts, it would be allowed between 10:00 P.M. and 7:30 A.M. And disallowed at other times of the day.
- So that's the case in that instance.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comments as follows:

- How will the City manage overflow in unincorporated county areas?
- I think we have discussed the difficulty.
- We can't enforce our laws outside of our City limits and that's just the way that works.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- One was a question about the status of the CAHOOTS model and the answer is and the Chief can confirm this and so can our City Manager, the answer is that that CAHOOTS model is being pursued as we on the City Council know and that also the Chief has taken advantage of the county with the mental health team that the county offers.
- So those mental health services are in place.
- How much space between the RVs? So it's ten feet. So it's larger than originally planned.
- That's based on advice and direction from our Fire Chief.
- So there is substantial space, which is why we have twenty spots there.
- There is a question about what outreach is going on tabling, brochures, answering questioning.
- The answer is that SAVS is doing outreach and has been today and will continue boots on the ground in the neighborhood and is handing out factual information.
- As we heard from the public is making themselves available door to door to do outreach and also we'll be doing additional specific outreach to individuals.
- Is there a plan to erect permanent structures? The answer is no, there is no plan to erect permanent structures.
- The fund-raising effort is in order to help subsidize the portable toilets and other facilities.
- Finally the final question specific to this was why not an extension of 72 hour rules?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I would like to address the 72-hour mark.
- I do agree that there is a need for more restrictions within the 72 hour parking ordinance that we have.

- However, I'd also like to remind the community and the Council that 72 hour marks are complaint driven.
- If a vehicle is parked one, two, three days, typically it is in the area of three days or more before we hear a complaint from them.
- The 72 hour Mark occurs when we go out there and Mark the tires.
- After being there for three days, we still have an additional three days, so that takes us up to six.
- So we're looking typically at a minimum of six days that the vehicle will be parked in the same space.
- No matter what type of restrictions we put and add to the 72-hour marking, there is still going to be complaint driven and they still are going to have a probable six day minimum of staying put before they move and that creates some of the challenges that we have already faced especially when it comes to vehicles that are not properly maintained and leaking on roadways and things of that nature.
- I would like to address the fact of the laws being utilized as they were.
- You're right. I gave leniency. Why? Because I think it is the right thing to do. I gave plenty of time for people to get things right. In my job, and in any law enforcement officer's job, it is a balancing act of providing compassion, empathy, education and enforcement. That's what I do. I stand by it. I'm good with it. That's what I expect my people to do, too.
- They have to show all these things to everyone at all times.
- This is my expectation and what I'm going to model for them and what I'm going to do.
- That route I chose to take has allowed us as a Police Department to form a collaborative relationship with our advocates.

City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- As Councilmember Glass stated early on in this evening's discussion of this item, this is about a compromise.
- This isn't about any one person or any one position getting everything that that one position or one person asks for.
- It is about a compromise. It is about reaching consensus.
- It is about being open hearted and generous, but it's also about hearing the impacts that our businesses have.
- It is about obeying laws that we all agree to. That's part of the social contract.
- So it's now to the Council to deliberate and come up with what we want to do.
- I think that the sense of urgency we have felt, and that's the reason that this item has moved forward and pushed other extremely important items aside so that we can get through this so when we can take up those other items.
- Any major shift of these drafts we all know the implications of that to our schedule and so I will turn To my colleagues and ask for thoughts, opinions and a potential direction.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Unfortunately the 72-hour has not worked.
- We know that our vehicles can just move a couple inches.
- We have heard from our Chief before.
- We heard now it takes up to six days.
- It is complaint driven and the RVs in town have doubled and tripled, especially after we announced our RV Village idea hit the news and more showed up.
- I have been very vocal both with our hotel project and this project that I am for local preference first for our unhoused community members that have been here, not the people that just showed up five

minutes ago, and we have been guaranteed that that proposal is that we're going to house our local people first up at the village.

- That will help clear the original people from Morris Street, which was tied to why we have done all this.
- I also feel like we got a little criticism for our outreach coordinator position which I fully supported it.
- Supported it for years before we given got it and I do expect that person will be able to assist our Police Department with an education process of our new ordinance that we're going to pass, I hope we're going to pass because I'm in support of passing this tonight.
- As it's been stated, it is not perfect.
- As I stated earlier, I think overnight people should have a place to park, but it's a compromise as my colleague Council member glass stated at the very beginning, and it is a fair compromise and we got to start somewhere.
- If we have any issues, we will have to address them but we need to start somewhere.
- That's my concise comments and I will be in support of the ordinance tonight.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- My comments may raise some questions and discussion points.
- I would hope the rest of you would be willing to enter into discussion.
- I am in support of the ordinance as well.
- The one concern that resonates for me is the one that Arthur George expressed about denying people access to our downtown during the daytimes.
- Especially when he mentioned the library where street campers may need the support system, the computer access, the information for job interviews, job openings.
- I think that's really part of the compassionate response that we need to consider.
- Also for our businesses to be able to come into town and walk around our community and be part of what is available here, which is pretty unique and very personal.
- I think we're a community that has relationships with people more easily than others.
- So I don't really know how to suggest in a nice way that we might take care of that concern I have.
- Also, I wanted to share with the Council a second concern and that is about no parking at all on residential streets.
- We did talk about a permitting process.
- Vice Mayor Hinton also made in support of some limited parking there and the Chief has provided that option.
- Here is the reason I'm thinking about that.
- I take my own street as an example. There are twenty houses addressed on my street. Thirteen of them either don't have A driveway or share a driveway with their neighbor. So there really isn't possible RV apartment for them anyway.
- So the driveways aren't level. The street parking isn't level.
- It's complicated when your aunt and Uncle come to visit.
- The houses like mine where we don't have accommodations for a guest who might want more privacy and don't want to sleep on the Hide-A-Bed in the living room.
- I'm dramatic in my example because I think our residents may want some flexibility in this ordinance to allow their family members and their guests to be able to come.
- Their restriction I think is two seven week stays over a six-month period that just struck me as a little too little. A little too confining.
- So those are the two places I would like us to talk about.

- I know the permitting process is a staffing issue, a budget issue and we just don't have the complete picture on that tonight and that doesn't trouble me because we're going to have a longer conversation about the mid-year budget review and we're going to soon get into the next year's budget discussion.
- March is just around the corner, which means may is around the corner, too, especially when our workload is like this.
- So I would appreciate some helpful conversation on these two issues if people had suggestions.
- My colleagues if you have suggestions, I would appreciate that if you just want to deny my concerns and say, no, you are welcome to do that.
- I think they're valid ones and they speak to the tenor and value of our community, both of them.
- The point about having access to our downtown and public facilities in the daytime, there is -- there is no prohibition on somebody who has a vehicle going and parking in a public plot or a legal spot and going and using the library.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- My point is the visitors to town.
- If they are using the library and the parking spaces in the public lot for them, they're well within their right to do.
- The exception within the ordinances allows for people to utilize City-owned lots that are designated to a City-owned building or use for business purposes, using the library for that.
- Parking on the roadway would, based on the size of the vehicle or the types of vehicle, could be an issue.
- But, again, as you have heard from one member of the community who spoke that utilizes a recreational vehicle often that parking is an issue no matter where they are and people who are utilizing it in the way they intend to utilize it find the ways to do so within the rule.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I could go on and on about what's problematic here.
- I actually am in agreement with Councilmember Gurney that there is a problem with tourists who may want to park or who may want to park their RV or their mobile vehicle sometime during the daylight hours.
- I think our ordinance, the idea that they still can go to the library when they're prohibiting any parking of our RV vehicles in the residential areas, then they can't go to the library because they can't get there.
- I see two issues here.
- First of all that how do we accommodate visitors, tourists who have an RV that want to visit our town?
- I do believe there are a lot of people that come through that want to visit and that are driving an RV.
- Then secondly where can somebody that actually may be an overnight sleeper somewhere else drive to someplace near downtown so they could go to the library or use some other facility.
- So what that brings up to me is we need to identify a location where there could be short term RV parking like maybe say time limited RV parking in daylight hours because that accommodates people that may want to visit the restaurants and that may want to go use the library.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I may have an answer to this that may help. Page 7 of this particular draft item B.
- It is unlawful for a person to park or leave standing any recreational vehicle on any public street in the City that is owned commercial, industrial or community zoned facility at any time between the hours of 7:30 and 10:00.
- It is not illegal for somebody to park their RV in a parking lot.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- That's why I asked that.
- Can they put an RV in those lots?
- What I'm trying to address here is they're going to need a lot where there are over sized lots.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows: I don't know what parking spaces are available as far as size wide in our City owned lots, but it does not prevent them from parking in a City owned lot to conduct business with that City business.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- That is an issue we may want to think about because we do want visitors to have their RV and visit our town and we want somebody to visit the library.
- I think we do need to accommodate some RVs during business hours and that is a point that the Council may be willing to take a look at.
- Do we need to figure out where we might be able to look at in our City-owned lots with limited time during daylight hours and then the second issue that I think is problematic is just that issue of homeowners who don't have huge RVs but who have VW vans or whatever that they take camping.
- There is plenty of people around town that have those and I do think that's a problem and what can they do to not cause a problem for our residents with that issue.
- Those are two issues that I would like to see us be able to address.
- I just have to say this is I hope a temporary solution to something that is hopefully a problem that We start to solve because the real problem is that there needs to be places where RV dwellers can go and park their vehicles legally.
- There need to be like RV camping places all Over-the-Counter.
- As a member of the COC, I plan to make that a very high priority to try and get the funding so we could have RV parking lots distributed throughout West county so we can tell people there is somewhere to go.
- That's the overall goal. Hopefully we could get that done. Maybe in two years.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- We have a number of people saying we aren't doing enough.
- We have some people saying we're doing too much.
- To me the message is we're probably doing the right amount.
- I'm concerned about what I'm hearing here is that I think we're losing sight of all of the policy decisions we have made, all of the support we have offered for the unhoused in our community.
- You know, we've got park village. 10 RVs can be accommodated. We've got two units ready to be deployed and people will occupy them. 5 to 15 safe overnight parking spots we're working on.
- We're looking at the 20 RV spots at the RV Village.
- All of these locations, and we have a full-time outreach coordinator that is serving all of the unhoused who will, let me remind you, be making sure that all of them, those who aren't accommodated in all these other ways will get service. She's already working on it.
- We need a solution, and we need to come up with a decision tonight and there was a comment earlier by Councilmember Glass about compromise.
- I am concerned that if we start working through a way to allow RVs in the downtown, a way to allow downtowns in the neighborhoods and I could add on a couple of things I'm interested in.
- We're not going to come to a decision.
- To the extent that we're going to address those issues, I would say access to downtown is provided through the parking that's available in public lots.

- It may not be perfect, but we can't do everything.
- In terms of residential streets, again, it's compromise.
- We had a speaker tonight and we have a lot of people in town who take care of their RVs by storing them.
- A lot of them have RVs. They find other alternatives.
- To the extent we will discuss anything in here, I would just vote let's just go with it.
- If there is a discussion about points, my discussion points would be look at Morris as a 24/7 to clean that out, what we have talked about it and look at the possibility of the RV Village street between Hurlbut and the City limits, 24/7.
- I don't have to go there. I can just vote for the no permit option that the Chief has put forward.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- There is things I'm interested in, too, and if we want to start opening up that can of worms.
- I think that to just address the things that have come up, i think our Chief has clearly defined and I have been reading in the ordinance that RVs can park in the City lots if they're visiting a restaurant, going to the library, doing business.
- Maybe we have to restripe a couple of spots, but that doesn't have to be addressed tonight.
- It's clearly addressed in the ordinance and so we have a place for those folks.
- The people that have visitors, if I had a visitor with an RV that I needed to be on the street in front of my house, i would tell them they need To move the RV down to another location where overnight parking is allowed and I would give them a ride to my house to stay.
- It is not perfect but that just seems like we can work within the ordinance we're performing here.
- If there are a lot of houses down the load, I think we can revisit, but I'm good on voting on the ordinance as proposed tonight.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- We can deal with restriping or finding RV parking in a municipal lot.
- I think we could agree that we can locate that in another meeting and make that a discussion topic discreet in itself.
- Once we know the size of the parking lots, the number of spaces it would take and the driving radius, that's more than we can do tonight, but We believe it is a worthy issue that we could raise later.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I would like to just clarify that as pointed out earlier, the word motive power is actually correct.
- I did a little bit of research while we have been talking and what that means is any source of energy used to produce motion or the supplying of power to an engine, vehicle, et cetera, so the way it is written, I just wanted you all to know that.
- Should it pass, there would not need to be an edit of that specific thing.
- I just want to make you all aware.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- With the no permit option, which I'm hearing general consensus beginning to form around, it doesn't really address the concerns that I'm hearing from my colleagues about the residential areas.
- We've got on page 7, exceptions period not to exceed 48 hours.
- I'm wondering if extending that period of time would be a compromise.
- To allow it for the performance of a homeowner or out of town visitor to load or unload the vehicle.
- Homeowner tenant or out of town visitor.
- That means that it's sanctioned by the homeowner.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think that's a very practical solution to look at it that way.
- I would suggest a 72 hour rule.
- That provides us more gracious timing and I don't think it creates problems, any more problems.
- If you are enforcing 48 hours, you are enforcing 72 hours.
- I appreciate that suggestion.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I did not hear a concern that 48 hours wasn't enough time to Load and unload.
- Is that the question that we are trying to address?

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The proposal that I am putting forward is to perhaps modify the load, unload and simply allow the RVs 72 hours.
- That provides for brief multiday visits from family members with RVs.
- It allows for the servicing of RVs and to the point about 72 hours, I don't have a particular reason to not think that just making everything 72 hours isn't logical.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Well, my concern in this discussion is to the extent that we are implementing tighter controls in the industrial commercial in the nonresidential.
- We're now it sounds like looking at a 72 hour rule in our residential areas which, as our Chief has indicated, is really a six day rule based on complaints.
- I think the likely result from what I have heard from our Chief is that we would be pushing vehicles from the industrial commercial into the residential.
- I may have misunderstood what that concern was.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- As the ordinance is written now, this 48-hour period would apply to all areas because there is a specific area in here as well.
- So that same section allows for performance of repairs of vehicles not to exceed 48 hours.
- So that is distinguished between the two. These are complaint driven.
- So if we extend that to 72 hours, someone calls in, we go out there three days later, it will be another three days.
- If they call in after 48 hours we're able to take action.
- Then without a 72 hour marking of that, I guess that we could technically take action after a 72-hour violation of this as well.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- If I'm an RV dweller and I'm in town and my choice is to be in an industrial area only at night so I have to move every morning or I can go into the neighborhoods and be in one place for three to six days, I mean, the results are predictable to me.
- They do cause me substantial concern.
- I think that's the problem with modifying what our Chief as proposed.
- I'm not waiting 72 hours to call the police.
- I am saying I have a strange RV in front of my house that is not allowed to be here.

- I'm okay with the 72, it's not going to result, it's not the same, we still have the qualifier.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I would like to point out that there are going to be times and events where a homeowner tenant, is not going to be home.
- Someone may park a vehicle in front of that home that cannot be verified with the home or tenant, and we cannot get ahold of them.
- Then we have to default to the reasonable assumption that they are an out of town visitor.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented you can't cover everything in a policy, but whatever the will of the Council, I would be willing to go either way.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follow:

- It's the same circumstance if it's 48 or 72 hours.
- In the homeowner is not there and you cannot verify.
- I think we can rely on our neighborhood, I know my neighborhood had one person that was dedicated as the street cop and she knew every car on the street, when something was suspicious, I was ready to call it in to be tagged or tell the neighbor to move the truck because there's too many leaves.
- We do know the cars And especially the unusual ones. The VW, or the VW camper van.
- I think we can count on the residents to no, in some measure self-police and know when it's not the homeowner, tenant or guest.

Councilmember Glass commented she concurs with the 72 hours.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm going to talk a minute about the discussion regarding the 24-7 approach to Morris Street and in order to help our Committee for the Unhoused with the enforcement there on a street that has become a location where an encampment has been well established.
- I would like to hear what my fellow City Council members would say about that proposal.
- The idea being to address a specific area where we have seen a problem develop and I'm concerned about the difficulty that might be involved with clearing that location especially with the Chief's comments about the Laguna.
- I would appreciate hearing about that, thank you.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I disagree with that idea.
- I think that we need to treat every place that is zoned a specific way the same way and not make an exception.
- So we are going say, oh, we are going to have none of this RV spending the night on Morris Street or in that area, but now we are just going send them to our downtown merchants instead and we are going to send them to our merchants up by Fiesta or Lucky.
- It seems that we should be spreading that out and it's not fair to just, you know, okay, we are going to try and rectify what has been a problem in another area and send them to another area without using a uniform criteria

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

