

City Council  
Mayor Patrick Slayter  
Vice Mayor Neysa Hinton  
Una Glass  
Sarah Gurney  
Diana Rich



**Agenda Item Number 3**

City Manager  
Larry McLaughlin  
[lmclaughlin@Cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:lmclaughlin@Cityofsebastopol.org)  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC  
Mary Gourley  
[mgourley@Cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:mgourley@Cityofsebastopol.org)

**City of Sebastopol**

CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
MINUTES FOR Meeting of December 21, 2021

As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of January 4, 2022

The City Council Regular meeting was held via teleconference pursuant to AB 361.

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

**Special Meeting Start Time: 5:30 pm**

Topic: City Council Meeting - December 21, 2021  
Time: Dec 21, 2021 05:30 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81418648849?pwd=WnlZSHRVZlZlUkxRSmNpLZUFGanhdz09>  
Meeting ID: 814 1864 8849  
Passcode: 868089  
One tap mobile  
+16699006833,,81418648849#,,,,\*868089# US (San Jose)  
+13462487799,,81418648849#,,,,\*868089# US (Houston)

Dial by your location  
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)  
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)  
Meeting ID: 814 1864 8849  
Passcode: 868089  
Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81418648849?pwd=WnlZSHRVZlZlUkxRSmNpLZUFGanhdz09>

**6:00 pm Convene City Council Meeting - Meeting Start Time (ZOOM VIRTUAL FORMAT)**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Slayter called the regular meeting to order at 5:32 pm.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Mayor Patrick Slayter – By video teleconference  
Vice Mayor Neysa Hinton – By video teleconference  
Councilmember Una Glass – By video teleconference  
Councilmember Sarah Gurney - By video teleconference  
Councilmember Diana Gardner Rich - By video teleconference

**Absent:** None

**Staff:** City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley

Administrative Services Director Ana Kwong  
City Engineer Joe Gaffney  
Engineering Consultant GHD Toni Bertolero  
Planning Director Kari Svanstrom  
Police Chief Kevin Kilgore  
Public Works Superintendent Dante Del Prete

**ROLL CALL**

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

**COUNCIL PROTOCOLS FOR MEETING:**

City staff read the protocols for the meeting.

- This meeting is being conducted utilizing virtual settings for teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Orders regarding the COVID-19 pandemic and AB 361.
- Live stream and zoom is being utilized for this meeting. In case of technical issues, meetings will be uploaded to the City web site as soon as possible after this meeting.
- Members of the public may view and listen to the meeting by use of Zoom as noted on the City’s website and as noted on the agenda.
- Members of the public wishing to speak to the City Council may do so during public comment or may comment on agenda items during the discussion of each item and must be logged into Zoom. Live Stream is a viewing only format.
- 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.

**PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS:**

The following was presented:

- Recognition of Retirement of City Engineer Joe Gaffney

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Just on behalf of myself, staff members present and past wanted to acknowledge Joe's service to the city.
- Joe is one of these individuals who have been incredibly helpful to city staff and to the citizens of Sebastopol for a number of years, but operates sort of in the background.
- I don't think a lot of people realize just how many projects Joe was involved in for so many years, both public projects, especially the street-smart projects and projects related to that in large part, but also private projects, especially the Barlow project where he was tremendously involved at the time the Barlow was trying to open.
- So we as a staff really appreciated Joe's experience and counseling over the years, and I wanted to acknowledge all the things he was involved in as kind of an unsung member of the staff, sort of, behind the scenes.
- So Joe was tremendously helpful to all of us and he will be missed.
- This, by the way, is not Joe's first retirement.
- So who knows what the future will bring, but I wish Joe all the best and thank him for all his years of service.

The following were recognized:

- Recognition of Calendar Year 2021 Years of Service:

Lamb	Mitchell	Fire	Volunteer Firefighter	3/29/2001	20
------	----------	------	-----------------------	-----------	----

ODell	Shawn-Paul	Fire	Volunteer Firefighter	10/25/2001	20
Pogar, Jr	Joseph	Fire	Volunteer Firefighter	4/4/2001	20
Ressler	Richard	Fire	Volunteer Firefighter	5/3/2006	15
Mooney	Christopher	Police	Police Dispatcher	12/6/1996	25
Soria	Amy	Police	Police Dispatcher	9/16/2016	5
Del Prete	Dante	PW	Public Works Superintendent	9/3/1996	25
Roman	Margarito	PW	Laborer	7/17/2006	15

**Reference Order Number: 2021-318**

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There was none.

**CITY COUNCIL REPORTS:**

1. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports:
  - a. Update of Cyber Fraud/\$1.2 Million Funds

**Reference Order Number: 2021-319**

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin reported as follows:

- We've had a number of members of the public ask for more information about this, and at the time, approximately seven months ago, where these events began, we were kind of constrained not being able to give as much information as I think we can now.
- I wanted to take a few minutes this evening to both update the public, who may not have heard much about this, and to provide a few extra details even to the City Council who has heard more about it.
- As I mentioned, it was approximately seven months ago.
- Thieves posing as the City's Administrative Services Director sent e-mail requests to the County treasurer's office requesting a transfer of funds from the City funds that we have on deposit with the County treasurer.
- The City Council knows but the public may not be completely aware.
- There are millions of dollars of funds from all the cities in the County on deposit with the County treasurer.
- Cities are constrained somewhat in the investments that they can make with their funds, and as a service also to those cities, County treasurers keeps these funds on file, invests them prudently, and cities then need to go to the County treasurer when the cities need to access large amounts of their moneys that are on deposit there, so there are a series of transactions that routinely take place between all the cities in the County and the County treasurer's office.
- The County treasurer's office has put a number of their own internal protocols in place to prevent any accidents from happening, and one of the most notable is that above a certain amount of money, the County personnel must wait a certain number of days before they transfer the funds just to make sure that everything is correct in the request.
- In this particular case, as I said, thieves posing as the City's Administrative Services Director requested a large transfer of funds from the County treasurer from the moneys we had in an account over there.
- That particular request, in our opinion, City attorney and City staff's opinion, should have alerted staff at the County treasurer's office that this was potentially a fraudulent request transfer.
- Including the wrongly spelled name of some of the individuals involved, a grossly wrong date on the form which was used, the date almost one year away from the actual calendar date on which the request was made, the fact that the request was directed to be deposited to an account in Georgia and to an account whose name or description of an account in the bank in Georgia made no sense in the context of the normal uses of City moneys.

- We feel any and all of these things should have alerted staff at the County treasurer's office that there was something wrong with this request.
- Nevertheless, the County did honor that request and transfer the funds.
- The County did so within about one day of the request being made in violation of its own protocols which required a greater number of days to go by prior to responding to a request of that size, which was in excess of \$1 million.
- The funds were transferred, and the short version of what occurred after transfer that transpired is these funds went through a long series of transactions going from account to account in order to place them beyond the efforts on City staff or the Federal Bureau of investigation's part to retrieve them.
- These funds seemed to be irretrievably lost to the City and that probably occurred shortly after the transfers were made.
- The City has filed a claim against the County.
- When we filed this claim, that's our way of saying that we think that the County is legally responsible to reimburse the City.
- Nevertheless, we agreed with the County that we would all seek to have our respective insurance policies cover this loss before pursuing the claim further.
- We have a claim on file with each of us, the County and the City, have filed all of our respective insurance claims.
- There are four insurance companies involved, two of them are involved on behalf of the County, two of them are involved on behalf of the City.
- The policies are similar. Each of us, the County and the City, have two designated types of coverage.
- We have a coverage for what is called cyber fraud, and we have coverage for crimes.
- Unfortunately, for reasons presently not known to me, the County's coverage is, in my opinion, grossly inadequate to cover anywhere near the amount of funds they have on file, not even enough coverage to cover our own funds which were on file there.
- The two policies the County has, one policy was the amount of \$375,000, the other policy was in the amount of \$500,000 whereas we have two similar policies for cyber fraud and for crimes and our policies are adequate to way more than cover the total amount of moneys we have lost.
- Of the four claims, only one of the four insurance carriers has made a decision.
- The cybercrimes policy for the County of Sonoma agreed to pay their policy limits.
- Pursuant to an agreement that we made with the County of Sonoma, as they receive their insurance proceeds, they turn them over to us.
- So the policy limits in one of their policies was made.
- The policy limits of that policy were \$375,000, so we have received back into our account with the County the total of \$375,000.
- The County's other claim of cyber fraud in the amount of \$500,000 is still pending. No decision has been made by that carrier.
- In addition, unfortunately, the two policies that we filed on behalf of our City, the two City insurance policies, in neither case has the insurance company made a decision yet.
- So out of the four claims, one is paid off, three are still pending.
- Again, our agreement with the County is our claim with them will remain pending while we seek to exhaust all insurance company avenues of recovery.
- We've had a lot of things on our plate recently, as I think the Council is more than aware.
- I have talked to our outside counsel.
- Any advice that I receive from our outside counsel I would want to give to our Council in a closed session as is permitted by law, but I will say that I'm assured our outside counsel are aggressively pursuing all of our insurance claims that we have any control over to try and bring them to a claims decision.

- I also want to acknowledge the help that we have received from our insurance pool, Redwood Empire Municipal Insurance Fund (REMIF). Now we're all aware of the merger that took place, and it's been seamless. Amy Northam who was the executive director of both REMIF and now assistant for CIRA has been very helpful in assisting us in our insurance claims.
- I think that everything we can do has been done in order to try and bring these claims to fruition, and we will continue to pursue it.
- I hope that assists both the Council and the public with a little more knowledge as it puts this into some perspective, I hope, as to both how this transfer happened as well as what avenues we're pursuing to get recovery.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Thank you to our City Manager for that summary.
- I you could, on the City policy, the crimes policy and cyber fraud policy, what is our coverage amount on those

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The City has crime coverage with \$2 million in limits.
- The crime policy alone has coverage that exceeds the amount of our claim.
- In addition, we have a cyber policy. It is way more limited.
- We believe the amount of 375,000 and an additional, we believe, 75,000 in excess of that, the type of coverage is still being debated with our outside counsel.
- Between the two policies, we have more than enough money in coverage to theoretically cover our entire loss.

Councilmember Rich requested to re-open comment on the Years of Service Awards previously heard on the agenda.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- We have been waiting seven or eight months since this started up.
- Do we have any sense of how long it's going to take, how much longer it's going to take as we wait for the insurance companies to make decisions?
- When are we going to get frustrated with them taking a long time and maybe take a next step?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Depending on your level of frustration, which can vary from person to person as far as dealing with insurance companies.
- I've dealt with a lot of them over the years, so I may have a higher threshold.
- We felt we would have answers from at least one of our insurance carriers prior to this.
- One of the insurance policies for the County has made a decision.
- We have similar coverage, so we're not real clear right now what issue they may have.
- They don't tell you until they've made a decision if they have issues. Then you would find out if they have issues. So I can't really say more than that.
- We filed our proofs of claim. That's the legal steps we need to do.
- They have a duty under the law with deadlines to give us an answer.
- That's quite a ways away in time, so they're well within any duty under the law to make a decision.
- We don't have a lot of leverage there.

Councilmember Gurney questioned what is their deadline.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented I think it is one year, but that's a long ways away.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Kyla Falbo commented as follows:

- It may sound great that they would reimburse all \$1 million taken from our City accounts.
- What I want to know is how much are our insurance costs going up because of this claim?
- Insurance companies are for-profit organizations, so while it may be the case we'll receive back the stolen money, this will still cost our City and County over time in increased insurance costs.
- Regardless of the description of the mistakes made by the County or his description of the County's insurance policies, what has not yet been addressed was how this was able to happen in the first place.
- It's quite easy not to address this, merely citing ongoing investigation should be enough, not getting into the details of how our City's security was breached not once, but twice, within a single year.
- The first being with the Sebastopol Police Department.
- I mentioned this in our securities review, citing specifics of security methods.
- I would love to hear any specifics regarding protocols we have in place such as Citywide e-mail phishing, testing and training.
- Please provide information regarding the City's security protocols, and while we're at it, I would love to hear about the City's I.T. Department.
- It's my hope we have dedicated employees who we trust with the City's institutional knowledge of the structure and meetings.
- It would be a disappointment if we decided to outsource these jobs which is added to our City budgets.
- Finally, to the Council, when the public was finally let in on this breach in the depths of a budget discussion, it was made clear that in November, we would expect an update, and as a result of the outcome of the City's ability to get reimbursed, there would be a revisit to the City's budget.
- As a result of tonight's update, I sure hope the Council makes good on this proposal and revisits the budget to make any needed adjustments.

Linda Berg commented as follows:

- What comes to my mind is that this is a lesson that we ought to take to heart.
- Adopting any kind of a more hackable technology, you know, wireless easily hackable, insecure technology.
- We need to return to wired and secure technology as much as we can.

Mayor Slayter re-opened the Agenda Item on Years of Service Awards as requested by Councilmember Rich.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I just wanted to make a point of recognizing one of our staff members who I have come to respect and appreciate to an extreme degree, and that would be Dante Del Prete
- He has run our Public Works Department for a long, long time, as we all know, but he just provides some stability as an incredible source of really battled information.
- I appreciated him when I was at the community center as the executive director and now sitting on the City Council and dealing with policy issues and turning to him for content.
- So, thank you specifically to Dante Del Prete.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I wanted to add, as we recognize our employees with five to 25 years' experience, that I once had the occasion to write a speech about this.
- For our employees, that deep commitment to be here for such a long time shows deep commitment to our citizens

**PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

Speakers are allowed to speak for a maximum of three minutes so that all speakers have an opportunity to address the City Council. Power point or visual presentations for public comment shall not be permitted unless approved by the Agenda Review Committee two weeks prior to the requested meeting date.

Yielding Time: Speakers may not "yield" a portion of their allotted time to others.

The Mayor has the authority to limit or extend the time allowed for speakers dependent on the number of speakers in attendance.

The Mayor can poll the members of the public for an indication of the number of people wishing to speak, then call on individuals to speak. It is the goal of the Council to conclude the public comments portion of the agenda within 20 minutes. If the public comment period exceeds twenty minutes, the presiding officer, typically the Mayor, reserves the right to reduce the time per speaker or carry over public comments to after all business items are completed.

The City Clerk will monitor the time for public comments and inform the speakers when the time limitation has been reached.

The Mayor could survey the members of the public, as appropriate, to move agenda items up or back to address the members of the public items of concern.

Public participation is encouraged on all public agenda items.

Council and staff will treat participants and each other with courtesy. Derogatory or sarcastic comments are inappropriate.

The public will likewise be encouraged by the Mayor to maintain meeting decorum.

In Council meetings when citizens are agitated, the Mayor may call a short recess to calm the situation.

If a member of the public is unable to attend the Council meeting, written communications may be sent to the City Clerk by e-mail or by regular mail. Communications received after distribution of the agenda packet will be made available to the Council at/or as soon after the meeting.

Tony Francois commented as follows:

- Represent Friends of Northwest Sebastopol. We write to alert the City to the likelihood of litigation over its illegal approval of an RV Village at 845 Gravenstein Highway.
- Friends of Northwest Sebastopol wishes to engage constructively with the City, and thinks it is possible for the City to meet its goals for assisting current RV dwellers in the Morris Street area, while also meeting all of its legal obligations under state and local law.
- The City is in violation of a number of those legal obligations, largely due to the haste and lack of consideration attendant on the project.
- We question whether the City's notice for its November 30, 2021 meeting adequately gave notice under the Brown Act of the action that the City considered and acted on.
- We also find that the City's packet for that meeting provided no analysis at all of whether the proposed RV village is consistent with the zoning for the site
- Nothing in the City's Zoning Code allows an RV village as a temporary use
- Nor is there any acknowledgement of, let alone attempt to comply with, the City's obligations under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- We questioned whether an RV village is a land use within the City under the building code.
- Our view is it is certainly not a homeless shelter as that is defined in the code, and therefore we think the City's reliance on that designation is suspect.
- Finally, we note the absence of any effort to comply with the California environmental quality act despite acknowledgment on the record that there are environmental impacts of the RV village including, but not limited to, potential sewage issues.
- We do think, and that's why I'm speaking with you tonight, that the City can avoid litigation on this project by rescinding or modifying its action to the extent that that action permitted the operation of the proposed RV village.



- The sponsoring organization could be advised, for example, that in addition to the MMU that was approved, it still does not have proper land usage for an RV village and needs to provide supplemental applications.
- This step would allow homeowners and other homeowners to comply with the admiration of this project.
- The time to do that, however, is unfortunately running short due to both impending court deadlines and the speed with which the City wishes to stay occupied.

Patty Hiller commented as follows:

- I have a question of what's happening with Woodmark.
- It's gotten very quiet over there, the signs have been taken down, the buildings are boarded up.
- Do we know if it passed the tribal review or where it stands right now?

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- Tonight me and many of you will be making public comment on many of the agenda items tonight.
- We have elected public officials.
- These elected public officials have a responsibility to engage with the public, respond to the public, interact with the public.
- I hold all of you in the public to task to make sure our elected officials do, in fact, respond to the questions and concerns that you and others make during public comment.

Rick Geggie commented as follows:

- Mayor Slayter, I want to commend you for the last meeting.
- It was very difficult and I thought you departed yourself with great class and made tough decisions and stuck with them.
- Councilmembers, I salute you for having such rigor to stay in long meetings and to change your minds on issues and to be honest.
- Some people said, oh, it was such a messy meeting, but I thought, you know, that was an honest meeting. People were being honest.
- That's what I think this City needs.
- So thank you very much for all your work and service.
- I'm so touched, I'm almost in tears.
- Thank you very much.

Linda Berg commented as follows:

- Christmas is starting for me.
- I got the request form, and despite the Public Works best efforts at preventing me from getting access to illuminating information, it has been made available to me only after staff enforced the law.
- We'll look into the communications but with the boondoggle being misrepresented at no cost, with that \$1 million debt, this town can no longer be bamboozled by smooth-talking liars, which is what's happened.
- Discussed pension liabilities
- As I see it, this is incurring more bad debt, for example, buying into the dangerous disposable hacker made in China and are going to be the wireless water meters.
- These lithium meters need to be replaced about every five years.
- Discussed cancer causing meters
- Discussed Chinese prison labor
- For the cost of \$2.3 million for every water meter in this town, individual units cost about \$7.



- We are continually feeling like we're acting in good faith, and I, like Santa Claus, wanted to share.
- Discussed acts of fraud
- I've already contacted the press Democrat and the whistleblower's attention on this issue.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comments:

- I'm going to circle back to a question that was raised in public comment status of the Woodmark.
- Requested a short response; otherwise we will need to return to this item and I'll have the City attorney do the process.

Director Svanstrom commented as follows:

- We are keeping the Website up to date.
- For anyone who is interested, that project is still undergoing tribal consultation.
- There was a phase 1 archeology done in November and the tribe has been reviewing that.
- We will be meeting with them in the Federation In January to continue tribal consultation, so that is ongoing.

### **STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Conflicts of interest may arise in situations where a public official deliberating towards a decision, has an actual or potential financial interest in the matter before the Council. In accordance with state law, an actual conflict of interest is one that would be to the private financial benefit of a public official, a relative or a business with which the Councilmember is associated. A potential conflict of interest is one that could be to the private financial benefit of a Councilmember, a relative or a business with which the Councilmember is associated. A Councilmember must publicly announce potential and actual conflicts of interest, and, in the case of actual conflict of interest, must refrain from participating in debate on the issue or from voting on the issue and must remove themselves from the dais.

**There was no Statements of Conflict of Interest stated.**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM(S):**

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. At this time, a member of the public may speak for up to three minutes on the entire consent calendar and 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.

Councilmembers 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 Tern.

Mayor Slayter read the consent calendar.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment on the consent calendar.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- With the passing of this agenda item, we'll continue to be without a permanent engineering manager and rely on the use of hiring outside agencies to perform the work of the City.
- These agencies will often lack the institutional knowledge that is consistent with our community's values and priorities.
- In particular, as I've already commented on our City streets
- They are in a shambles
- Although a majority of projects has come from a quarter City sales tax it has been utilized to balance other government fund expenditures as a part of it.

- One is the pavement maintenance plan which I would have expected it to be addressed prior to this meeting with council
- Here are my questions.
- What, if any take aways did the City Engineer take during his term as engineer in the last year?
- How has the tenure of one-third rating of City streets as very poor changed?
- What paving projects were initialized to decrease the number of streets that are rated as very poor?
- To the council and staff, what, if any, changes to the Bodega construction project have taken place?
- Are we still set for the one-year delay or are there other setbacks we are yet to be informed of?
- On Palm Avenue, why am I able to still travel Eastbound on this street.
- Please enlighten me on the five-month delay for an \$8,000 there are change to the roadway.

City Engineer Joe Gaffney responded to public comments:

- The Palm Avenue project grew from a resurfacing project to providing a sidewalk gap closure along the North side along with the striping and then the changes on the striping on Petaluma Avenue and South Main Street.
- So far the work on Palm Avenue itself has not been budgeted but I have submitted an encroachment alteration for the striping changes that are needed on Petaluma Avenue and on South Main Street, and so far I haven't heard anything back from them yet.

Mayor Slayter questioned if any Councilmember(s) wanted to remove any item(s) from the consent calendar.

**There was no request for removal of an item.**

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin introduced City Engineer Mario from GHD.

Mayor Slayter called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Glass moved and Councilmember Gurney seconded the motion to approve Consent Calendar Item(s) Number(s) 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

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

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Glass, Gurney, Rich, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

2. Approval of Minutes of the City Council Special Meeting of November 30, 2021 (Responsible Department: City Administration)

**City Council Action: Approved Minutes of the City Council Special Meeting of November 30, 2021**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-320**

3. Approval of Minutes of the City Council Regular Meeting of December 7, 2021 (Responsible Department: City Administration)

**City Council Action: Approved Minutes of the City Council Regular Meeting of December 7, 2021**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-321**

4. City Engineering Services with GHD Inc. and Resolution Authorizing City Engineer to Sign Certain Documents:

- a. Approval of Modification 3 to Contract Amendment #24 to Provide City Engineering Services with GHD Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$60,000 and;
- b. Adoption of Resolution approving a budget amendment; and
- c. Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the City Engineer to Sign Certain Documents

(Responsible Department: City Administration)

**City Council Action: Approved City Engineering Services with GHD Inc. and Resolution Authorizing City Engineer to Sign Certain Documents:**

- a. **Approval of Modification 3 to Contract Amendment #24 to Provide City Engineering Services with GHD Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$60,000 and;**
- b. **Adoption of Resolution approving a budget amendment; and**
- c. **Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the City Engineer to Sign Certain Documents**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-322**

**Resolution Numbers: 6389-2021  
6390-2021**

5. Approval of Budget Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2022-23 City Budget (Responsible Department: Administrative Services)

**City Council Action: Approved Budget Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2022-23 City Budget**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-323**

6. Acceptance of California Department of Justice Tobacco Grant Award (Responsible Department: Police)

**City Council Action: Approved Acceptance of California Department of Justice Tobacco Grant Award**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-324**

**Resolution Number: 6391-2021**

7. Approval of Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Santa Rosa Groundwater Basin (Responsible Department: City Engineer)

**City Council Action: Approved Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Santa Rosa Groundwater Basin**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-325**

City staff introduced the "Interim City Engineer" who is Mr. Mario Landeros. Mario has nearly 30 years of municipal engineering experience, most recently serving as the City of Healdsburg's Senior Civil Engineer and Interim City Engineer before retiring in 2018. Mario's knowledge and skills in city engineering functions and activities, particularly in Sonoma County, make him an ideal City Engineer for the City of Sebastopol. Mr. Landeros provided his background and thanked the Council.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS: None**

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

8. Discussion of Direction to City Staff to develop a practical, enforceable, realistic plan to:
  - a. Clear Morris St.
  - b. Modify and enforce parking rules on Morris St to prevent future collection of overnight lived-in vehicles;
  - c. Make any needed changes in parking rules city-wide to prevent similar situations from developing in neighborhoods

(Requestor: Committee for the Unhoused/Responsible Department: Police/City Administration)

Chief Kilgore presented the agenda item recommending the Council provide direction to staff.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- As the Chief alluded to, he and I have been discussing parking regulations and also with the Committee for the Unhoused.

- What you're looking at this evening are broadly stated options that lack every conceivable detail that would be part of actual adopted regulations.
- There are many different provisions that could be in such regulations, for example, a limited permit system or exemptions for people to load and unload their personally owned recreational vehicles.
- There are a number of provisions that actually could end up in final regulations.
- As the note here indicates where we would have to proceed on this is any ordinance that would be considered by the Council would have to first come to the Council for a first reading, and any changes, and then a second reading and then a 30-day notice period would have to abide before that ordinance could become law.
- It is possible theoretically on Morris Street to adopt something quicker than that, but parking regulations in one part of the City could and would, I believe, have an effect on other areas of the City, hence the Chief feels, and I agree with him, that this needs to be addressed on a Citywide basis and not just in certain areas.
- Therefore, we are recommending that whatever regulations the Council adopts would be following the standard for a second reading, 30-day notice procedure, and again, the Council can discuss and give guidance tonight and give direction to staff for preparation of ordinances with specifics in them that could come back to the Council, the hard work on that would be done at meetings where an actual ordinance is before the Council, and the Council can give very specific direction.
- So tonight what we attempted to do, it is outlined broadly option options for the Council and that's what you're looking at right there.

Committee for the Unhoused:

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Rather than just look at these maps and talk about unhoused parking of this and that, we need to back up and say what's our goal here?
- Why are we even talking about this issue.
- I think the reason we are talking about this issue is it has been a concentrated issue on Morris Street.
- Many parts of our community have found that very distressing.
- It's not the optimal place for unhoused people to live on a permanent basis and that's why we've proceeded to create an RV village so that people could have a permanent, legal place to park and get the services they need.
- However, the other part of this is that a lot of members of the community have been distressed and unhappy with this concentration in one particular area.
- So I believe the proposals that our Police Chief has put forward are about still accommodating legally individuals' right to be able to sleep overnight, because by law, we must accommodate RV dwellers' right to be able to sleep over overnight in our City while also mitigating the possibility of there being a concentrated encampment in one place
- Members of our community find that distressing and it does become an issue in terms of health issues, et cetera.
- So I think that's really the issue that we're dealing with here, is how do we accommodate the individuals' right to sleep in their vehicle somewhere while avoiding what has become a situation that it's an encampment that many people in our community are unhappy with.
- I think that's kind of the essential thing here, and how do we keep our neighborhoods and everybody feeling safe and intact so that we feel happy in our neighborhoods but we also are supporting our business areas.
- So I think that's the essential issue and that's the question we're trying to address with these various options that our Chief, of course, has given to us.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- For purposes of context, as I look at the proposal that Chief Kilgore has provided here, I just want to point out the general pattern.
- He has presented it to us, he's described it, but the idea here that we see him proposing is one approach to our residential areas, and that would be no oversized vehicles in our residential areas and he's provided a zoning map to give us of an indication of what that might mean.
- Then a different approach taken in our commercial/industrial areas.
- What I would suggest in that area, is to, in essence, disallow parking of oversized vehicles during the daytime. But in essence, from about 10:00 P.M.to about 6:00 AM., allowing in those areas the parking of oversized vehicles.
- Then during the day, there is the option of adding a three-hour or limited time provision.
- As we as a City Council look at this, I think it's really important that we remember this is the first step.
- This is an outline, and now what we need to give our Chief and the rest of our staff is an indication of what our particular concerns on behalf of the community might be.
- I think that's where I would suggest that we have our questions.
- For instance, if some of you are interested in knowing whether there would be some limited permit opportunities in residential areas, I think that's where they're asking that question, in order to determine, given our limited resources, limited staff whether that's actually an option within our town.
- Similarly, if we look at the commercial and industrial areas, we need to ask ourselves, are there areas within that commercial/industrial grouping that we would like to say to our Police Chief, we would like to have him consider not allowing any oversized vehicles to be allowed, and that would be daytime and nighttime.
- Our City attorney has indicated that that would be acceptable, that we could designate some areas.
- So my thoughts on that, and then I will turn it over to others to ask questions, but my initial thoughts are to try to give some parameters.
- We want to allow our staff to draft an ordinance that's got some pull but allows some flexibility as things change.
- For instance, if we don't want to allow the encampment that is currently on Morris Street to continue, then perhaps what we should be considering is asking our Police Chief, our staff, to draft a provision that would disallow oversized vehicles from being located anywhere where an existing encampment is a concern, similarly where our RV village is being located, we could consider no parking in front of the RV village, but no oversized vehicles in front of a location where we have an unauthorized homeless shelter.
- I want to just structure it that way.
- As you look at it, all the various issues, we need to give our Police Chief the information that would allow him and the rest of the staff to go back and draft an ordinance that would be easy to implement and that wouldn't cost a whole bunch.
- So the staff is here as resources to answer those questions, to go down that path and figure it out.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I have a question about timing.
- I think for our City Manager, potentially our Police Chief, if we're looking at general discussion tonight, as Councilmember Rich has given us some parameters, staff takes that back and has to work up an ordinance, bring it for discussion, review and revision and then we go to a first reading and a second

reading, it seems like the earliest we may be able to put in play a Citywide policy would be somewhere in March.

- Is that a reasonable timeline?
- I'm trying to get a sense of how long this is going to take, reasonably.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Staff has made an attempt to estimate reasonably the realm of what's possible and has come up in the first week of March.
- We felt the first meeting for the first reading will be the second meeting in January, not the first meeting in January which would require preparation of the ordinances during the holidays.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I just want to reiterate a couple things.
- One, the public has asked about private lots and if these regulations that we're discussing would impact private lots.
- I just want to confirm my understanding for the public that private lots are private property and the owners of those lots can put post signs and can have vehicles towed. Is that correct, Chief? Chief Kilgore stated that is correct.
- Then I heard you say somehow, but it wasn't detailed out as Councilmember Gurney just asked, the question about the 30 days and when we would get Citywide regs in. Staff stated we are talking early March. However, I heard someone say we could deal with Morris Street quicker than that and just deal with that section and move it along quicker, which I think we've kind of been alluding to and talking about.
- So could somebody answer if we took these things on a tiered basis and deal with Morris Street, I'm assuming maybe we could deal with it quicker because it is a health and safety issue right now.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The Chief and I have discussed that.
- We strongly advised against enacting any regulations on one section of town on an emergency basis because we think that the result of that would be to drive the vehicles that are presently on the street in question, for example, Morris.
- We could enact regulations on Morris Street now on an emergency basis. It would drive the vehicles on Morris Street throughout the rest of town.
- I recall that the issues with camping on the roads that came from residential issues, the Chief and I were worried that enacting one part of town and not others would drive the vehicles into other areas and other places.
- We would have to deal with them when they reached those other places.
- This would be a sporadic attempt of enforcement, so we highly recommend against a rush.

Vice Mayor Hinton questioned what is legal and can it be done only for Morris Street.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- This is from me, the City Attorney, and we've consulted with our outside attorney as well.
- The situation on Morris Street is different from some areas in town.
- It has some significant health and safety violations very well documented, and for that reason, I think action could be taken more swiftly on Morris Street.

- Those conditions do not exist presently in other areas in town, and so I think it would be a stretch to try and enact parking regulations in our entire City, and it would be a stretch to enact those on an emergency basis.
- Furthermore, I don't think that's fair to the public. The public should have a chance to vet whatever the regulations are.
- There is a reason for a first and second reading and 30-day notice. That's so the public can become fully aware of what these regulations will do in their particular neighborhoods And elsewhere in town.
- I think for all those reasons, yes, you could do something on an urgent basis on Morris Street.
- I think that would have unintended consequences.
- I don't think you can do that elsewhere in town.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I recall on Morris Street, when we heard about the restriping of the bike lane proposal, we have an issue with the striping there and I was told that is why we can't enforce parking tickets for vehicles that are stretched out into the bike lanes.
- That's also happening there, correct?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin stated that is correct.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- To address the overall timing issue, we now have the RV pilot program of a projected move-in date looking more like February, from what we've learned so far
- We're looking at a schedule here that would involve a proposed first reading of an ordinance on January 18 and possibly a second reading on February 1.
- As we look at our overall plan, the plan had been to coordinate the RV village population with a City ordinance and an overall parking assessment.
- We're still here, because as we heard from our City Manager/City Attorney, as we know from advocates and as we see with the unhoused, there is an obligation to provide notice.
- We have heard from our Police Chief that he intends to be aggressive.
- There has been some delay and some patience shown, is probably the best way of describing it, in enforcement on Morris Street. That is scheduled to change after Christmas.
- We have a process here where in early January, there will be increased enforcement and presence and notification through that on Morris Street.
- We have a first reading on January 18 of the ordinance, again, that will act as notice to the community of unhoused and the rest of the community that changes are in the wind. That it will no longer be the place to be.
- On February 1, hopefully we have a second reading of that ordinance.
- The public and the unhoused and the advocates will be aware of what those upcoming changes are.
- Sometime in February, we have the RV notice populated.
- That provides us a real opportunity to meet the notice obligations to do what we need to in terms of the RV village, to provide the public with the opportunity for input, which we have heard recently the public needs the opportunity for input and to do something in a thoughtful and effective way that will help the entire town.
- That advice is the overall timeline that does fit within what we have told people as we move through this process.



Chief Kilgore commented the only thing I would correct is addressing an enforcement. It will be an effective enforcement that has been provided a way lot of leniency over the last 12 months or more in hopes of having people willingly and voluntarily comply with getting their vehicles registered to a point that they would be legal on the roadway and that we could effectively enforce the codes that we have at our disposal.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I want to just follow up by identifying that if you step back at the big view here, there is an entire process that has been followed by our Police Chief, and each one of those steps, working with Jennifer Lake at West County Community Services, Michelle in the Police Department, working with West County Community Services with the applicants, that all has been a process that's been in place for quite a while that is leading to that effective enforcement.
- This is just one final piece of the bigger picture that we need to make sure we do correctly.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- How does this timeline fits in with our encouragement of the people on Morris Street to move over to the proposed RV village.
- My thoughts are what we are working to achieve with the RV village is an environment, a welcome environment where we can provide in a good and appropriate and happy home for people to move their RVs into and simultaneously relieving a situation on Morris Street.
- I have concerns about the timing of enforcement because we don't want to enforce at a level -- and I appreciate the effective enforcement phrase from the Chief -- that it needs to dovetail. It needs to be kind of carrot and stick.
- We want to encourage people to move to our RV village but not have them so alienated from us as a City that they say, the heck with it, we're not going to participate.
- How are we making this a balance, the more effective enforcement to alleviate the constant encampment on Morris Street while also encouraging the residents to move to something that's going to be a better situation for them without making it be a very negative situation where they are not wanting to participate?
- What are we doing in terms of our timing and policies to make that be an effectively solution we're looking for? What about that timing in relationship to enforcement.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- The Police Department has been working for ten months in a collaborative service with West County Community Services and Jennifer Lake, and what we have worked collaboratively on is working together to provide resources for the Committee for the Unhoused for those on Laguna Parkway, Morris Street, Palm Avenue and others throughout the City
- We have collaborated with those that have provided resources for the unhoused community to get their vehicles registered and properly maintained for roadway use.
- We have had a few people who have taken us and Jennifer Lake up on the offers that have been provided, and we have a significant number of people who have not.
- What we have done is pre-holiday and Thanksgiving we had approximately, I believe, 22 vehicles that were on or around Morris Street location. Post-Thanksgiving we counted 37 of those vehicles.
- Of those vehicles, there are several that are expired, and not just by six months when we would typically tow a vehicle.
- Some of these vehicles have been identified as being expired for a year up and some of them up to eight to ten years, which is completely unacceptable.

- Some of these vehicles have had leaking sewage and leaking fluids, which we have worked together with Jennifer to identify sources for the unhoused who have those vehicle issues to get those fixed, and some of them have done that.
- Jennifer works very collaboratively with us and provides information as to the vehicles that are in progress as far as being corrected. Our personnel also works to identify those vehicles as well.
- But notices that are not taking the active engagement to correct these issues can no longer continue in this manner.
- Our enforcement is a two-pronged approach where we have the approach that is a collaborative working relationship with West County services' advocate groups who can provide the resources that can correct the issues that we're seeing, and the other prong, which is the enforcement action which we hope we don't have to take, but it is a needed action that we maybe do have to take.
- There have been multiple asks over and over again for intensions. I've extended the hand multiple times. You can only extend the hand a number of times before you can't extend that hand.
- However, we've continued to extend that hand to resources around the County who can help the unhoused community in order to put them on the right path.
- We've also got to take the enforcement action so we don't have vehicles that are illegally operated on the roadway, parked on the roadway and in violation of various vehicle code matters.
- If we're speaking with these folks, they understand and they are cool about the RV village that is coming.
- We've had some more people actively engage with us so we can help get those things.
- That information is provided to all personnel in the Police Department.
- I've asked our police personnel to be cognizant of the information that is being provided, to provide a compassionate, empathetic approach, but in the end, at the end of the day, I do not have the authority, both the legal authority it.
- They did not tell them we are not going to enforce anything this particular.
- To use their discretion as to how they're going to take action, whether that may be a warning, a conversation, a citation or if a vehicle has to be towed as well.
- They're getting this message in multiple ways, and they're not only getting that message from our personnel, but they're also getting that message from me.
- I spend an awful lot of time on Morris Street, whether in a vehicle or on foot, having many conversations with people.
- I can tell you on many occasions it's greeting street, an interaction that is something to let them know about resources, and that is to repeat the same.
- So it is a collaborative relationship.
- I've extended it beyond the 25th
- That does not give me the authority to tell my people what they can or can't do as long as it is a policy

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The common thread with the enforcement the Chief is talking about right now which is basically vehicle registration issues and what will occur later as parking regulations actually come into effect is plenty of notice, plenty of discussion, proactive assistance, as the Chief has alluded to.
- That's going to be a common thread both in what present action he was talking about as well as discussion of parking regulations.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I noted that the Chief and our Police Department as well as WCCS and our outreach volunteers have put a tremendous amount of work into working with the community to resolve these issues.

- Why I'm asking this question really is for us to keep in mind we have an issue and will be working to resolve their issues.
- However, the people that are moving forward and are collaborating, let's say it's with our volunteers, with our Police Department and are actually now in compliance as far as restrictions and see that we are encouraging those people but to participate in this future parking site we're looking forward to having in February.
- The timing needs to help encourage those people to move from where they are to this new facility that we're creating and not have maybe lost some space in the interim is kind of my point

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- We've been advised that we should and we will start giving warning of coming parking regulations no later than when he does that in the first reading.
- We're going to give plenty of warning on that. But we're certainly not limited to that.
- They're going to get warning of that, but they'll also be told in detail and encouraged multiple times of the other.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- It would seem to me that the schedule of first and second readings end of January, first part of February enacting first week in March given staff vacations and other demands on staff's time, I mean, something as simple as getting signs printed and posted, that's going to take significant effort, and this schedule feels aspirational.
- I think it's possible if maybe if there wasn't a whole lot of other things going on.
- I know the speed at which government can operate, and I just want to keep that in everybody's mind so that is best-case scenario that nothing goes wrong.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- It depends on what the regulations are.
- If you receive a zoning map of the entire City, if we're going through the entire City and say, this is what we're doing in this neighborhood, and this other thing is what we're doing in that neighborhood, or something similar to that, you're quite right.
- That would be fictional, that schedule I was alluding to.
- We tried to keep it simple. I know it won't remain that way.
- Regulations are going to have complexities and definitions and some of the things we've already mentioned would be in any regulation adopted by the City.
- But if they're kept fairly broad, fairly simple, I think we can meet that deadline.
- I've heard over and over again from the committee, at least, the importance of trying to coincide in time with the putting the vehicles in RV village and enacting the parking regulations. That has been our goal.
- Fortunately, or unfortunately, the moving of the vehicles into RV village seems to be taking a little bit longer than what we had first hoped.
- As it gets a bit longer, it gets closer to the realistic time for enforcement of a parking regulation.
- I'm just hoping that between keeping it straightforward and relatively simple and the realities of moving a lot of vehicles onto a site that requires demolition and other work that these two will coincide in time. Or nearly so.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Councilmember Glass and I have been working on these related issues quite a bit.

- I took a look at our Police Chief's proposal and I outlined some potential modifications or adjustments that I was considering might be acceptable direction for a Police Chief and fit within the parameters that our City Manager has just outlined.
- In other words, keep it simple.
- I'm wondering if you would like me to outline those provisions for the City Council to think about at the moment in order to try to focus this discussion, or if you'd like to leave that for a later point in the meeting.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I would like to leave that for discussion amongst the Council for deliberations.
- I think it's important for any of our suggestions to be informed by the public.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'd like to understand from our Police Chief's perspective how he would propose from an enforcement and efficiency perspective, how he would propose to deal with trailers.
- In other words, the fifth wheels, the trailers sitting there without a vehicle attached to it.
- I'm curious about his suggestion there.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- We are actively reaching out to companies to engage in a conversation with them as to how we might be able to work with them in the event that we would need to tow a fifth wheel.
- It is a very costly matter. Typically an RV tow costs somewhere in the area of two to three thousand dollars each.
- Working with them is first in making a plan to do that and moving forward from there.
- It would be wonderful if we had any of our advocacy groups who would be able to contact resources who could tow these vehicles out and find a location for them that is not on the roadway and would meet the compliance of the proposed parking restrictions.
- Once those are present, typically what we would do in some of these situations is we would first try to make contact to provide people with information as to what the new parking regulations are, make them aware of that.
- If there is non-compliance that way, we would issue a citation. If there is non-compliance we would look at the greater issue.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- My question was really with oversized vehicles, if we are prohibiting oversized vehicles with the particular measurement of that vehicle.
- Perhaps you haven't really gotten into these details, which is completely fine but do you have a perspective.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- In the draft parking ordinance that I've been working on actively, what I have done is to define recreational vehicle.
- What recreational vehicle means is a motor home, travel trailer, truck camper, camping trailer or other vehicle or trailer with or without mode of power, designated or altered for human habitation, recreational use, not found in section 18080. Section 18013-14, and it goes on to state the different sections.
- It's a non-recreational vehicle, but it encompasses all vehicles that are for the purpose of habitation.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- You mentioned a towing charge. Did you say \$2,000, and is there a storage charge as well?
- Because you have an obligation to preserve people's belongings, can you explain that situation if a tow is necessary?

Chie Kilgore commented as follows:

- When the Police Department tows vehicles, there are different sections of the vehicle code they can be towed under.
- When we tow a vehicle for a parking violation or something to that effect, we may put a police hold on it but it's not necessary for us to put a police hold on it.
- If we're storing it, we're responsible for those stored things.
- If we're not storing it and it's simply a tow because it's a vehicle violation, those fees are delegated to the vehicle owner who then has to take care of those in order to get their vehicle out.
- If they fail to do so, the tow company then basically the ownership of that vehicle for abandonment and then they would typically auction that vehicle off.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Rick Geggie commented as follows:

- I am so touched by the concern that everyone has about this issue, and I wonder if you could raise your hand and wave at me or something if you remember what a delightful walk it used to be down Morris Street.
- I'm quite happy to think that I'm going to be able to have that delightful walk, because now I can't.
- I can't do it easily because I'm walking past human suffering and it hurts.
- That's one of the benefits of Morris Street is it's reminding us about human suffering, which we tend not to want to look at.
- It reminds us of the need to look out for one another.
- I've said before that Sebastopol is a kind City, and it's not just me, me, me, gimme, gimme, gimme. It's a very generous City.
- I have some suggestions that may be useful and may not be.
- I think that there's merit in thinking about tiny, mini, RV temporary permitted parking areas on the outskirts of the City
- Are there any property owners in Sebastopol, particularly industrial property owners, who would be willing to take two, three, four vehicles for a limited period of time, say three nights.
- I think those options were really well laid out.
- I think there is a chance for the City to make some money by having, as in many cities where you buy a permit to park your car and there are many, many workers in the Sebastopol area that would be profoundly affected by a three-hour limit on their parking.
- I just want to commend everybody for working so hard and doing such a good job.

Suzanne Lande commented as follows:

- As most of you know, I'm one of the volunteers who is on Morris Street really a lot.
- I've been working on gangbusters to get things like registration and insurance and whatever information to Jennifer lake. I've been collaborating with her.
- I'm out there most days.
- I have no objection at all to clearing Morris Street. I think it needs to happen.

- On the RV village, it's very good. But that, from what I've heard, is only going to house, I think, a maximum of 35 people.
- I think most of you have no idea how many homeless people we now have overflowed into vehicles on Morris Street, trailers or buses or whatever.
- The people who were swept, who are within the City limits are homeless in Sebastopol.
- There are other homeless in Sebastopol people who are now staying in some of the trailers because it's very cold out there at night and in the day, too.
- But the proposals, when I heard them, I have great objection to some of it.
- Don't we currently have something where it's 72 hours community -- if they parked in my neighborhood for 72 hours, I could call the Sebastopol police and ask them to help them move, but the 72 hours seemed doable to me for people.
- It would be hard, they have to move their vehicles a lot, but it would be possible.
- Commercial and industrial areas not during the day but could be there 10:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M.
- Allowed day after day, can you imagine? I mean, you want to sleep some but you can't sleep certain hours and then have to move your vehicle every day.
- Mainly the number of homeless in Sebastopol, you all in this meeting have no idea how many.
- I'm trying to get names of people who are homeless in the trailers who wouldn't move to the village, but that's a slow process.
- I just want to say thank you for listening to me.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- I just want to be clear. All of the options that were presented tonight are all laws against poverty.
- They're cruel, they're unusual, and they are very suspiciously trying to skirt the eighth amendment in its regards to homelessness.
- We have a municipal code that can be enforced.
- Already speaking of insurance, vehicle registration but also our own municipal code
- No person who has custody or control of any such vehicle shall park such vehicle in the street or alley for more than a consecutive 72 hours. This is a municipal code that could be enforced. I don't know why it's not.
- I suspect we have some issues regarding COVID and some lack of enforcement of that during COVID pandemic, but if that's something we have to address, then that's something we can address, but the reality is that any sort of sweeping large-scale change to our municipal code that restricts parking is a law against poverty.
- I'm just not for it, and I don't believe many in our community are.
- Please don't do what you did months ago in the middle of the night, changing the parking regulations on Morris Street already once to be three-hour parking, just recognize that we have already enforceable municipal codes and hold our police accountable to enforce those regulations that we currently have as laws.

Lindsay commented as follows:

- I'm not sure if the gentleman who just spoke was for parking on Morris Street or not.
- I'm more for parking on Morris Street because they're there now.
- I'm concerned that all this time and all these people are trying to help register these vehicles and it sounds like compliance is not happening. It sounds like it's a little out of control, very out of control.
- Some people might be registering their vehicles, doing what I have to do, what I have to pay for, what I'm held accountable to. And other people don't have to do that. They know they're not going to be held accountable to it.

- I am concerned about the time frame.
- I just heard about moving over to that RV park in February when it's so undeveloped that site.
- It is only \$80,000 that the City is putting towards it.
- I see a lot of people here who are for the RV park and clearing Morris Street, but I don't see a lot of people who are representatives of Sebastopol or have the means to be here like I am, retired.
- I know my neighbors who have young children are against that. I know people who are younger who are family people who are concerned about safety of their children are definitely not for having people over there at the RV park. They're very concerned about it.
- I'm concerned because everybody thinks these people on Morris Street are going to agree to a contract of behavior.
- But as a nurse, I can tell you that behavior can change in a second, and there is going to be a lot of problems if somebody has a substance abuse problem and blows out.
- I don't see anybody addressing in a real way the substance abuse with medically assisted treatment, with the addictions.
- I don't see that the sanitation is going to be any better there than over on Morris Street.
- I don't see so many things being addressed.
- There is not enough money to sustain that RV park.
- If somebody is going to watch it overnight, literally, I would have patients who are detoxing or going through withdrawal, and we had cameras on them and there is no way of controlling them.
- It is a sickness. I'm concerned about the substance abusers.
- I saw that Cynthia who lived in an RV right up the street from me. I saw her right before she died after she got shot by a neighbor because there was drug dealing. I saw the drug dealing with my own eyes.
- I understand the frustration and the people going in and out.
- I have seen the same drug dealers on Morris Street that brought her the drugs.
- I don't have a lot of confidence in what this City Council is trying to do.
- I think they're rushing it. February is ridiculous.

Arthur George commented as follows:

- Responding to the Chief's report under the Council's directive to clear Morris Street and related parking areas.
- We respect and achievement the effort of City staff.
- However, the options presented may be overbroad rather than a narrowly tailored response to the problem.
- Hybrid approaches under option four are better conceived.
- To review each of these options, option one, no street parking of oversized vehicles in neighborhoods at any time, this would prevent even residents from parking their own RVs on their own street and prevent visiting from relatives for parking for any duration.
- The existing 72-hour rule that we all know about would be sufficient to get anyone to move on.
- Unhoused persons, visiting relatives where the resident who never moves his own vehicle in the neighborhood.
- Option two, no parking of oversized vehicles between 6:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M. This would deny access to large commercial delivery trucks that are parked and larger vehicles serving cultural, commercial and recreational purposes would be prohibited.
- This might include band, busses and equipment trailers, the cultural center, the center for the arts, bicycle vans, trailers and trucks related to bicycle tourism or live-in vans united stated by film makers as part of this documentary film festival.



- Option three, time daylight parking. If this is implemented, for example, a three-hour may flush the street but prevent other employees from completing their shifts without having to run out and move their vehicles. This is already the case on the West side of Morris and applies equally.
- The additional expenses and personnel costs for implementing a parking regulation system.
- Thus, we return to option four, some hybrid and therein are better choices.
- These might be 8 to 10-hour parking on the East side of Morris for employees' convenience.
- Strict endorsement of the 72-hour rule anywhere in the City.
- Overnight parking would be allowed.
- In commercial and industrial areas, an exception for parking of commercial vehicles and delivery vehicles stated on signage.
- No additional or administrative procedure costs.
- Finally, because we address vehicle parking of the unhoused, the City for everyone's health and welfare must acknowledge and address sanitation issues presented by this population even as they move into rotating randomized locations.

Rei commented as follows:

- Accolades to everyone on the City Council and to our City staff for addressing the questions in our humanitarian issues here in the City of Sebastopol.
- If and whatever derives out of this item is how will they look to the County of Sonoma to support and further expand on what is implemented in Sebastopol whether a City-wide ordinance
- Expanding on what Kyle mentioned if there is already something within the City municipality code if people just move out to the City outskirts just on the outer lying City limits and park for days on end, how will the City be supported by the County
- How will the City reach out to private property owners such as a parking lot in the downtown center and private property? Such vehicles might just park there and stay there. What outreach will be done for private property owners?
- Personally I had received in the mail a mailer from Mark Levine pointing out that in the state assembly, the pledge they had cast for homelessness, a pledge of \$1.1 billion to clean streets and public spaces impacted by encampments.
- I want to point that out and hope that the City will do research on how the state can support our City and cleaning up Morris Street.
- Biggest concern for me is just the human sanitation issues that arise from any encampment.
- I have personally witnessed somebody urinating downtown, and it was a hard hit of reality that it was happening in our town and somebody else watched somebody defecate along a street.
- So it is a real reality and thank you to everyone for what you are doing to address the issue.

Zach commented as follows:

- I would like to echo one of the things that was brought up by Kyle and a couple others
- I just want to question a little bit about the sentiment behind the project and the underlying motivations.
- Getting a little sense this evening that there is a little bit of a kind of disguised as a well-meaning offer to RV residents to move to the safe parking site.
- I have been in touch with a couple RV residents who echoed what others brought up this evening, that the population largely does not want to be disrupted and forced to move their vehicles, many of which would have to be towed to safe parking site.
- I have also heard the statement repeated several times that we as a community are not kicking the can up the road, but I would argue that this is potentially the case here.

- Again, rather than meeting people where they're at, we're forcing people to move just on the perimeter of the City limits where despite new parking regulations for the City, those living one block over will not apply under the same parking regulations.
- I would echo what Rei asked and like to know what there is a plan when all the RVs line up just outside the City limits in the unincorporated areas.
- Just one other item in terms of budget. I would just consider the cost of street parking as a part of this.
- From what I have understood, those can play a significant part of the budget in making a wholistic plan for street parking regulations.

Jill commented as follows:

- I just wanted to say thank you to all of you for considering and looking into the RV parking permits.
- As you know, I am very supportive of this. I applaud you for the suggestions.
- One thing I wanted to add, I have done a lot of research and looking at all the different cities and their permit for parking process.
- One thing I didn't see is that many cities have an actual parking permit for residents.
- They merely need to provide proof of residency with their utility bills, which we're all accustomed to doing.
- Most cities have a range of time that that permit is in effect, anywhere from seven days up to a year.
- So there is that additional option. It would not limit residents. So I hope that we can consider that.
- Another thing I just wanted to say that I'm glad to hear that effective policing will happen on Morris Street as someone who spends every day in that area, I welcome that.
- For those people who do not live there every day and witness what happens, it's frightening at times.
- The other thing is that the 72-hour parking ordinance that people brought up, I'm not certain if anyone realizes that the only requirement for the vehicle owner is to roll the tires.
- That means that someone sitting on my street could roll their tire every day and live on my street for the next infinity just by moving their tires.
- I know that for a fact because I spoke with a Sebastopol police officer last week and the week before regarding an RV that is on our street. So he told me that he couldn't do anything and that I needed to contact City Council. So here I am.
- The 72-hour ordinance does not work.
- Thank you for looking into this, and I hope that you will, you know, consider having a permanent RV parking permit in place so that the residents here can live in peace.

Oliver commented as follows:

- I submitted a pretty long document to the public comments with a bunch of details about parking permits.
- I just wanted to add to what people are saying about Sonoma County or rather Sebastopol because I applaud the efforts to try and get things organized there within the \$10 million budget of the City itself.
- I think my focus is more on the County and as I think Rei said earlier the money the state will be spending on this.
- We need a County-wide approach so that people arriving in RVs have somewhere to go which is credible with sanitation and so on.
- The County has incredible amounts of land and infrastructure they're not using.
- The Glen Ellen mental hospital, the Kaiser Campus, which you just found out they sold to somebody not having due any due diligence.
- I applaud what's going on.

- I'm pretty skeptical what can be done with the California law at the moment in terms of moving people on that are causing trouble on the streets and so on.
- Far more importantly I urge anybody who is listening to this to pressure Linda Hopkins and the Board of Supervisors in Sonoma County to provide scale and credible resources for homeless people which aren't just band-aid solutions of village RV parking areas for six months run by nonprofits and so on and so forth.
- It is just not good enough in the current climate we live in.
- When you look at the money the bank spends across California, it is bizarre that we're wasting a bunch of time in a Council meeting in Sebastopol, a \$10 million budget on this tiny little corner of the County when the County has spent \$92 million in the last two years on the homeless and nothing is happening.
- So I'm kind of with the Council on this, but I want to say very strongly in 2022, I think it is all about really chasing down the County and getting results from them and also from the state as well.

Robert commented as follows:

- I have lived in Sebastopol my entire 47 years. My family has been here for a long time.
- I understand the idea of trying to help out people who are in need.
- I think that's a great idea. I don't think that the City Council is right group of people to do it.
- I don't think the people who we have chosen are really the right group of people to do it either.
- This is a much larger problem. I wonder why it is that the City is trying to tackle it.
- It kind of makes me worry that with the horror stories we hear about people defecating or the fighting or the drugs that without a long, long thought-out thoroughly documented and understood plan we would want to risk either putting people who are unstable or we are not too sure about into one place near a school or why we would want to do something that would cause people to maybe disperse into other areas of the City.
- There is obviously economic and social impacts on children, on people, on schools, on homeowner ship, on the cost of living.
- It seems like you are putting the cart before the horse.
- It doesn't seem thought out very well

Linda Berg commented as follows:

- It occurs to me that there used to be not too long ago a commune like that area off of Green Valley Road that accommodated people who lived there and some in RVs and kind of maybe have unconventional helping.
- I think this is similar. Although, I don't know that you would call it a commune right there.
- But also thinking along these lines, and there used to be in the '70s an acreage that was developed for people, students, students at Sonoma State. They were living in their RVs. They made it their own community there with their RVs and all different stuff. They ended up having hookups. They had community showers. They had a community building and their vehicles were parked on a lot.
- It was hugely successful and lasted for years and years and years.
- It seems like that might be an idea because we have a lot of open space here that could be developed to accommodate people in their RVs and so forth.
- I hope some of you will remember that and think about that.
- There was a thing about so many times I mentioned before about Lyme and tick infestation at Laguna.
- The City is putting itself at risk for liability for failing to post signs that are already made and developed by the State of California, the yellow signs.
- They really need to be posted at every trail head because in continued talks with people and I continue to find more people with lime disease.
- When they get lime in their brain, they cannot follow directions.

- An infection in your brain is not a good thing or in your joints or anything else.
- So it needs to be put up. It is pretty cheap. It is not an extensive project. It is just a matter of will.

Mayor Slayter called for a break at 7:53 pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:04 pm.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment.

- A lot of the comments and questions were related to the proposed RV village, and that is not the item that is before us. It is related, but it is not this agenda item.
- This agenda item is possible changes to parking regulations within the City limit.
- I have a question about state money and curious if staff knows anything about the crystal ball gazing that is the state budget and whether or not funds for cleaning a public spaces and streets is something that we are looking towards.

City Manager McLaughlin commented we're always looking for that, but we don't know anything specifically at this minute to assist in the things we're talking about.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I keep a close eye on the newsletter from the League of Cities and other advocacy groups, and I'm sure if and when that's announced, that will be the lead story of the day.
- Commented on parking regulations just outside the City limit.
- One of our members of the public who spoke I believe was speaking directly about Belmont Terrace, which is not within the City, but there may only be a dozen people who know that because it is so close and so intertwined with the City. We're not the County of Sonoma.
- I don't expect our City staff to be able to know and speak on the County's parking regulations.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- I can report that we met with the County Administrator the other day, and the County is interested enacting uniform camping, which is related, regulations throughout the County that would deal with areas where persons can stay overnight in their RVs and so forth.
- But that's in the future. Right now I don't know.
- I think the by and large it is the California vehicle code.
- We obviously do not have any enforcement hours beyond our City borders.
- We have asked our attorneys about the possibility of utilizing County property for an out of City boundary RV village if an opportunity presented. The law is kind of unsettled in that area as to whether it would comply with Boise decisions, et cetera.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The other question that I have noted that was brought up by a few folks was the 72-hour rule.
- In parking on this item and getting ready for the meeting, like probably everybody, I looked at an awful lot of parking regulations around the State. Big cities, small cities, tiny cities like, Point Arena.
- The 72-hour rule seems to be discussed with varying levels of understanding maybe of the actual law in these parking regulations.
- Some state that a quarter of an inch is moving and others kind of state that moving means like to the next block.
- Asked the Chief, can you educate everybody here about what the state law actually is on the 72-hour rule?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- There is no consistency on the law. It is within a municipal code, and the City Councils in their respective City can set that guideline as to how far someone must prove. Our municipal code that is not present.
- So if someone is marked for 72 hours, they can simply move their vehicle six inches to a foot, and that's sufficient enough.
- The other issue is that vehicles are not parked for 72-hour violations until we receive a complaint about them. Then we go out. We mark the vehicle and the 72 hours begins at the time of marking.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- In addition to that was that we have looked in the past years at a number of other City examples of 72-hour laws when written by individual cities, and as the Chief said, they are all over the place.
- Some actually say move to a different street. Others have requirements of moving a certain amount of footage, et cetera.
- As the Chief says, we have none of that here, but there are, you know, a lot of different possibilities of enacting your own 72-hour law and saying what you want from it.
- But as the Chief also mentioned, we have no way of knowing what that vehicle was doing prior to the complaint. Therefore, it could have been there for three weeks.
- 72 hour begins when the police are notified of it. You go out and mark the tire.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I think my colleagues have probably heard about this too often, but I want to respond to Linda's assertion about the village that was across from Sonoma State.
- It was called Sonoma Grove. My friends were people that helped found Sonoma Grove.
- It was in response to a squat, which was basically very similar to what's going on, on Morris Street now.
- There was a squat across the street from Sonoma State in the '70s. Mostly Vietnam vets living in their vehicles.
- People got together, created a safe parking village. I think they have approximately 60 or maybe 80 spaces in the village. It had a community building. It had a community garden. It has a play space for kids. It had a laundromat, showers, bathrooms and a community space.
- They also have a self-governing board of people that lived there.
- I have been advocating for that. That's what we need.
- We need like, you know, 40 or 50 of those scattered throughout Sonoma County.
- I have been talking about this specifically with the CoC. A number of times as well as other people that are engaged in what we can do about homeless in this County because it seems to me that's what we really need, and that's kind of what we're starting out with the RV village that we're looking at.
- This is kind of something along those lines. But it needs to be bigger.
- We need to have them all over the place, and they need to be well funded.
- We're not going to get that unless it's from the state.

City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'd like to respond if I could to really the big question as I see it here, which is why.
- Why can't we just clear Morris Street? Why can't we just set up the RV village?
- Why do we have to enact and concern ourselves with the parking situations in neighborhoods and the businesses?
- We have a lot of interests going on here.

- We are a small town, and what we have at the moment is an opportunity to provide a safe and respectful location for 20 to 22 RVs, which is more than a lot of jurisdictions are doing.
- But we have to do that in a way that recognizes a lot of different needs.
- So Morris Street, the businesses there. You have heard people want to be able to walk.
- I think Rick himself said he wants to be able to walk on Morris Street.
- We have people interested in having Morris Street available to the public.
- We have people who don't want the RVs to be moving into their neighborhoods.
- We have advocates who want consideration for the unhoused.
- We have the unhoused themselves, those in RVs who just want a safe and respectful place to be.
- We have to meet all of these needs, and it is not a perfect solution.
- But in order to do the RV village and return Morris Street to the use of the public, we have got to be realistic about what that means for our neighborhoods and for our remaining commercial and industrial districts.
- There is a real concern. Those RVs, they're probably 35 right now. That RV village will not accommodate them.
- So let's be real. Where will they go? They have to go somewhere.
- In order to protect our neighborhood, we have to figure out an approach that will meet all of these various needs
- So that's the balance. It's not perfect.
- But if we can succeed and we can convey to the world and to every interest here that we have set up a safe and respectful RV village, which by the way, is fully funded in Sebastopol and that it's met everyone's needs, we have a pilot project that can be a template for others.
- So that's the answer to why in a nutshell. Why do we have to do this?
- Our Chief has proposed parking changes that he tells us need to happen, 72-hour rule he's told us is not going to work.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm hoping the committee for the unhoused will have more answers because you, Councilmember Rich and Councilmember Glass have been working on this so deeply and intensely for the last several months, particularly in the last weeks, I'm wondering how you respond to the options one, two, three and four.
- Do you have any particular recommendations that you see doing that balancing of all different constituents to whom we are responsible?

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I think it is important to hear what the subcommittee has to say, but I also think it's important that we have all read the agenda and attended all these meetings, so I thought it might be time to weigh in on some thoughts and obviously we have to figure out how to move forward.
- I feel like Morris Street has had parkers as long as I have been elected, so that's five years
- have been driving down there every morning to go to the gym and last count I saw just in that little section 24 RVs.
- I agree with Councilmember Glass. I think it's a little bit of the carrot and stick here.
- I heard the City manager and the Chief say that they're hopeful that by doing parking regulations altogether that it might merge, but I don't want to count on hope.
- I think that we just passed the RV village, you really need to lead with a plan for Morris Street on an emergency basis and lead through the rest of the parking regs.
- I have always heard there is this fear of RVs in our neighborhoods.

- Frankly, on a nightly basis, if somebody needs a place to sleep, I would be fine with an RV park in front of my house.
- I like the idea of safe night parking for RVs, so I think that was the proposal, too, and I'm just going to state it.
- I think we all have to share the lead because in the five years I have been elected the homeless issue has just gotten worse. It's not getting better. It is getting worse. Add a couple fires and COVID, and it is getting worse.
- I'm also really interested in when we consider the 30 day posted more serious regulations that we might recommend for those City wide, possibly a simple permit system that could be administered out of City Hall by the same staff that you used to be able to pay your water bill in person to and you get a business license from and they could verify that you're a resident.
- I'm not interested in those necessarily being up to a year, but for our residents, I think that seems fair if my kids are coming from out of state to stay and they want to park in front of the house, I should be able to go down to City Hall and get a simple permit.
- It wouldn't take too much. I think those would be not that widespread.
- You just have to prove as somebody suggested earlier your water bill or something so it could be both for a homeowner and a renter that lives in our City and participates.
- Those are my thoughts out of the gate.
- We're trying to figure it out. I don't think we can sit here today and go, boom, let's do that. I think that we need to roll it out a little bit in phases.
- What I would hate to see is we encourage and do all this parking, the RV village, and then there is a window of a month and Morris Street just fills up again and we're sitting in the same boat, and I don't want to see that happen.
- So it is really important for me to make sure that it doesn't.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- The ad hoc committee consists of Councilmember Una Glass and me.
- Given the nature of the staff report and our not involved participation in the production of the staff report, what I am going to propose here, I have to say, is my interpretation of the staff report and then I would suggest we turn to Councilmember Glass.
- I want you to understand that this is not necessarily what I'm about to describe a proposal that comes from the ad hoc committee because although we have been working closely and my instinct is that this is going to be supported by Councilmember Glass, she and I have not yet talked about it.
- With that introduction, looking at the Police Chief's proposal, my thought is to lay out the following suggestion which then hopefully will be a touch point for the Council to come to some sort of agreement and also for the Police Chief to give us a sense of whether this would even be working, some parameters.
- So in residential areas, our Police Chief has suggested that there be no oversized vehicles.
- We also had heard from many people including just now from Vice Mayor Hinton is question about permits. We heard that from the public.
- My question to the Police Chief, assuming the Councilmembers would support it is whether, if we gave him direction, to come back with an ordinance that would state that permits be allowed for the short term needs of residents, specifically for residents own RV or for a resident's visitor.
- We have heard some suggestions on how that residency might be established, that it be for seven days or fewer and that the number of times that a resident could get that permit in a given period of time, a year, be limited in some way and that the total annual number of permits allowed be limited to what the department can bear, the Police Department can bear, without involving large budget items that would shift police resources away from other community needs.



- Just in the residential piece, what I'm trying to do is lay out some direction for the Police Chief as an example to even ask him within those broad parameters and it involves the City manager, too, within the broad parameters of what our City manager and our Police Chief have described to us, if we gave that direction to the Police Chief, would that be acceptable?
- Would that be doable within the time frame that he has available? Setting aside for the moment whether the Council supports that?
- Could we ask as a test case whether our Police Chief and our City manager feel those directions would even be manageable? Because if they're too specific, we need to reassess.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- The short answer would be from the police perspective it is not feasible. We do not have the staffing for that.
- We do not have the budget for it and we do not have the capability of working within those parameters at this time.
- Now, should staffing be increased that deals specifically with this permit issue, it's reasonable. I just don't know what the idea is for that.

Councilmember Rich questioned are you saying that permitting of any kind is just not feasible for the Police Department?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- That's correct. We have a very, very minimal permitting right now that is and has been established for a long period of time near West County High School on only I believe a couple of streets right there that only have a dozen or so residences.
- But it is not feasible for our department to take on that workload for the entire City without additional staff

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- I'd like to weigh in on the permit issue.
- There are permit programs, and then there are other permit programs.
- I think a simplified permit program, and I'm not disagreeing with the Chief here, nor am I volunteering City Hall, I might add.
- I think a simplified permit system that's extremely easy to administer, such as any resident who owns an RV can come down and pick up a 48-hour or a five day or whatever it is permit to wash and unload their RV and sample, almost taking it off the top of a stack of permits to do that.
- I think we ought to be able to somehow administer that without additional staff.
- I have told the Chief that I support additional staffing for the Police Department.
- I just don't want to have to hire somebody whose job it is to issue permits.
- I want to hire somebody who is out as an officer doing additional traffic enforcement or along those lines.
- I don't want to spend the Police Department budget on somebody whose job it is, full-time job it is to issue permits. So in that sense, I completely agree with the Chief.
- The Chief and I, however, talked about that earlier this afternoon.
- Some of the draft provisions he's talking about in the ordinances he's looking at proposing would get away from a permit system but try and achieve the same result by, for example, allowing residents who own RVs 48 hours so unload and wash their vehicles and so forth. No permit required.
- My only comment on that was it would be a complaint-driven enforcement.
- I don't know whether that's good or bad.

- It is certainly good from a perspective of not having to hire additional staff.
- I'm not sure if it's enforceable.
- We've had problems that I have observed in town of RV parking by I'll just say homeowners who don't want to pay to store their RVs there, and they would be very happy if they could park them in small areas 365 days a year.
- I agree with the Chief. We don't want to have to augment police staff for the purpose of issuing permits.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- To echo what the City manager stated in the draft proposal that I have, one of the sections that I have listed for exceptions is recreational vehicles parked or left standing on any street in the City zoned residential so as to allow the performance of a homeowner, tenant or out of town visitor to load or unload the vehicle for a period not to exceed 48 hours.
- That would be one of the exceptions within the prohibited RV parking in residential areas.
- That would not need a permit.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- So that would be, as you just stated, outside a permit process.
- Then it would also be complaint driven.
- Certainly not something that we would be asking sworn peace officers to be out patrolling for.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- As we think about the direction that we're going to give to staff, I think we now know the breadth of what could be handled without additional personnel costs, which is basically modifications in the ordinance.
- We should ask whether there is a way to address the other requests that we've heard from the public, which is allowing an RV visiting a resident to be parked on the street for some limited period of time.
- Is there a way other than a permit that that could be addressed?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Without a permit system in place, it will be unable to be enforced.
- It would also be unable to be addressed as well.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Wrapping up the residential discussion, I, as the City Council, I think we see what our options are without additional staff costs involved.
- If we're going to direct the ordinance come back, we probably want to look at asking for an ordinance on the residential side that would not include a permitting option and then perhaps to the extent there is the will on this Council to do it, we ask for a permitting option that would allow the resident to have an RV located on the street for some short-term period of time and that the Chief and staff, our City manager, provide us with a cost estimate of how much would be involved in order to have staff to do that.
- That's my idea on the residential side.
- My proposal is that we determine as a City Council whether it's important to allow our constituents to have RVs parked on the street who are visiting them to the extent we feel that's important, then we have to understand that there will be costs associated.
- I think our Police Chief has said can do 48 hours.
- It would be no oversized vehicles in neighborhoods, except there would be a 48 order allowance in the neighborhood that would be self-imposed, self-monitoring for cleaning and unloading RVs, but otherwise you get no RVs in the residential areas, even if they are visiting a resident.

- That's one option.
- To the extent we want to allow our neighbors, want to support our residents having visitors with an RV parked down the street, then there is going to be costs associated.
- As we give direction to our staff, if we want to have both options, we got to say give us the two options recognizing there is going to be a cost or just give us the ordinance, which is simple and direct and we can probably get in time.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I know that this is not applicable to all of our residences within the City, but I want to point out that there is nothing that says that if someone has a visitor that they can't park that RV in their driveway and they can clear out their regular size vehicles and put those on the street.
- This would allow for an RV to be parked in a driveway with the RV parking restriction
- Many times it is convenient for people to load and unload in an RV in front of their house rather than the driveway.
- Should they have someone who has extended their stay and is staying in an RV that's visiting, they could clean out their driveway and have that option available to them.
- The other thing I would like to point out, too, is that on the permitting request, I will work diligently on it.
- I just cannot tell you that I would have an ordinance ready for the January 18th City Council meeting.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- To indicate the needle we're trying to thread here, I really like your suggestion, Chief, about passenger vehicles moving to the street to allow an RV.
- However, there are an awful lot of properties around here that that is not feasible; people without a driveway or people with a super narrow driveway with retaining walls on each side.
- There is lots going on there. So that's the needle we're threading. You know that. I think all of us on the Council understands it as well.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- So the situation that I'm aware of in this time of housing crisis with our prices being so high as they are, there is a situation with the next generation wanting housing that the parents can't build an ADU because that's impossibly expensive and they're allowing our next generation, possibly even with grandchildren to live across the sidewalk in an RV.
- I mentioned this earlier at a meeting. That to me is a really important opportunity for a family to be together and provide housing for people that just can't afford it because of our circumstances.
- The difficulty our City presents isn't just in addition to narrow driveways.
- We also have a lot of areas that aren't particularly level. For instance, you might have a driveway that goes downhill, but the sidewalk and the street is level so the RV can park there and it can't necessarily park and be accommodated in the driveway.
- That doesn't work in a lot of neighborhoods.
- So I'm particularly concerned about the family member for whom there isn't an extra bedroom in the house or a private enough space for a family or public to live in and are now with an orange cord across the sidewalk and living there.
- Part of the housing emergency that we have to deal with, it is not just the unhoused. It is the people, our next generation or young people who are just getting squeezed out because of the affordability factor.
- For me, a permit for a family member makes more sense. I think that's an important component.
- 48 hours to clean your vehicle. That kind of permitting just isn't liberal enough in my mind to allow for the circumstances that people have to deal with.

- I'm more comfortable with a demand for this. Not that it would necessarily go to the Police Department because I'm with our City manager. I would rather see our police budget go to enforcement than administrative work.
- I'm wondering if this is a program that could be simple and direct that a trained volunteer could manage it four hours a day.
- I think we have to look for options here that are inclusive or more people getting more housing and it could mean RVs on the residential streets, particularly for family members.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- In response to Councilmember Gurney's comments, I would like to also note that in the draft municipal ordinance that I have been working on, there is prohibited activities, one of which is running electrical cords, extension cords, hoses, cables or other items on the parkway or sidewalk from any property to a recreational vehicle parked on a public street at any time.
- There is significant liability when those things occur. That is one of the prohibited activities.
- There also has been discussion regarding the running of generators during the nighttime hours that may violate the noise ordinance as well, which is specifically why we have looked at the commercial industrial areas for the overnight nighttime parking rather than the residential areas.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I feel like it's sort of a wake-up call and a reality check for something in response to some things that the public said.
- I found myself actually agreeing with somebody that I often going, oh, gosh, I can't believe he's saying that again.
- That's that actually these are rules against poverty.
- We have been corralled as public policymakers into making these kinds of decisions because of the overall environment we live in.
- We're talking about making rules to control our environment as privileged people because we have enough privilege that we can control our environment and say we don't want a bunch of people that are homeless living on our street because that's not very pleasant.
- That's because we have enough privilege that we can control our environment. The people living in those vehicles don't.
- As a decision maker, I have found this entire issue so excruciating I just cannot begin to say.
- It has been so hard to figure out what's the right thing to do because the other thing I think that these are rules against poverty.
- But the other thing that I feel a responsibility for is figuring out rules that accommodate our City residents and basically keep the peace.
- We can't let the situation get to the point where we have a lot of residents who are angry, who are up in arms, and heaven knows it was terrible that that homeless woman that got shot on Valentine.
- We have to do something to regulate our environment.
- To my mind what we need to do it at, we need to do it in the minimal way possible because this is regulating our environment at the expense of people that don't have very many options.
- I just want us to consider that because I lived in this house for 33 years.
- Part of what I like is that people kind of let you do what you want. We're sort of this laissez faire kind of place.
- I don't want to live where everybody is controlling how green that your lawn as to be or something.
- I like living here because we're kind of a quirky community.

- I always care about these people that don't have anywhere to live. Many of whom do have jobs and do have full-time jobs.
- As we consider this, let's think about the minimum amount of regulation possible and where we're not over regulating in a way that I don't really care about the trailers and the RVs around my neighborhood.
- It is like Vice Mayor Hinton said. She wouldn't mind having someone parked in front of her house once or twice a month or something. I feel the same way.
- I have talked to the people on Morris Street. I don't find them scary.
- We also can't allow a situation to get to the point where our residents are getting very aggravated about the situation.
- How do we do the minimum amount?
- I'm tending to feel that the notion of allowing some kind of not the oversized vehicle, but allowing some sort of permit so that families when somebody does come to visit, they can visit.
- But the other thing I also want us to be mindful of is that not everybody lives in a house like all of us do.
- We have lots of apartment buildings. We have lots of facilities where it's not as simple if somebody comes and visit somebody who lives in an apartment building.
- What does that kind of permitting look like?
- Those are the things I want to throw out there that I just want to remind us of all that
- Part of why we like living here is because we're not the kind of community that is exclusionary and we are the kind of community that tries to be, as Rick has told us, kind.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I agree with what Councilmember Glass just said.
- I also think about the logistics and the practicality of any permitting system.
- Could you imagine the education that's going to be required to enact any kind of a permitting process?
- The amount of staff time that's going to be needed to educate our residents that have a situation of a brother and his wife and family coming and they're bringing their RV and they're going to park in front of my house
- Most people don't, that some special process needs to be done. A great majority of residents don't own RVs.
- It just needs to be as simple as it possibly can.
- To the point of what Councilmember Glass just said.
- It needs to be responsive to the concerns of our residents, but it also needs to be something that is practicable and enforceable without a whole bunch of red tape.
- People already think the government is too intrusive.
- Residential parking permits seems like a bridge too far for me.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- We haven't even gotten to the commercial industrial, but on the residential issue, I haven't heard what our City Manager and our Police Chief.
- We know that our Police Chief is in the midst of trying to draft an ordinance.
- I'm wondering if we could simply wrap it up by just directing him to provide an ordinance on residential parking that is simple to enforce, that allows permitting to the extent that he thinks it will be simple to enforce and that gives at least some short-term opportunity for people in town to have visitors in RVs in front of their houses.
- That seems to be the general gist of what I'm hearing here.
- Can we wrap that up and let's realize that it is just a first reading, that we want to get that done and that, then, we can assess what he's actually written up for us and move on from there?

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I still don't understand why these permits, if we're going to issue them couldn't be issued at City Hall.
- I'm not interested in funding an additional person at the Police Department to issue permits.
- I'm not interested in pulling an active police officer off the street.
- I feel like we're all hearing a lot of comments and I'm not sure we're sending any clear direction to the Chief.
- Councilmember Rich just said it sounded like her recommendation is to throw back his recommendation for an actual ordinance. I'm not sure if we all agree on that. I'm interested in hearing from others.
- Councilmember Glass, while she kind of agreed with me, while an RV is okay up front, she also said but we don't want everybody upset.
- So I'm unclear about what the Council's direction is, so I would feel a lot more comfortable figuring that out.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- What I'm hearing is that there is marginal support for permitting.
- I could see a permitting process being something but would need public education.
- How would someone know this is something that would need to be done.
- You just go to the City Website. You enter your information of whatever the information is, vehicle registration, license number, ownership, whatever. You hit print. It's entirely automated.
- But what does that solve? I don't know that that solves anything.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Not to throw a wrench into the simplicity that everybody has impressed, but as it has been pointed out by many Councilmembers during this meeting, not all of our residential streets are alike.
- Many of them are very narrow.
- So the residential permit process is not as simple as coming in and showing a water bill.
- It is a street that needs to be inspected as to whether or not a vehicle could park there that would not impede public safety.
- If it does impede public safety to the use of a fire truck or police vehicle, that would not be something that would be granted.
- It is going to take staff to do that and actually physically go out and look at roadways and make a determination whether they do that ahead of time and have a list as to what could be allowed or not.
- It is not just a simple process as described.
- That's why I have taken the very broad view of eliminating the need for permits so that we are not incurring additional cost for staff and we're addressing the needs of all of our community.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I'm actually really interested in that phrase impede public safety because what if we rather than having to have a permit we added something into an ordinance that says we do not allow oversized vehicles where they will impede public safety?
- I'm not saying that that might not be the entire ordinance, but that might be something so if it would be complaint-driven, if somebody feels that there is a vehicle on their street impeding public safety, then -- then it would be our Police Department's job To go out there or our traffic control to say there is something impeding public safety.
- I think for the most part people are not going to complain unless it really is a problem.

- There is a big vehicle sitting in the middle of the street and we're making it a problem for all their neighbors.
- Usually people won't complain unless it's really a problem.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think we're all familiar with streets and neighborhoods in town where people want to use vehicles to slow down traffic.
- That's most frequent complaint I hear is that people speed through the neighborhood.
- So parking cars on both sides and squeezing two way traffic into one lane where you are doing that do see do to get through is what a lot of neighbors actually prefer.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Maybe we need some agreement on at least some of the elements here.
- I certainly would be in favor of a general no oversized vehicles in residential areas rule.
- I would be in favor of some way to allow up to a short-term stay of RVs in residential zones.
- There might be a way to write that into an ordinance.
- I would certainly be in support of a short-term use by a resident for their own RV being parked at the curb.
- I could not be in support of long-term an RV parked with a corn across the sidewalk as an extended bedroom for a residence.
- I just think that's a bad idea for a number of safety, security and let's go back to Morris Street.
- The sidewalk belongs to the public. It is not a front porch for an RV.
- Is there a way to go down the factors and see if we can get any thumbs up or something.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- In regard to Councilmember Glass' comments as far as the areas I think that we should push for responsibility on to our community to complain about vehicles that may be impeding public safety.
- I think that it sets us up for a likely catastrophe.
- There is a famous saying by Gordon Graham that he uses which is predictable is preventable.
- I think that in this situation, in many streets we have here in the community that if we're depending upon our community members to call in a complaint to us about a vehicle that's causing a narrow pathway for vehicles to get through in public safety, they may be reluctant to do so.
- I would hate for a tragedy to occur because we get called to a fire or some type of an emergency and we can't get emergency vehicles to there because of a resident not wanting to call a complaint on a neighbor for a vehicle that's parked on a residential roadway that could be impeding public safety.
- I'd like to reiterate the fact that I have in the draft that I have been working on the 48 hour exception for unloading and loading.
- But a permitting system, I do not believe is feasible for something that can be accomplished in the time frame that's being asked for.

Council Discussion of Items:

Question: No oversized vehicles in residential zones with exceptions (exceptions such as construction trailer, dumpster/debris box, motor boat on trailer)? There was no consensus on this item.

Question: Should there be no oversized vehicles in residential zones without any exceptions, allowing short term stays at residences in residential zones for visitors? Five thumbs up



Question: Should we allow long-term stays where people are basically using RVs as an extended bedroom parked at the curb? 4 Thumbs down

Question: Should there be permitting program in place? There was no consensus on this item.

Councilmember Rich questioned if staff has received enough clear direction and stated what was said is that we are in support of a no oversized vehicles rule in residential zones but we would like to see an option that would allow in a way that doesn't cost money short-term stays for residents and in general with one exception no long-term stays for residents.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- That is exactly what I heard, that the Council is asking for a proposal with exceptions which would allow delivery vehicles of that nature.
- That would also include a possible option for short-term stays for family members of residences in that residential neighborhood that can show that process or that -- provide that address that you voted or that you stated that you wanted to not allow long-term stays for residents or resident family members and that you would like no permit process because all permit processes will be somewhat complex and most likely cost more money and more staffing.
- There would also be the provision for short-term maintenance, washing, loading, unloading.
- There is an option for the 48 hours of loading, unloading, washing.
- Some of this was not stated by all Councilmembers. However, my response to that was is that at all permitting processes will be somewhat complex and will likely cost money and staffing.
- The resident would have to show that they live on that street that would be asking for the permit, whoever it may be, whether it's family, friends or whomever.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I just want to say on the record and say I still am okay with overnight parking in residential neighborhoods as outlined, I think, in the hours that we saw suggested in option two.
- So I just want to state that.
- Even if I'm outnumbered and they're not bringing that back in the ordinance
- To clarify my point I would not be opposed to oversized or cars in residential neighborhoods.

Councilmember Gurney commented as a point of information, we're talking about oversized vehicles only and residential.

Staff stated that is correct.

Councilmember Gurney commented we are not talking about regular sized vehicles like tear drop trailers.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I would like to remind the Council as the definition I stated earlier which would include motor home or other vehicle or trailer with or without mode of power designed or altered for human habitation for recreation.
- That would include tear drop trailers as well.

Mayor Slayter discussed a provision of the width of the roadway and the location of any portion of the vehicle in relation to the center line of the road so that we can maintain clear passageway on our narrow residential streets and allow wider vehicles on wider streets?

Chief Kilgore commented we're getting into the minutia that I am not trained in providing that information; that would take traffic engineering to provide that information and I don't think that that would be appropriate for me in my capacity to provide.

Mayor Slayter commented that comes from my day job where I see easements and setbacks to center line of road in County properties that are kind of all over the place as far as development standards. I thought that might be a way to address the narrow street question in a more comprehensive way that would be complaint driven I suppose.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- This is starting to feel just too much like it is excluding too many people, too many ways.
- I'm starting to feel uncomfortable with this and the protections that we're building for our privileged selves.
- It is getting way too restrictive and protective, I think, of our privilege.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I would just like to note that we already struggle with staffing as it is.
- To ask the Police Department to look at enforcement of vehicles in the residential areas of this City which far outweigh the commercial and industrial area of this City related to the 10:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M. Hours is not something that will be effectively managed or enforced by the Police Department based on the staffing that we have right now.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I just want to remind everyone that what we're looking at here is an overall plan where we have RVs that are currently parked on Morris and will not be taken in to the RV village for a number of reasons.
- The primary one being there just isn't room.
- They are likely to go somewhere.
- What we're experiencing in our residential areas now is not representative of what might happen if we, in fact, do clear Morris Street.
- So just reminding everyone keep an idea, keep a focus on the umbrella plan here and also remember that we will be looking at the draft ordinance from our Police Chief and can then adjust it if we need to.

Councilmember Glass requested Vice Mayor Hinton to restate her comments.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- My point of view right now, and I have, again, talked about a possible phased in.
- I just heard what Councilmember Rich said which we don't know the repercussions of clearing Morris Street but also don't know it is going to be a huge problem.
- But I am not in favor of adopting an ordinance of no street parking of oversized vehicles completely in residential neighborhoods.
- I would like to phase in the ability for them to park anywhere in the City unless we do short-term parking between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M.
- That would include residential neighborhoods.

- Frequently I swim at the high school and I walk by an RV. In the proposal that we're faced with right now, that RV would not be allowed to be parked there. I have never seen them disturb anybody.
- So I'm not in favor of that strict of an ordinance.
- I do find of following Mayor Slayter about little less government.
- I think that people should be able to park and sleep between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M. if they need to in a safe spot in our City on the street where, as the Police Chief has pointed out would not be a problem for the fire trucks.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- If we move forward with something like that, someone would need to be contracted, hired or have a volunteer to go out and assess every single roadway as to what would allow for vehicles to be parked there that would not create a significant issue for public safety vehicles to get through in the middle of the night while people are sleeping and a fire truck is in need to respond and that cannot be done by the Police Department.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Right now we have no parking ordinance.
- There is RVs parked, like I just stated down Ives Park, and no one is analyzing every street to see if it's safe.
- I don't know why we would be adding something if we don't have an ordinance now. I don't really see the need for that.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I think the purpose of this whole process is to create ordinances that will allow us to effectively deal with the situation that we're dealing with and to effectively deal with the future situations that we might have.
- Though it is not meant for us currently or in the past, it is something that we are being asked to look at from a very broad perspective in going forward in the future.
- Just because we have not done it in the past does not mean that we should not assess it for the future and for the safety of this community.
- I think we open ourselves up to a liability if we do not look at this with a very clear lens as to how we can do this effectively.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- We do have the commercial industrial area that we haven't talked about.
- The proposal is to allow oversized vehicles overnight from 10:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M.
- I just want to remind everyone that there is that.
- There is a place for these RVs to park overnight.
- I wanted to ask of those who are reassessing the residential area, are you suggesting that that same rule should be applied in residential areas that would allow these RVs to park in residential areas during the nighttime from, for instance, 10:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M.?
- Is that what you're thinking? If so, then the question would go back to the Chief as to whether there is a problem with that.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- That's exactly what I'm saying. I think it should be City wide.
- I don't see it as a big problem because we don't have an ordinance right now.

- We're adding a law right here and I'm just trying to make it the fairest in my mind to share the load throughout the City.
- I think it was Councilmember Glass that said can we create something that means we can only have so much in a cluster.
- That's what I'm thinking and we don't currently have any restriction now.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I think I'm in the minority at this point, but I do tend to continue to feel that allowing that in the commercial industrial areas is going to be sufficient and that with those commercial industrial areas available, that would provide sufficient space.
- I'm concerned about enforcement for our police and access from West County community services.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- I just want to make sure I understand where this conversation is going so far.
- So am I hearing that what you want to do is clear Morris Street and no RVs will be parked overnight on Morris Street period but they will be allowed in every residential neighborhood in the entire City.
- Is that what you are saying?
- The first complaints that came to the City in droves was when RVs were parking in residential neighborhoods.
- That's what started this whole process where they ended up over on Morris Street.
- The Council talks about not having your citizens in an uproar.
- What's going to happen when they say, oh, they're all gone from Morris Street and now they're in my residential neighborhood.
- I remember what started this whole conversation.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- The purpose of allowing them in the commercial industrial areas is that typically in those areas they are already set up for large vehicle deliveries by semi-tractor trailer or large box trucks which would typically accommodate an RV.
- Residentially neighborhoods are not typically set up for that for a long-term purpose.
- In this City from what I have observed we have several streets that are not set up for parking overnight in residential neighborhoods, and I think it is also an invitation for more people to come into this City, park their RVs.
- I have one person who is here three-quarters of the time to go run around this City when people are complaining about RVs parked in their neighborhood that have not left by 6:00 A.M. or 7:00 A.M. which is absolutely untenable for this Police Department as it is.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- This is an off the wall idea
- What about if we just had expanded on the 72-hour rule and specified what that meant as some other municipalities have done?
- So instead of you can move here your vehicle six inches or a foot, what if we take that rule and expand on it and just say the 72-hour rule applies everywhere but you have to move at least a block away or something like that.
- Just keep it simple. Just expand on what we already have, but expand the definition.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Listening to our staff and thinking about our goals here, I feel strongly that we should accommodate our RVs in the commercial and industrial zone.
- Overnight as has been proposed and we can talk about hopefully we have time to talk about some particular exceptions within that category.
- But give a place for them to park and a space that is the right width, the right dimensions that won't impede traffic in our commercial and industrial areas.
- Understand that we have accommodated those people and those spaces and our residential areas do what our staff is proposing, which is simply not allow oversized vehicles and ask staff to come back with some sort of ordinance that will meet the specific needs that we think our neighbors have in their residential areas.
- I'm feeling strongly that that's the way we need to go.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- What I don't understand is how our old town with commercial and industrial zones accommodates big vehicles.
- It's not working down there. That's a really wide street. We have conflicts with the bike lanes. We have conflicts with cars.
- I'm wondering if the Chief would explain his remark about how those zones have enough parking or enough turning radius, whatever it is, that allows big trucks there because it seems to me a lot of those zones are still the old part of our town.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- On Morris Street I see semi-tractor trailer deliveries that are happening on a daily basis down there.
- They have an ability to pull down the street, go around the side streets that they utilize.
- They utilize the parking lot.
- Downtown is plenty wide enough.
- But the restriction for RV parking would be no RV parking during 6:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.
- Allowing it for overnight, which typically we're not see cyclists in that time and not interfering with them.
- The businesses we have in our commercial and industrial areas now have accommodated larger vehicle for their deliveries and I have not yet to hear a complaint of any of our officers getting stuck or anything of that nature.
- Typically people who are driving RVs, especially ones that are pulled by a vehicle and that are in a trailer type mode are doing so where they can easily pull up to a curb and pull away from that curb where there is not a lot of backing and exercising of maneuvering other than pulling in and pulling out, which is done so on a regular wide street similar to Morris Street.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm just wondering about the sense of safety you have about the people in those particular zones.
- I know a number of the street campers that I have observed in my neighborhood.
- Let's say within four blocks of my home are single women. I think they feel safer with residential neighbors around them rather than empty commercial buildings or empty industrial parking lots or whatever.
- So what is the safety factor that you're anticipating for those overnight parkers?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I think there is a risk for safety for anybody residing inside a vehicle at any point in time no matter where it may be.

- I don't know that there is a higher or lower risk factor in a commercial industrial area than there is in a residential area.
- I would say that there might be some folks who own homes or rent homes in our City who may not feel safe with people who are parking on their street utilizing campers and RVs as well.
- It's unfortunate, but we live in a world where we cannot monitor every single person that comes into the City as to what their background may be and it is a free country.
- Even though people may have a criminal record, they're allowed to go within the parameters of what the government has allowed them to do, whether they are on parole or probation or anything like that.
- They're allowed to do that.
- But as far as the safety factor goes for whatever gender or any type of identity that someone may have, I do not feel that there is a significant risk that is higher or lower in an area that is residential versus an area that is commercial or not, especially in a City this size.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- To return to the big question here, which is as the City manager noted, what is the root of this?
- Why are we here?
- The root of it is that we have had complaints about people residing in RVs in residential zones for extended periods of time.
- There is a very, very real concern from a public safety, from a public health perspective.
- The regulation of oversized vehicles with the exceptions that the Chief is working in, in residential zones feels reasonable to me.
- It would provide for short term curbside parking; we are not talking about off curbside, off street parking and blanket way across the City.
- The analysis of each roadway, that Chief said would be needed, that's an engineer and is a yearlong project for someone with advanced knowledge and degrees to accurately assess all that.
- I'm not comfortable with that expense. I doubt any of my colleagues are.
- Do we want oversized vehicles in residential zones with limited exceptions, as noted by the Chief, or not?
- I mean, the possibility of the RV village encountering difficulties in opening on schedule. It's already been slightly pushed back.
- I'm still hopeful it's not in any way significant other than a day or two here or there.
- When that opens, folks from Morris Street will have a place to go.
- Then we have a way to protect the neighborhoods from large encampments starting up in residential zones, which our residents are generally not supportive.
- It is not that we're cold hearted. It's a visceral uncomfortableness of the unknown, and we have to acknowledge that that exists for an awful lot of people.
- What if this was 30 years ago an RV pulled up in front of my grandmother's house? And somebody took up residence there? That doesn't feel safe for somebody's grandmother.
- I think it's common sense that we need to put some sort of a boundary around the residential zones.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Restated the direction to staff.
- No oversized vehicles in residential zones without any exceptions, allowing short term stays at residences in residential zones for visitors
- No long term stays
- I can provide an overview for commercial industrial zones as well in the January 18th meeting, as far as the three-hour limited time parking.

- I believe that is something that could be already expanded upon and the ordinances that are already present that included time parking.
- The option would not need to be included in this specific ordinance draft regarding commercial industrial zones.

Councilmember Rich proposed that we might consider taking a thumbs up, thumbs down on three exceptions to the commercial industrial rule to take ten minutes to see if we can come to agreement before you table it.

Councilmember Gurney commented I think we all came prepared to talk about it tonight, and if we're looking at a schedule that relates to an RV village and a Citywide policy to be coordinated in a way where they lay down and work for the community, we have to get through this point.

The Council discussed the later agenda items and questioned the time sensitivity of the items. City staff explained the need for the Council to hear the items on this agenda as follows:

- The deadline for item number nine is tomorrow.
- Funding is on the 23rd so these loan documents have to get to New York overnight.
- The deadline for item number 10 is the validation process which is the judicial validation process.
- It takes three to four months to go through. Staff is proposing that item needs to be approved tonight as well.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- I did exchange emails with legal counsel who would be filing the validation action.
- They wish to file it soon.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I would like to lay out three areas.
- My proposal is that we go with the Chief's suggestion, no oversized vehicles, 6:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.
- We can set aside the timed parking for the moment but we also indicate that we do not want oversized vehicles at all in three areas.
- These are stated in general terms so they can apply going forward.
- In areas where encampments are established, right now that is Morris, and Laguna Parkway.
- Areas where there is an authorized homeless shelter, that is 845 Gravenstein Highway North.
- The early morning hours, 5:00 A.M. to 7:00 A.M. So bridging that time period.
- At the moment, the specific area that I could see would apply to is the school route for kids walking from pearl buck to the charter school, which also overlaps with the authorized homeless shelter.
- So my thought is perhaps we could see if we quickly can get agreement on there being complete and oversized vehicles rule in three areas, where encampments become established, and that could apply future in location. Where encampments have been established.
- There there's an authorized homeless shelter and in areas where sidewalks are in use in the early morning or late evening hours.
- I can explain my thoughts on that but it's probably evident.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I'm seeing a difficulty in the definition where encampments have become established.
- I'm in the sure how that is legally defensive.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:



- We would have to have a definition possibly in there what encampment means.
- I'm not sure that I have seen an ordinance that defines with an encampment is.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I think the concept here in order to compress the process is to agree conceptually on those areas and leave it up to staff to address it.
- As long as we understand the point is a group of condensed area where there's many RVs.
- The example being RV dwellers, Morris Street and Laguna Parkway.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I think it's a good idea if we name the streets rather than says where encampment is established.
- That is broad and doesn't allow us to define -- the use of a street is more appropriate, and that would have to be vetted by the outside council, and I believe the outside Council and City attorney would agree that the naming of the street specifically would be best suited for that.
- I would like to point out you state where there is an authorized homeless shelter, I don't believe that the RV parking village is considered a homeless shelter. So I think that needs to be defined a little better.
- Because that will include the Sebastopol Inn as well.
- I think we might run into a legality on where sidewalks are in use between 5:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M.
- That is every sidewalk in the City.

Councilmember Rich commented we can direct you, direct staff to articulate that in a way that is legally appropriate and enforceable.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- We can check for outside help to see if we can name those as well.
- I made an exception in here and nothing in the ordinance is applicable to services providing services to businesses or residents, such as delivery or picking up goods.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The Chief is correct.
- If you name the streets and add as to why you are naming the streets, in other words, it applies to homeless encampments and the same thing applies to sidewalks.
- To be delegated along with a finding they are in use in the early morning, light night hours, and late night students going to school, whatever the use is.
- The Chief is right. That's a way to make it enforceable.
- But he's right, we will run it by outside Council.

Director Svanstrom commented we did review, confirm the RV village is considered a homeless shelter.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think there are other areas that are potentially ones we want to name.
- The street for instance, Willow and Jewell as it goes around Ives Park.
- I have received complaints about vehicles being parked there.
- I'm wondering if there is a way we might protect other property similar from the intrusion on Morris Street, and access to that outdoor area.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- It is my understanding that the majority of our parks with the exception of Laguna are located in residential zones.
- Therefore the residential zoning restrictions would cover anything in the areas of the parks and the commercial industrial area would cover anything in Laguna.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I'm in disagreement.
- I think we should have uniform policy for commercial and residential or industrial.
- I do not agree that we should suddenly now say we are going to have zero overnight parking on Morris Street as an exception and say we're going put overnight parking in the downtown area and other commercial areas.
- That is like putting all that overnight parking in the downtown and other business areas and here have been encampments on Morris in the past.
- Then that's going to be taken care of by the rule that goes from 10:00 to 6:00.
- I don't see why we should make an exception for that.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I agree with what Councilmember Glass just said.
- Calling out specific areas seems problematic to me, and I can understand the motivation behind the suggestions.
- This just needs to be really, really simple and easily enforceable.
- We can't call out GPS coordinates that it's safe to park from X to X.
- That doesn't make sense.
- I'm in agreement with the 10:00 to 6:00 prohibition and it's everywhere in commercial and industrial.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- The neighborhoods were an initial concern regarding RVs.
- During the entire discussion of the RV village, the consistent message for the community is that we clear Morris Street.
- What is proposed here, what I'm hearing, is a partial clearance of Morris Street. It's clearance in the day.
- So the perspective of a promise made to the community we have an obligation to stick to the promise.
- It has been clear. It's clearing Morris Street. Not just daytime clearing.
- We have an established location that RVs have become accustomed to going to on Morris Street.
- I think it's going to be really, really hard, a lot harder to modify it so it's only a night time location.
- Then it will be to simply say Morris Street, Laguna Park Way are not the place to go to park your RVs.
- That is a clear message that is easy for the police to enforce.
- It will be easy to the people in the unhoused community to understand, and is completely consistent with our heart in the community, which is to provide places for people be.
- We are providing places for people to be in the commercial and industrial area.
- I think this would be a really big rejection of our community and what we've been saying as a City Council.

Mayor Slayter proposed a straw vote on the question as proposed: Should the City have special areas in the commercial and industrial areas where there is a blanket prohibition? Special zones that would have no RV parking.

Councilmember Rich added with some timed parking.

There was no consensus. Question received three thumbs down.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The direction to staff would be we are in favor of the 6:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.
- Blanket across commercial and industrial areas.
- I think that the three-hour parking, as the Chief noted hours ago, that is something we can look doesn't need to be part of the ordinance, correct, Chief?
- That can be taken on a case by case.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- We already have an ordinance in place that restricts and provides for timed parking and it would be just added on.
- It would be whatever street you decide to add on to that would be part of that.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- We have spent a long time but we are a problematic case.
- We need to hear more from the public, particularly the people who are volunteers and most of the people who are impacted.
- So this will roll on to the Chief bringing it back.

**City Council Action: Provided direction to City Staff as Discussed above.**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-326**

Item Number 10:

1. Discussion and Consideration of Adoption of Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol Authorizing the Issuance of One or More Series of Pension Obligation Bonds to Refinance Outstanding Obligations of the City to the California Public Employees' Retirement System, Authorizing a Judicial Validation Action, and Approving and Directing Related Matters (Responsible Department: Administrative Services)

Administrative Services Director Kwong presented the agenda item recommending the City Council approve adoption of Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol Authorizing the Issuance of One or More Series of Pension Obligation Bonds to Refinance Outstanding Obligations of the City to the California Public Employees' Retirement System, Authorizing a Judicial Validation Action, and Approving and Directing Related Matters.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I just have to say, that was so fast, it was a little hard to follow.
- My mind is back with the fellow who is concerned we didn't talk about parking in commercial areas when he waited through three hours of conversation and we didn't get it.
- I'm still distracted.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- What are the risks of this under taking?
- I recognize there are no risks at the moment but what about if this moves forward?
- What if the market crashes, et cetera.

Mike Myer with NHA Advisers responded as follows:

- To your question, the core risk with a UAL restructuring is CalPERS restructuring.
- Any analysis right now in an estimated saving, assumes they earn their targeted rate of return of 6.8 percent, to the extent they missed their marks, it could impact savings.
- That is why, the screen of the time line, one of the things that we would like to present to Council through the process is what we call a stress test in process.
- So just to look at what some of those down side risks look like.
- What if there was another '08 reception after giving CalPERS a big chunk of money.
- Basically, the risk to boil it down, it means that the City is better off if CalPERS earns more than the interest rate over the bond over the long term.
- The City borrows at 3.5%. Who knows where it is next spring.
- As long as they beat the return on the next 20, 25 years on average, you will be better off from a financial perspective.
- If they did not beat that number, you would be worse off.
- That is where the risk lies, and that is why as part of the process, as we look at the restructuring process, we will want to show some of the down side for us as well so that you can make a prudent decision when it comes to that time.

Mayor Slayter questioned what if there is a bailout.

Mr. Meyers commented as follows:

- That's a great question. All of the cities would be very happy.
- Obviously, we don't know
- Part of the options of evaluation, there's so many variables with the restructuring.
- If you look at all the agencies, everyone's a bit different.
- How much of the UAL to take out, what's the term of the new debt? What is the repayment shape and those are the things we want to explore.
- Whether you go to full funding and don't need the bailout or you go to partial funding.
- It's hard to say what would happen in that event.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- I have been following the City's budget process for two years.
- I watched that we have been in debt and had a deficit budget for the last three years.
- The discussions of issuing bonds to fund the City services has been in discussion for the last year.
- So it's not surprising we have reached the point now where the City Council is actively seeking opportunities to go further in debt to fund the City.
- Be very careful ability the path you go down. Be very careful about the debt you take on. Because at the end of the day, we're going to be paying all that pack.

City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Someone needs to help me understand, thinking of Kyle's question.
- How is it going to affect our budgeting process?
- Do we have relief set aside that we do every year for the UAL?
- Explain that to me if you will.

Director Kwong commented as follows:

- In the budget on an annual basis, there is the normal cost, which is paid by the City, and the employees.
- There's the UAL side of that, and that's been borne by the City, and it's all combined in the budget.
- The UAL is being paid up front in a dollar amount, and that's, as I mentioned before, runs about \$1.2 million in July.
- We are talking about taking that from CalPERS perspective, it can be 1.2, 1.3. It could be a million.
- It is a soft liability based on CalPERS' actuarial study, and that's part of the budget amount that the City budgets on an annual basis.
- So if the pensions bonds are issued, you take that \$1.2 million, and that would be turned into a hard cost, which is a debt service that you pay, and that debt service could be \$800,000.
- It could be less, it depends on the interest rate.
- Then the City has that room between \$1.2 million and \$800,000 in the hard cost for this debt issue to be paid.
- It will give some room in the budget to absorb any shock from CalPERS.
- That is how these unfunded liability is funded own an annual basis

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I have been part of the budget process for quite a few years now and was part of the CalPERS City Council subcommittee.
- I want to say I'm in favor of this tonight.
- It feels like it's a refinance. It's not a matter of going into debt. It's more using what we set aside and maximizing it.
- I can see that it may take some pressure off the budget
- We have become accustomed to putting away quite a bit to offset CalPERS, and hopefully we can continue that because this obligation that we made to our past employees and current employees isn't going away.
- So we have to deal with it, and this looks like a good opportunity as far as I see. I'm in favor of it tonight.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I always have to keep correcting the record and say we continue to have one of the highest reserves of any small City in the County.
- So we're not going broke
- Could you just make it a little clearer of the reserve that we currently have set aside for our PERS liability? Which is a couple million. How does that affect this?
- If we determined from this report that we don't want to do this, we don't have to do it.
- We're getting an analysis and a lot of information about with which we can make a decision.
- So we're not committing tonight to going into debt

Director Kwong commented as follows:

- The City has \$2.8 million set aside for CalPERS, and the fund balance, and how it will play in the process it would depend on when the finance team had time to look at all options and all the available data, and how that will play in the restructuring

Mr. Meyers commented as follows:

- You're correct the validation process tonight is not the final approval.
- That is a four-month process that needs to happen before you can issue a pension bond.
- Whether you decide to do that, or wait until a future date.
- During that time is when we look at different options.
- The market could be different.
- This is refinancing high interest rate debt lower interest debt.
- If interest rates were no longer in the 3% and they were 5% next year, it might be a different conversation.
- That is all what we will be exploring over the next several months.
- You will have another final approval of the P.O.S., that is documents that will go to investors and that is the Council's chance for final approval.

Councilmember Glass confirmed that we have a chance to just say no, if that's what we decide to do, correct?

Mr. Meyers stated that is correct. He also stated leading up until that point, I imagine there would be lots of updates on the market and options getting feedback and all that from Councilmembers.

Mayor Slayter commented the other thing is To make sure that everybody knows this, the cost, if this moves forward this evening, the cost is \$10,000, and it is already budgeted, account code 100-14-101-4210.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Thank you for the numbers.
- I think we already agreed we didn't want to do the 115 trust.
- Didn't we already talk about that?

Councilmember Glass stated that is correct.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I too am in favor of going forward with the exploration and see where we land once the analysis is done.
- I think this is a good step. The debt already exists. This is not new debt. It's a restructuring of debt.
- It's a potential savings for the City.
- We have on page 4 of 53 of this item, a couple graphs and a chart that indicate the realities of what things are costing us now and the potential savings of 2023 through 2037.
- I think that the potential for savings are very real. I'm in favor of this going forward as well.

**MOTION:**

Mayor Slayter moved and Councilmember Glass seconded approval and Adoption of Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol Authorizing the Issuance of One or More Series of Pension Obligation Bonds to Refinance Outstanding Obligations of the City to the California Public Employees' Retirement System, Authorizing a Judicial Validation Action, and Approving and Directing Related Matters

**DISCUSSION:**

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think it needs to be really clear.
- We're saying yes, we're going to approve this future issuance.

- But what I'm hearing, we can backtrack on that, and if the future predictions look like we can decide otherwise, we request say no.

Mr. James Wawrzyniak, Jones Hall, Bond Council, commented as follows:

- Because there is an approval of the bond issuance that needs to happen for it to get started but there is a step that Council needs to take before you actually go to market with a bond.
- We need to have the Council approve bonds to take action in court, so it's filed in court and to have something to validate, we need have an approval of bonds.
- But as it's been said, and in the staff report, we would come back to the Council.
- So there is no actual issuance of the bonds without the final templates that a Council needs to approve.
- What the resolution provides is for staff to come back to Council for a final action.

Councilmember Gurney commented it appears if we are committing to this and is there better wording to be used.

Mr. Wawrzyniak commented as follows:

- The only thing, just to reiterate, certainly we can put something on the record or we can add a sentence so the resolution.
- It states that City staff will cause to be sub committed to the Council for any series of bonds for further agreements and for approval.
- That is the language, we have done that in many other cities.
- We will refer to the Council if that is sufficient.
- What I heard there is that was a proactive statement of the fail-safe.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- I was just going to agree.
- The section of the resolution, I think makes it clear what the ball line is this evening.
- So I commend you not trying to condition the actual approval motion so it's clear you're taking all the legal steps you need to do so it's a legal validation action.
- So in other words, I would leave the motion alone.
- You can rely on the resolution, in my opinion.

Councilmember Gurney questioned if it was Section 5 that was being referred to. City staff stated yes.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- To me, that commits us to implement the issuance of the bond.
- So I'm just wondering if there is a way that is significant enough in this action tonight that we can make some note that we back out of it if that's what we did with the analysis that comes forward in four or five months.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Section five says that we have to approve another resolution.
- So there has to be a vote for that. You cannot commit a future Council.
- So when the resolution comes to you, you can disapprove it.

Councilmember Gurney commented you're saying that is protective enough of us to have that choice?



City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented yes, as it causes an action to be submitted to you in the future, another resolution with an agreement.

Councilmember Glass questioned we can change our minds without penalty.

Mr. Meyers commented as follows:

- Stated that is correct
- The only thing the council is committing to tonight is the \$10,000 legal cost for the validation.

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

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmembers Glass, Gurney, Rich, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved Adoption of Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol Authorizing the Issuance of One or More Series of Pension Obligation Bonds to Refinance Outstanding Obligations of the City to the California Public Employees' Retirement System, Authorizing a Judicial Validation Action, and Approving and Directing Related Matters**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-327**

**Resolution Number: 6392-2021**

9. Consideration of Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to execute a Tax-Exempt Lease Purchase Agreement (TELPA) and Related Documents for Energy Savings Contract with Signature Public Funding Corp. (Responsible Department: Public Works/Administrative Services)

Administrative Services Director Kwong presented the agenda item recommending Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to execute a Tax-Exempt Lease Purchase Agreement (TELPA) and Related Documents for Energy Savings Contract with Signature Public Funding Corp.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- A little introduction on top of the facts there.
- So this project, this Council approved the project unanimously before.
- What this item is tonight is to approve the funding mechanism for the project that is already approved.
- We have all received a significant number of emails about this issue, and many, many of the ones that came to me referenced a series of erroneous comments.
- The last time water rate increase was discussed was in 2018, a five-year plan that in '18-'19, it was 0% increase. In 2021, it was a 3% increase. In 2022, a 3%, and 2%.
- The base rate actually went down in 2019 when a greater percentage of individual bills went to actual water use rather than just falling underneath a base rate that was inflated for most.
- So the less you use, the more you save. That's the way that the rate structure was planned.
- There is no rate increase proposed in this.
- So I want to make sure that everybody understands that.
- We have a water system that is aging. It does need repair and maintenance. That costs money.
- That's what the system does. It is basically a nonprofit little business that the City runs delivering water to customers and customers need safe water delivery that's reliable to their homes and businesses.
- That costs something, and that's the reason for the little business that the City operates.

- So a little background about some correction to some erroneous information floating around in the community.
- I hope that clears up some people's misunderstanding of what the item actually is.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- We have that the City has already approved purchase of the system and we have already signed contracts to make this happen.
- What we're considering tonight is a different way to finance what house already occurred.
- Is that right?

Director Kwong stated that is correct.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I have received a number of questions from members of the public who are concerned about this technology and its relationship to the kind of smart meters that we have previously discussed about being on our houses
- Is a water smart meter out that would be out where most water meters are, on the street or just slightly below grade.
- So I had a member of the public tell me they had actually asked for a PRA and got a lot of documents about this technology and one of the things they told me is that this technology transmits data every four seconds, one Watt of power, the same as a PG&E smart meter.
- They sent me a document indicates that.
- So I actually forwarded the information to the City Clerk and asked her to forward it to the Public Works Superintendent.
- I recall that actually, this technology only transmits data for three seconds four times a day.
- My question is, is that accurate or what are we talking about with this technology?
- I know it's not that technology that is discussed because we have already done that, and I think the public needs to hear this technology information cleared up.

Public Works Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows:

- That information was forwarded to me and I looked at that, and I believe that in a flurry of emails and probably a quick typo.
- Adding the words seconds rather than per day.
- The technology is four times per day. Per work day, I might add.
- It is programmable and one is random which means there is only one random transmission on a Saturday and Sunday.
- So it's even less than four per day on average.
- And three of them are programmable so those can be set by operational staff to best support the process and the water billing department as far as timing.
- So it's four times per day, and three seconds would be the max.
- it's closer to a second.

Councilmember Glass commented is it pinging anybody or sending anything out the rest of the time?

Superintendent Del Prete commented it is not transmitting but it is calculating data internally, and it sends out a ping of data at the three programmable, one random times per work day.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Alex commented as follows:

- To the point you guys were just talking about, I remember with the electric smart meters were put up, they said it only transmits once or twice a day, but it turns out they transmit several thousand times a day and every few seconds.
- I hope that information is correct. You say it transmits for three seconds.
- Most microwave technology is pulsed and it turns on and off.
- I'm not sure if it's a continuous wave that you explain, or if that's going to be pulsating for three seconds, however many times a day you said.
- Just something to consider.
- When you are putting 3,000 of these in a neighborhood, the imagine the signal is traveling how far?
- It's sending microwave radiation for miles. It's 3, 4 times a day.
- That is how many pulsations will be send through the neighborhoods.
- It's another layer of microwave radiation that has been proven over and over again to be carcinogenic, the radiation, and Wi-Fi, it's continual think.
- Sebastopol was the first to lose the meters and I hope you continue lose this.
- Some things to consider. Thanks for your time.

Sandy commented as follows:

- There is no way this is a typo because it's clearly written on two pages.
- It says the transmitter for the water meter transmits a signal every four seconds, and the next page talking about how the City will need to install collectors and repeaters and switch the meter days to the AMI setting, and that time, the transmitter will emit a signal every four seconds at a power rating of one Watt.
- That is exactly like a smart meter that PG&E is installing.
- So is really outrageous. This is an outrageous betrayal of community values.
- Sebastopol ban the smart meters in 2019.
- You rushed the decision. You didn't talk to the public, you didn't get feedback how we feel about this.
- You're putting in it in our streets, where we lived.
- You are so compassionate about the unhoused but this is threatening us, in our homes, in our streets, in our neighborhoods, where we walk.
- So, you know, it's difficult. I am so upset to hear that this is just the typo.
- It's outrageous. I feel like I'm dealing with PG&E all over again.
- I was an intervener of smart meters. We were paid for our time.
- We were taken seriously, and Sebastopol banned smart meters in 2013 because of our work.
- They recognized the health effects. They recognized the need for consumer protections.
- Smartphones and smart meters emit the radiation, cell phone use is optional and voluntary.
- If a neighbor wants to sit there and use a cell phone all the time, the risk is on them.
- But the City has a much greater responsibility and obligation to protect public health and the environment.
- City has an obligation and responsibility and honestly vet the proposed technology where a peer review study show the effects of the technology, and where that technology have been oppose in this town, and that technology is 24/7 involuntary.

- You have made a big mistake, and I am just so upset by the claim, no, it's a typo. I'm upset by the whole thing.
- I have sent you several letters.
- Is PG&E all over again, and you have been swindled here into making a very, very poor decision that you will not be able to undo for a long time. I ask you to deny this.

Martha Glaser commented as follows:

- I think this is utterly misguided and you have not proven lack of harm, potential harm by objective monitoring.
- I believe you are only coming to the figures and information from company sales people, and this is not credible to the public. It's not credible.
- I'm frustrated you are rushing to meet a financial goal as if it were an emergency for locking in an interest rate. That is horrendous.
- That is a horrendous way to make a decision that will change the ethos of a City that is compassionate for people with EMF issues, with sensitivity, and the care if following a general plan that was written in 2016 that many of you were on the Council to sign which has the whole section for community help and wellness.
- The section four, the goals and options to have the lowest possible EMFs, and an analog meter would do that.
- This is not a necessary step. This is not a step forward.
- Earlier tonight on the call, Sebastopol was a kind City, not just a me, me, me City.
- Compassion to walk the City. I want to be able to walk the City.
- I am a member of a constituency of people that are vulnerable and don't do it to jump to get a rate locked in.
- It's foolish and not a responsible discharge of your responsibilities and people I trust giving you my vote.
- Una said we're not a community that is exclusionary.
- Do you realize 3,000 meters throughout the City radiating, will be excluding me and others like me, and Patrick said earlier, this is putting the cart before the house.
- I believe the Council is misled by the project and it's very complicated. The technical issues are very complicated.
- It merits inquiry and scrutiny and it's not an emergency.
- There are other issues in the City at this time that are life and death emergencies to push forward, helping people get services that are unhoused.
- This is not one of the issues.
- There is an effect.
- When you're walking on the street, if someone is on the cell phone, I can walk away from them.
- When they are throughout the City, I will not be able to walk here.
- I will be driven out of this town, and I lived here 25 years.
- I raised my children here, and this is unfair and wrong.

Moshe commented as follows:

- I go back to October 19, agenda number nine
- It was given an obscure name to hide the impact of the project.
- The hide tells me that Sebastopol City officials nodded that smart water meters are not safe.
- The Council voted that any City project over \$30,000 would be competitive.
- And later, they violated the rule and approving a project, \$4.9 million project.

- Discussed needs for buildings and the half million work will be trash for the library.
- The contractors receive a sweet deal without bidding and this is corruption at work.
- How much money are the contractors going to put in their back pockets of the public officials when they don't look or they do their work.
- I expressed my concern to all members about agenda number 11 but there was no reply
- In today's convoluted project, the smart meters were overnight. No debate or option to opt out. There is no debate anymore.
- This are not smart meters but toxic and kill all life.
- We want to be done with the thousands of toxic batteries
- What is the cost.
- Many people are electromagnetic sensitive
- I am sensitive and the City of Sebastopol will be off limit for me if smart meters are installed.
- This is an atrocity
- I am demanding the City of Sebastopol abandon the smart meter project.

Linda Berg commented as follows:

- The smart meters are going to allow Sebastopol to have a new one. Come to Sebastopol and get hooked.
- Discussed the public records request and stated = I'm in possession of 932 pages incriminating the staff if you're going to stick with that explanation of lots and lots of typos
- What that really is, cancer causing water meters, it's a self-deployment of 5G through the water meters what it really is, and the 952 pages I received.
- It's just full of as I said earlier, fraud, deception, misrepresentation and acting in bad faith, which will all come out.
- I have already contacted the Press Democrat to do an investigation to see how it is.
- This needs to be publicized about how the criminal organizations operate. Sebastopol is too good for this.
- There are a lot of wonderful people.
- This was a ground zero for the opposition, with cancer causing electric meters, and we prevailed
- With the information I have now, I can see that all these damn things need to be recalled and replaced
- We do not need to add anymore heat. The microwave oven we are living in.
- I object of being cooked alive along with the wonderful people who are spiking up about the issue.
- So I also demand that you reject this stupid contract, what I wonder if any of you read.
- You would see a few pages after if the those contained.
- Something else that the water survey it was not sent to the manager, owner of units
- Several others in the apartment building near Sebastopol, and that includes Burbank heights did not receive it
- Also the cancer cluster at Palm Avenue

Rick commented as follows:

- It sure is difficult, isn't it? To make decisions on the information you have.
- I have a friend by the jam of Jeremy Johnson. He's an engineer and he is working on the EMF issue For decades.
- What he told me was watch the companies with the EMF issue who have managed to get through Congress. The protection of people not being able to sue them.
- I don't think that the Council has that protection.

- If people can't see the manufacturers of the EMF producing devices, they will go over City Council who will think it's a great idea.
- It's worth taking a second or third look at and check out what is the transmission?
- It may take hiring somebody like Jeremy to research it and give you information that is no produced by the manufacturer of these things
- I wish I could set you back to so you can play and this is a complicated world we're living in, so thank you very much for listening.
- I hope we don't have these meters in Sebastopol. Because I think it will eat the lawsuits down the road.
- Because the data is coming in about EMS.
- Thank you very much for listening.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- So I understand that you have already approved this project, and tonight's really just about funding.
- But I think really, having an honest conversation about the process, about how we engage our public, how we communicate about results and how we move forward with decisions, it's an important conversation to have.
- So in February of 2021, the Public Works Director said they were testing new water meters.
- A few months later, they asked a survey asking if the community wanted to sell the water meters.
- There were 31% opposed and 4.3 are undecided
- Surveys are a really interesting political tool because it's really easy to state the numbers without actually publishing them.
- It's really easy to make decisions based on when you control the surface.
- How much information gets in the survey.
- Questions that are asked, and questions that are not.
- People were not given details about the cost or how the meetings work.
- Anyone could have taken the survey including people who don't live in town.
- One point, that was a conversation or discussion on our concern about the Internet security and Mayor Slayter said these things are secure.
- Yet, twice within the last year, our own City's infrastructure was broken and the loss of \$126,789 million as well as our police computer system.
- So I'm not having a lot of confidence in the cities I.T. What protocols do we have in I.T.? Not sure it's going to get answered now.
- Do you have information about up who actually answered the survey? Is it representative?
- We had a survey, \$10,000 to CoMission
- We subcontracted out and we got the most unrepresentative information about financial stability based on COVID.
- We paid money for that survey that was completely unusable.
- If let's share information.
- Let's be transparent in our decision making process.

Let's not make bold claims about security that we don't have anything we can verify on it.

Angela Ford commented as follows:

- I write as an elder in our community and a resident at Burbank Heights & Orchards. This proposed purchase and installation of 3,000 'smart' water meters takes our community away from minimizing EMF radiation and down the slippery slope of adding more and more harmful EMF radiation to our community.

- Among my numerous concerns:
  - Compromises health and well-being of all residents, including chronically ill and elders. Smart water meters emit EMF radiation which is harmful to people and the environment.
  - This proposal would add 3,000 transmitters to the city. And when the technology needs an upgrade it will be to 5G, using millimeters waves which independent scientists are warning is harmful.
  - 4% increase in water rates will add additional financial challenges to many of our citizens living on marginal incomes, such as elderly residents – in these times of inflation and economic uncertainty.
  - No Zero Waste – The Zero Waste Sonoma purchasing policy calls for purchasing products that minimize environmental impacts, toxins, pollution and hazards to worker and community safety, as well as to purchase durable and long lasting products. If a smart water meter battery fails, the whole unit has to be replaced. Thus relegating the original meter to the landfill
  - Disregards Sebastopol's 2015 General Plan, “. . . is intended to serve as a 'constitution' for all future development within the city."
  - Sebastopol's 2015 General Plan's goal CHW4 very clearly states: "Minimize Community Exposure to Unsafe Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) and calls for minimizing EMF radiation and community opt out of public utility smart meters. CHW 4: Minimize Community Exposure to Unsafe Electromagnetic Fields (EMF)
- I urge you to vote 'no'. To follow the direction and intent of the 2015 General Plan's CHW 4. And to sidestep the physical, economic and environmental challenges the purchase and installation of 3,000 transmitters would present to many community members – especially elders.
- Thank you for your time and attention in this critical matter. And always, for your work on our community's behalf.

Loriel Golden commented as follows:

- I have been listening to many of the people who have spoken up against the implementation of the smart water hearings.
- If there is so much disagreement and so much actual fear and anxiety based on the number
- Discussed concerns with PG&E
- It just seems so cruel and aggressive to force it on us when it's obviously harmful.
- There are many years of religion behind it.
- It's just so far against living within the rhythms of worth.
- We need to get away from the technology that is disruptive of the life force.
- The high goals are the goals of the City Council.
- I lived in Sebastopol for the past 18 years. I know what your high vision is.
- You want to be Green, you want to be zero waste.
- Yet this technology is harmful
- It's none of those things, and Angela Ford saying the 2025 plan, it goes against that, we need to uphold or General Plan
- We need to be consistent with protecting the welfare on all levels of citizens in the City.
- I don't see where any questions are. All the costs, you have to raise it 4%.
- The elderly and the weaker people, the children and the elderly are going to be more threatened by this.
- To impose this thing it's very upsetting. We have to make decisions that are in the best welfare of people
- Someone brought up lawsuits.
- You better believe there's going to be lawsuits when people have evidence the health is compromised.
- Why take the risk at all?



City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I have a number of things I want to say but I want to start off with this comment.
- I'm here and it's 10 after 11:00, and we started the item at 10:26. Barely before the cutoff.
- But it was tabled from the last meeting and it was scheduled to be heard after the very consuming discussion about the RV village.
- Tonight instead of coming first as a tabled item, it's come after a three-hour conversation about parking in town.
- I think that is a real mistreatment of the public. Particularly the public with whom we have been in close touch with for years.
- There is the EMF Safety Network and they're our colleagues, friends and neighbors. They have been our constituents for when we cared.
- Sebastopol led the state of California, Marin County, Santa Cruz County, followed our lead with the letter following the precautionary principle.
- I'm wondering where our hearts are gone we push the public to the end of the agenda.
- We tell them their letters don't matter and we are hearing grief and anxiety and fear and threat from people who were active constituents and still should be.
- So if there is a vote I could reverse, I could vote differently on the project the first time around.
- I understand this is a financing question but I question this details as the public that is doing the research for us, and saying you missed this, missed that, and you're doing the wrong thing.
- That is not how we relate to the public, as I know the heart of Sebastopol, and I'm distressed I can't reverse my vote and the process.
- Perhaps that is not true. We were talking about the bonds, apparently we can say we approve them tonight and disapprove them in the future.
- I don't know why we need to be compelled to stick with a decision that seems so wrong headed going against the general plan, going in a hurry, going under surveys that have no validity.
- We have over 3,000 water customers.
- I think we're going to be creating an environment that won't welcome our residents.
- They won't feel comfortable in, and I don't see we have a lot to gain for becoming moderate in this way.
- If I can change my vote months ago, approving the project in a hurry, I would do that
- In my heart we are abandoning important people and issues that are key to our success and what we believe in terms of health.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I just have to express my sadness, grief and all the concern that we're hearing about this issue.
- All the people that are having fear and anxiety about the water issue.
- I know there are people in the meeting tonight, and I agree with Councilmember Gurney, you are part of our community.
- As a City Council member, you are tasked with making a decision for the town.
- Sometimes those decisions are more painful than other times, and for me this is a painful moment, and I want all of us out there to understand that.
- It's a tough situation that we're in.
- I think we're pretty much bound by the agreement that we made, the vote that we made before.
- I don't want to give up on something that is super important to me, which is respect for the information that was provided by our public works superintendent. I trust his work.
- I trust his research.

- I haven't had the opportunity to do a deep dive myself, that's being a City Council person but from a policy perspective, I do trust his information and I relied on it before I
- Other than the sadness and grief I'm hearing from the community, which is compelling to me, I think we're stuck with it.
- It's a tough situation that we're in.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I am concerned, very concerned, about the apparent lack of information getting to the public about this matter.
- And for any role I've had in that I apologize.
- I do wish we had provided more information to the public and gotten the public more engaged in this issue back months ago when it first arose.
- I do remember the conversations at the Council meeting where we first talked about doing energy saving with our meters and it being my understanding was we were just providing more efficiency with our meters, and like the whole word of smart, and the issue of technology, and all of that didn't really enter into it when I first heard about this project.
- I am concerned about this discrepancy between the three seconds and the lot more seconds.
- As I have explained to some members of the EMF Network, I voted for this with an understanding that this is a technology that's with a smart meter out in the street going to be transmitting four times a day for three seconds.
- So my evaluation with that information was I get a heck of a lot more radiation from my next door neighbor talking on their cell phone than I would be getting from one of these meters.
- Now that is assuming that this is all information that this is complete information about what the technology does.
- So that's why I voted for this in the first place.
- I am concerned now that so many of our public, who are here, who have been allies and participating in Council meetings for many, many years did not have a chance and get enough information to weigh in on the process months ago.
- So this does seem to be one of those situations that this has already left the station.
- We've already basically the project is already under way, and this is about financing it.
- But I am disappointed that we did not have a more public airing of the issue.
- At this point it sounds like we already have all the contracts signed and so forth.
- I'm still not convinced that this technology is problematic.
- I do understand that smart meters on the side of your house can be problematic, but I am concerned that we did not have a longer airing of this process and longer, more information about it.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm unwilling to follow one mistake with another mistake.
- I think it's time to say no and think there's some other way to approach this.
- Earlier we followed the precautionary principle, and that was our guideline.
- We were careful in what we were doing, and took steps with great research.
- That's what we should be doing now.
- There's no real urgency to this.
- Supposedly there's a deadline tomorrow about funding but we know in the financial world as we've heard from experts again tonight, there are other possibilities, and the market does this and does that.
- I don't see there's a commitment.

- This is troublesome because we used the money urgency issue when we hurried a whole neighborhood through RV village approval with limited notice, but money was there and we had to do it.
- I don't think this has urgency like that, I don't see why we have to say yes now.
- Why isn't there a procedure?
- If we're going to be able to secure extra money because we're reducing costs for water delivery, why can't we provide protection for people so they're shielded.
- There are so many unanswered questions, and hearing about public records act that our very own staff said I didn't realize it happened.
- I don't understand why with so many questions and concern from our people for health we just want to impose this because oh, gee, we decided this in a hurry and didn't engage the public enough.
- For me that doesn't work. I can't make a decision based on that.
- Moral part for me is having to stand up now and say I think this is a no.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I was trying to reconcile my concern about my reaction to public concern, and specifically the idea that there was a document out there that suggested more exposure than we had understood as a City Council.
- Reconcile that with my trust in our Public Works Superintendent and the depth of his research and his reliability for all of us.
- To me the resolution of this issue as an individual is if in fact the information that the superintendent provided us which had to do with the frequency of how frequently the sound was emitted, and I think it was four times a day, if that's accurate information, the information that Councilmember Glass was describing and which we all relied on, to the extent that it is reliable, I'm confident in my vote in support of this agreement back when we made our vote.
- The uncertainty that's been introduced is whether in fact that is accurate information.
- I rely on our Superintendent, and he knows our community.
- Wondering if we can approve this funding but as a condition or specific request have the Superintendent confirm he has validated that information and he has independent confirmation aside from the company's brochures, and then also ask that that substantial information be shared in some way with the community, especially the EMF community.

Public Works Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows:

- All the information that I've received is consistent with what I've told you, I have no reason to say anything other than what I believe is true.
- All the manufacturer's information I have read states four times per day, three programmable, one random, transmission of one to three seconds.
- That's what I have to go by.
- I did reach out to a couple of other municipalities, and they confirmed they were pinging data four times a day during workday.
- I'm not sure if I have any reason to believe otherwise.

Councilmember Rich commented is that information simply from the company, company brochures, calls to other municipalities, or did you have a chance to double check on the accuracy of that information?

Superintendent Del Prete commented I spoke to other municipalities using this technology, they confirmed that.

Councilmember Rich commented did they also say it was four pings a day.

Superintendent Del Prete stated yes.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I just want to verify since we made a vote based on information and that that's correct.
- Also I just wanted to comment, I think on the survey, because I don't feel like this decision just came out of the blue.
- We did do a survey, we have been talking about it most of this year.
- I know for myself, I received the survey in email format and on social media, and I don't happen to like to do surveys, so I didn't do it.
- Probably the case for a lot of the public.
- So it is hard to get results of the survey however the majority of people were either in undecided mode or in favor.
- That's part of what went into the decision, and that survey was out there within the town.
- I'm on the City email site, I believe it was also promoted in our weekly newsletter.
- It wasn't like it just came up as agenda item because the survey was pretty clear.
- Tonight my inkling is stick with my vote as well on this item. Tonight is about financing.

Mayor Slayter commented can staff comment on how individual bills may be impacted by the potential change of water meter? Such as accuracy?

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows:

- About 1,500 of the meters are scheduled to be changed out entirely, body and register.
- All the meters 11 years old or newer than that, just the register is being replaced.
- The brass body of that meter is not being changed out.
- So as metering goes, over time they don't become more accurate.
- We quite often with the current technology we're using, when we change out water meters, because they're very old and inaccurate, sometimes water bills do increase.
- That's just a matter of fact.
- New meters read more accurately.

Mayor Slayter commented old, inaccurate meter bills inaccurate amount of money to the account.

Staff stated that is correct.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- With a more accurate meter, everybody will actually be paying an accurate bill based on accurate information.
- So that's the important potential impact to individual bills.
- A question I received an email that I think may be important or at least informational for folks is the bills will still be every other month; every account will receive a bill every two months.
- But the information that's contained therein at any point along that two-month period will be accessible to both the City as well as the customer.
- So somebody will know immediately if there's a large water leak or there's an issue or sprinkler is watering their tomatoes too much in middle of summer.
- So that's an important component of it as well.

- Another question that was raised, would these units be a part of a potential 5G rollout or connect with 5G in any way given the concern over that technology?

Superintendent Del Prete commented the technology is going to connect to the current cellular service within the area.

Mayor Slayter questioned the security of the meters and is this data secure and safe from hackers and malicious people?

Superintendent Del Prete commented it is a secure cellular network within the service area on a fixed network.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think over the years we've worked with a number of staff, and seen different kinds of presentations.
- I'm particularly calling to Councilmember Glass and mayor Slayter in this remark.
- We've received reports And recommendations from staff that were one-sided and Council said wait a minute, there's a different point of view, particularly one that our community is interested.
- From that experience with great controversy and two major lawsuits, we've looked to get the pros and cons more in our staff work.
- In this case I don't think we've had the opportunity, particularly guided by our public's concerns, to explore those cons.
- To me it seems like the information is really -- feels more like a sales pitch than really solid, scientific information, particularly validated by outside source, scientific information, validated financially as well.
- I'm getting to point where I think we could have done a better job, and now we need to start doing the better job we missed the opportunity to do.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- What are the implications of our not supporting this funding request tonight?
- What does that do to this project?

Superintendent Del Prete commented I think I'd asked the City Manager/Attorney to comment, because the contract was signed and executed December 9th, and the equipment has been ordered.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- We'd be in breach of contract.
- Given our long relationship with the proponents of the project, where there were many meetings, including meetings attended by at least one Councilmember from time to time, I would say they might let us off the hook, but we would be in breach of contract.
- We were obligated to pay for this, sources of payment money is essentially our problem.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I tend to on feel we need to move forward
- I do want to make sure we provide additional substantive information to the community if in fact this does go forward.
- I'll communicate with the Superintendent directly about that.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- The question was just asked as to the effect of us not moving forward this evening.

- I understand we would be in breach of contract.
- After hearing our City Manager say we've had a long-term relationship, I would think they as our vendor, this is a significant purchase, at least for us, I would think they might be willing to delay on moving forward while we ask that some additional information and presentation be made available to the public that is so concerned about this.
- So if that's not to put the kibosh on it but asking for delay for additional information and have a full vetting of this with the public.
- I'm suggesting that might be a course of action we could take.
- Realizing that we would be in breach of contract but likelihood is that the vendor would want to accommodate at least a delay for the satisfaction of the customer.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I think maybe a good solution is put a pause on this project right now and allow for more investigation and for more public discussion.
- So our processes are organized with better disclosure and independent review of potential risks.
- Are there other alternatives?
- Could there be an opt out program with some merit to protect people now feeling threatened by this?
- I don't see there's some great urgency to moving forward, particularly with the City Attorney commenting we have a certain amount of good will and rapport with this vendor
- I think the vendor is wanting to use us as first City example for success if I remember.
- I think a pause could be in order and could be very workable.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I feel like a voice needs to be given to those who are interested in this technology.
- Who would like to have real-time monitoring of their water use.
- The inability for individual residential customers to obtain a smart meter for their electrical service is problematic for a lot of folks, they want them, and want to take advantage of time of use rates, they want to take advantage of Realtime monitoring, and that is not available to them.
- In effect it's reverse of opt out fee. They're subsidizing the opt out fee.
- I realize that's a different topic. That's the electric meter.
- But there are folks around who are interested in this technology.
- I feel like I need to at least acknowledge them in a spirit of fairness.
- That's not meant in any kind of mean spirited way in any way, shape or form, that's just when I hear.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I felt like it was at odds where Superintendent Del Prete said he called other municipalities where these were being implemented, then I just heard a Councilmember Gurney say that we were a test project.
- Those things are at odds with each other.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The meters have been implemented in other communities, those communities are the ones that he reached out to for information on that.
- The Syserco proposal for energy upgrades writ large across the City is the first one or one of their first ones.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I feel really uncomfortable defaulting on a contract that we have signed as a City.

- I also have to say that I think we have some different opinions in the room, but I heard our City Manager say maybe we could, but default of a contract doesn't feel like the right thing to do either.
- So I'm really uncomfortable with that and almost feel like we should just call a vote because I think we're a little split on this decision.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I would like to give update on the availability of smart meters in town.
- My two immediate neighbors installed solar with two different installers.
- Information came from different people and got smart meters, no problem.
- It's asking PG&E, and a lot have and have gotten them.
- So I don't understand, those who are frustrated are not asking the right way maybe, I don't know.

Mayor Slayter stated it is because of the PV systems.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- To set the record straight, I've received many phone calls from people unable to order smart meters when they want them.
- If you have a solar installation, PG&E will supply a smart meter, if you just want one, they will not.
- They have cited that the City took action to ban them and they're blaming the City, but in fact we have no part in whether a person gets a smart meter or not.
- But I can document that we've received a number of phone calls at City Hall from people complaining that PG&E will not let them have a smart meter.

Councilmember Gurey commented as follows:

- That's based on misrepresentation by PG&E using us as scapegoat.
- We have to follow the thought to the end.

**MOTION:**

Vice Mayor Hinton moved and Councilmember Rich seconded the motion to approve Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to execute a Tax-Exempt Lease Purchase Agreement (TELPA) and Related Documents for Energy Savings Contract with Signature Public Funding Corp.

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

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmembers Rich, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter

Noes: Councilmember Glass and Gurney

Absent: None

Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to execute a Tax-Exempt Lease Purchase Agreement (TELPA) and Related Documents for Energy Savings Contract with Signature Public Funding Corp.**

**Minute Order Number: 2021-328**

**Resolution Number: 6393-2021**

Council requested staff to work to answer questions and get as much information as possible to the community.

**PUBLIC HEARING(s):**



10. Public Hearing - Introduction, First Reading and consideration of Amendment to Ordinance –Planning Commission (Responsible Department: Planning Department)

Mayor Slayter opened the item and continued the item to January 4, 2022 at or after 6:00 pm. The Council was in consensus to continue to the item as requested.

**City Council Action:** Council consensus to continue the item.

**Minute Order Number:** 2021-329

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

2. City Council and City Staff Committee Assignments and Update of Sub-Committees (Planning Commission, Design Review Board, Public Arts Committee, Climate Action Committee, Zero Waste Committee) (Responsible Department: City Administration/Planning/Engineering)

**City Council Action:** None Taken. Item Continued

**Minute Order Number:** 2021-330

3. Designating Voting Delegate and Alternate(s) to Vote in the Mayor's Absence for the 2022 Sonoma County Mayors and Councilmembers City Selection Committee Meetings and Sonoma County Mayors and Councilmembers Board and General Membership Association Meetings (Responsible Department: City Administration)

**City Council Action:** None Taken. Item Continued

**Minute Order Number:** 2021-331

Due to Council Protocols, the items below were not discussed as there was not Council consensus to continue the meeting.

**CITY COUNCIL REPORTS:**

14. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports:
15. City Council Reports/Committee/Sub-Committee Meeting Reports: (Reports by Mayor/City Councilmembers Regarding Various Agency Meetings/Committee Meetings/Sub-Committee Meeting /Conferences Attended and Possible Direction to its Representatives (If Needed) on Pending issues before such Boards)
16. Council Communications Received
17. Future City Meeting Dates/Events (Informational Only): (See City Web Site for Up-to-Date Meeting Dates/Times)

**ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

December 21, 2021 City Council Regular Meeting will be adjourned to the Regular City Council Meeting of January 4, 2022 6:00 pm (ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT)

Mayor Slayter adjourned the regular City Council Meeting at 11:47 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

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

