

City Council

Mayor Una Glass
Vice Mayor Sarah Glade Gurney
Diana Gardner Rich
Neysa Hinton
Patrick Slayter

**City Manager**

Larry McLaughlin
lmclaughlin@Cityofsebastopol.org
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC
Mary Gourley
mgourley@Cityofsebastopol.org

City of Sebastopol**CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING
November 30, 2021**

As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of December 21, 2021.

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

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

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

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Glass called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley
Planning Director Kari Svanstrom
Police Chief Kevin Kilgore
Public Works Superintendent Dante Del Prete

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

STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST : There were no conflicts of interest stated.

COUNCIL PROTOCOLS FOR MEETING:

Mayor Glass 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.

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

1. Discussion and Consideration of Approval of Memorandum of Understanding for Pilot Program with Sonoma Applied Village Services (SAVS) to Operate a Temporary RV Village on City Owned Property (Requestor: Committee for Unhoused)

Mayor Glass and Councilmember Rich presented the agenda item recommending the City Council Consideration of Approval of Memorandum of Understanding for Pilot Program with Sonoma Applied Village Services (SAVS) to Operate a Temporary RV Village on City Owned Property.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- This item is coming from the Committee for the Unhoused.
- I'm going to do a little introduction about this agenda item so that the public can understand where the proposal before us came from and what we are considering here.
- Earlier in the year the City Council appointed a Committee on the Unhoused.
- That is because there were increasing issues with homelessness in our community and Councilmember Rich and I were appointed by the rest of the City Council to engage in examining options for solving and mitigating the unhoused problems that we have in our community.
- We were tasked with, first of all, overseeing our relationship with West County Community Services, with whom we have just signed a contract to engage in outreach to homeless people in our community to try and get them plugged into community services, plugged into counseling and move them into housing so that they would be off the streets and be on a pathway to happier lives.
- So that was our first task to oversee that new contract with West County Community Services.
- Our second task was to identify sources of funding to deal with the unhoused problems that we were having in our City.
- We are a tiny City. We don't have a very big budget.
- We've been looking for grant funding, for funding from the County, funding from the State and Federal government and partnerships with nonprofits to work on the issues of the unhoused in our community.
- Then in addition to that, our committee was tasked with identifying potential locations for villages or safe parking and places that the unhoused could park safely and in a contained environment.
- Then generally policies that the City would need to enact to deal with the unhoused issues that we were having in our community.
- Councilmember Rich and I were appointed to the committee and then we regularly met with City staff.
- We regularly met with West County Community Services, which is the nonprofit that has been operating Park Village, which provides a similar park situation down by the Laguna.
- They're the people that have the social worker that is doing the outreach work to unhoused people in our community.
- So as we started embarking on this, my task was to primarily working on identifying funding sources or solving some of our problems.
- Councilmember Rich spent a lot of time looking for potential sites where we could safely park people that were unhoused and have them in a more safe environment and not on our streets.
- So we embarked on this project and we were approached by SAVS, which is a nonprofit.
- We have the chair and members of the SAVS nonprofit here to talk to us about their organization.
- They approached us and they came to our City with \$368,000 in funding to operate a safe parking village and get RVs off the street into a safe parking village.
- So that money was being provided by the C.O.C., which stands for the Continuum of Care, which is a part of County government.

- They have been allocated this funding, but they needed to find a partner and a location to create this village and to work on creating a sustainable kind of model for unhoused people that are living in RVs.
- So they approached us, came to us with money.
- As a small City when a nonprofit comes to you with money, you say, whoa, they're coming to us with a potential solution and they are coming to us with funding for that solution.
- We're interested in talking with them. So we started talking with them.
- Meanwhile, we were getting a lot of complaints and upset from the community about unhoused people on Morris Street and the in that general vicinity.
- We looked for potential locations where we would be able to create the village, and the only thing that seemed financially viable at the time was looking to a City property.
- So we looked at a lot of City property, one of which was our original proposed location, which was behind Wischemann Hall and next to the Community Center.
- We spent a great deal of time examining whether that was a viable location.
- Staff did outreach to the stakeholders in that area to talk to them about a potential for doing this.
- The committee members, Councilmember Rich and I met with stakeholders and met with unhoused people on Morris Street to investigate the possibility of that location.
- As we went through that process, we found more and more that there were very big problems with that location, not the least of which it would have cost the City several hundred thousand dollars to relocate the facilities that were currently on that piece of property.
- So the City owns that property, but the Public Works Department actually stores a lot of items on that site.
- Then there were other issues to do with the location that made it seem very problematic and it would be almost impossible for us to implement a parking village on that parcel.
- So meanwhile, St. Vincent DePaul approached Councilmember Rich and said they were purchasing a property on Highway 116 and offered it as a potential location to park RVs for the unhoused.
- A lot of the intention for that parcel is to develop it into perhaps an affordable housing apartment building or something like that.
- They have other long-term plans, so this was offered as a temporary solution to the issue of unhoused people parking along the Morris Street and downtown area but actually all parts of our City.
- This would be a potential place where people could be parked in a tiny village that would involve having a fence around it, that would have services, that would have a manager that would have a social worker and that would have rules and regulations, as opposed to what is currently the case, which is people parking in various places around town on the street.
- So we began to investigate that. We had already investigated putting it at that other location and spent a great deal of time with staff and with the staff from SAVS, so the City staff and the staff from SAVS talking about what an operating plan might look like if they were to instigate a village at this location.
- Councilmember Rich has done a lot of the detail work on this and we will have a presentation from SAVS.
- I want to tell the public is that this is not a done deal.
- This is a public forum for us to discuss with you, the public, and to discuss amongst the City Council and to discuss with our potential partner here, which is SAVS, the details of whether this is a viable idea.
- So just know that the City Council must make a decision on this and this is a forum for us to discuss concerns and solutions to problems and whether this is the right direction for us to go.
- So please don't think this is already a done deal.
- We are examining whether this is the direction that we need to go and this is also as a response to direction from our entire Council to look at potential solutions and this looked like about the best potential solution out of a lot of imperfect solutions.

- So I just also have to say many of you heard me say this over and over again, but many of you are new to this forum so I will say this again.
- The unhoused problem, the homelessness problem is a problem that is not unique to Sebastopol.
- Every community is struggling with how to deal with this issue.
- The issue has to do with poverty.
- It has to do with mental health issues and it has to do with a lack of housing and affordable solutions for people that live in our county.
- As often been happening, as what's happening in a regional way is that one City, for example, Santa Rosa will have unhoused people living under a freeway or whatever.
- It reaches something of a crisis proportion and so they move everybody out.
- Then those people move and that reaches a problematic situation and then people get moved on and they move to Petaluma and then that becomes a problem and people move back to Santa Rosa.
- Then that becomes a problem and they move to Sebastopol.
- What has been going on as regional policy is kicking the can down the road.
- We have unhoused people living on streets, living under freeways, et cetera, and we have not been dealing with it in a very proactive way.
- We are part of county wide task forces that are working to try and find regional solutions to these problems.
- I know we all tend to look at these problems as only what's going on in our City, which is absolutely and completely understandable.
- But as decisionmakers, we also have to be looking at how to solve this problem in a regional way, because if we just keep moving people from one place to another, it's not solving the problem in the long-term.
- So as the City and as decisionmakers, this City Council has to decide what's the best route we can take for our City, but also how can we responsibly participate in regional solutions to the problem of homelessness.
- I completely sympathize with what a problem this is for our community.
- We can't solve the whole problem as a little tiny City in Sonoma County, California, but we can work regionally as well as within our own community to look for solutions.
- So with that, I'm going to ask Councilmember Rich to talk about the plans that SAVS has been talking about in terms of establishing this RV village.
- Then after that, we will be hearing from SAVS and they will make a presentation about what their potential plans are.
- After that Councilmember Rich and I will make a few more comments and then my colleagues will be asking questions of SAVS about their plans.
- Then we will hear something about what's on the table in terms of decision making this evening from our City manager, Larry McLoughlin.
- Then we'll open up to public comment and everyone will have a chance to make their public comment after we've heard all this information about what the proposal is and how we're going to be making our decision making.
- So after that public comment, then we will go back to deliberating what to do next.
- That's kind of the order of things that we're doing this evening.
- We apologize if we're sounding a little bureaucratic here but in trying to download a lot of information here and welcome to this process and thank you very much for attending.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I want to first recognize how encouraging it is.

- I love this town and I love the engagement and involvement that everyone here, all almost 8,000 people insist on.
- When I look at the number of people who are attending this meeting, it is very heartening.
- I'm glad that everyone is so engaged and so concerned and so willing to take their evening to be here tonight.
- I also wanted to thank all the people who have sent in their e-mails, comments and reassure them that those e-mails comments have in fact been distributed to all of us on the City Council.
- We have read all of that input and it helps us move forward as a City Council in making decisions tonight and knowing the best course to select for the town of Sebastopol.
- I also want to emphasize something that Mayor Glass said, which may not be clear to everyone, but Mayor Glass and I are the ad hoc committee that has been assigned to investigate and explore options for an RV village.
- That was the direction given us, to find an alternate location for the RV dwellings that are on Morris Street, now extending into Laguna Park Way and beyond.
- That means our fellow City Councilmembers, these other three elected people who dedicate their effort and time to serving the population here, just as Mayor Glass and I do, are really coming to all of this information at the same time that the rest of the public is coming to it.
- I say that because it should be reassuring to you. They're very well prepared.
- They always prepare, but also you'll hear they will be asking questions that are in your minds too.
- I think you'll find even though you have to wait to do public comment that they will draw out the information that might be important to you.
- Given the comments that have come in, I want you to know that I am keeping track of all of those and the SAVS representatives will keep track of all of those and will be addressing those in the future, especially from neighbors.
- Adrienne from SAVS will reinforce when they're doing their presentation, they're very collaborative.
- They already have a plan in place to reach out to the public and a tentative location and date to share information and absolute questions and make sure they adjust their plans as necessary to respond to the community's concerns.
- They want this to be successful and we've seen them in action navigating that on Morris Street.
- The other information that I might share is simply that I spent the entire time since October 27th, which is not that long ago, when the Public Works storage yard was presented as a possible site, all that time between October 27 and today looking at alternate locations.
- I did public outreach and e-mails and talked to at least seven very involved, compassionate, supportive community members, who entertained the concept of offering up private property within City limits and ultimately declined for a number of reasons, one of which was they simply were not comfortable having an RV village pilot program on their property.
- So there has been substantial effort, just so everyone knows, at looks at all these properties.
- In terms of timing, I know there's a lot of people out there who feel this is happening so quickly.
- However I'm heartened to see 140 people here at this meeting, so we have gotten some information out there.
- I want to emphasize for everyone it wasn't until Wednesday November 17 that we realized that the Public Works storage yard was really not tenable, and it was only on Thursday November 18, remember, it's only November 30 now, that we had a conversation with St. Vincent de Paul, and it wasn't until Wednesday November 24th, which is the day before Thanksgiving, that that property went into escrow.
- So we've moved as quickly as we can.
- I want to compliment SAVs for doing Door-to-Door visits over the weekend in order to reach out to people.

- We have a staff report that I'm sure City Council has reviewed.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I did want to mention one thing because I realize we didn't put this other really critical piece of information into context.
- That's that the \$368,000 that has been promised to SAVs by the County has a deadline.
- That's why this whole thing seems like it's rushing so much.
- It's because if they can't secure a site and a tentative operating agreement for that site by, I believe it's December 8th, then their money goes away.
- So this is an offer to our City of basically \$368,000 for a SAVs parking site for the RVs that are currently on the street.
- That money will remain available for a short period of time.
- If we can't come to a decision to move forward with this project, then that money goes away
- Our City does not have this kind of funding. We just do not have the money to do this.
- That is why we have gone through this process at such lightning speed and why we have been examining this opportunity.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- The staff report has a list of questions to consider at the outset, and then summaries.
- There are many attachments.
- I'd like to just take a moment to thank St. Vincent de Paul and SAVs for their contribution, their effort to contribute to a solution to the situation that we face here in Sebastopol.
- They did step up, and I think that's worth recognizing. They could have gone anywhere.
- But they chose us to try to support the four questions that really are before the City Council tonight.
- First is there are homeless emergency in the City of Sebastopol specifically on Morris Street and Laguna Park Way that should be recognized by authorizing the Mayor to execute a resolution, declaring a homeless emergency.
- So that's the first thing. Homeless emergency resolution.
- The second item focuses on the Public Works storage yard, and asks the City Council to decide, because, remember, this is for the City Council to decide.
- We're simply putting the information before the City Council as the ad hoc committee.
- So the second item is whether the Public Works storage yard is still a viable option given the concerns regarding Green Acre Homes and also regarding the cost.
- Third is whether 845 Gravenstein Highway North is a viable option, given how recently that opportunity has arisen and the relative uncertainties regarding acquisition.
- Fourth is what is the City Council's decision regarding expenses either for the Public Works storage yard or for the Gravenstein Highway North location.
- And, finally, what is the City Council's direction to staff regarding parking changes on Morris Street and Citywide?
- So those are the four questions presented to the Council.
- We do have a summary in the packet.
- We do have also numerous attachments that include historical information.
- I want to make sure everyone in the meeting is aware in addition to the City Councilmembers that there are two additional documents that were posted on the meeting page, which are, one, the proposal, updated proposal from SAVs, which mirrors the proposal made on October 27th.
- But nonetheless for those who are new to this issue, that is available on the Website.

- An updated proposal, and also a brief slide set that they will be going through to present their proposal to us tonight.
- The one piece of information that hasn't been mentioned regarding the 845 Gravenstein Highway North property in terms of timing is that escrow is scheduled to close on December 6th.
- So escrow closes December 6th. The SAVs deadline is December 8 to confirm their funding.
- The projected time for SAVs to have access to the property would be mid-December, and moving in RVs to the property would be mid-January.

Adrienne Lauby, SAVS, made a presentation to the City Council.

- A big thank you for allowing us to come and talk about our project here, and particularly to the ad hoc and the staff.
- I have watched you work so very hard on this, and I just can't tell you how much I appreciate it.
- You all are very lucky to have such amazing people on your counsel.
- And the staff has been really cordial and professional with us.
- I also want to say thank you to the Morris Street neighbors.
- We had four different meetings with the Morris Street neighbors.
- They were very well organized, had their concerns really set up clearly.
- So we had good conversations with them.
- As it turns out, we learned a lot from it, and I really hope that it wasn't too terrible.
- I've been seeing people in the room as I looked around, I saw my really old friends are in Sebastopol and are here tonight, which is really great.
- I see people I hope will become new friends.
- So, this is the second go-around.
- We gave you a presentation that has some overlap with this when we came to you to talk about the Morris Street lot.
- So, I apologize especially to the Councilmembers who've seen some of this and heard some of this before.
- But I want to give everyone as much information as I can and provided the slide show to the Council and public.

Tim Miller, WCCS, provided an update on Park Village.

- Thank you, Mayor Glass, and to the Council.
- In every single case in Sonoma County, when a community has stepped up and allowed an organization such as SAVs or West County Community Services to manage a homeless population in a managed setting, Los Guilicos, Park Village, the tent camp we had in Guerneville, crime went down.
- Neighbors stopped attending the public meeting because there was nothing to discuss.
- They've been a success in every single case in terms of crime mitigation and public nuisance.
- Park Village in partnership with the City we opened four years ago.
- We moved in ten previously homeless families in RVs into the park co-living with 18 families that have been living there for decades.
- Chief Braga told us that calls to the fire department dropped by 90% once we took over management of park village.
- There has been one police call.
- Properly managed this greatly enhances public safety, it greatly diminishes garbage created by people without homes who have no place to put their garbage.
- And, likewise, we rent the tent City in Guerneville last year in a park and ride.

- We have weekly calls with the neighbors, and in the second month they said we don't need to do these calls anymore.
- Because when there's 24/7 oversight and people are safe for the first time many of them in years, they have something to lose by acting out.
- On the street they have very little to lose.
- When they have something to lose, the vast majority want to stay, work as partners with the provider to meet community goals and their own needs.
- Park Village 31 have moved into the park previously homeless, 19 have moved on to permanent housing.
- When people feel safe, they become ready with wrap-around services to move on, get a job, in many cases, not all, but to act like something they wanted to for a long time, which is to be respected as community members and move forward with their lives.
- So, that's been the experience that we've had, and that's the experience of literally every community that's embraced something such as this.
- Applause to the City of Sebastopol for considering this.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'd just like to make sure that our City Councilmembers and the public in general are aware that there's a document that lays out a summary of the plan in a text format that includes the budget that SAVS went over.
- That's posted on our Website on the meeting page.
- But it does include just to kind of give some gravitas to some substance to the qualifications and plans that SAVS is putting forward.
- It does include details regarding their proposal, the village setup, the number of port potties, hand-washing stations, the village residence services, health and social services, emotional, physical, and life support as we've heard are really helpful in terms of not just the residents that are in the RV village but the impact on the rest of the community.
- Security, their COVID safety protocols, resident policies, and leadership.
- They have a resident management team outlined, community participation.
- You're already getting that message from Adrienne Lauby. It's very important to her. We saw her in action on Morris Street.
- The fact that she took her weekend after Thanksgiving to go out and knock door to door is really meaningful.
- Good neighbor policy, food preparation, insurance, they have program outcomes and measurements.
- I'm hoping that everyone is getting the sense that this is a very professional, organized, and prepared group that intends to make a success and has thought through the details.
- Their proposed site plan, and then the budget that we've talked about, and a site opening plan.
- So just wanted to make sure that everyone knows that that's there.
- St. Vincent de Paul is the owner.
- So now you're going to have two operators with their eyes on this site.
- So I think you're really going to have a lot of professional attention.
- The other pieces that I'd like to point out is that the goal here was to meet all of the communities.
- That means those who are in the RV village, but it also means the community at large, our businesses, the neighbors, everyone who wants to enjoy this sweet town that we live in.
- I think it's important that we all keep in mind an image of what we know is going on Morris right now and we see expanding elsewhere.
- Compare that to the vision and the real indicators, the substantial guidelines that suggest that this particular offer will be a much different environment that will serve all of our needs better, all of us.

- I wanted to identify a piece that is important for the school, which is that SAVs has specifically agreed to not allow any registered sex offenders to reside in the RV village and that they've agreed to use of an outside entity to confirm that status.
- So it will be checked.
- Wanted to make sure everyone understands this is in fact a temporary one-year urgent use.
- That's the basis upon which this can be used according to our Planning Director.
- Want to make sure that you all see the proactive way that SAVs is approaching the issues that are coming up.
- Adrienne Lauby is already in email and phone conversations with people. She's very responsive.
- She's already addressing issues like loitering, trying to ensure that the public is aware that SAVs is going to be responsive and will adjudicate and accommodate to the needs.
- She very specifically pointed out that she wanted, that SAVs wanted as a group a community oversight committee and that they expected that community oversight to include monitoring and oversight.
- So they want active engagement.
- This will be a rule-oriented place that will be safe for the people who are there, and also for the rest of our community.
- Hopefully will address all of the fears and concerns that we already are seeing out there.
- We do have details regarding the various other proposals that are within the packet.

Mayor Glass opened for questions.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I want to thank the Committee for the Unhoused for the very intense work you've done with great commitment of time in a very, very short period of time for volunteering for the responsibility in doing such thorough work.
- I want to thank our staff for supporting you, and I want to thank Adrienne the folks at SAVs and everyone involved this evening for being present and going through this conversation.
- I'm wondering if it would be helpful to organize our conversation around the five questions that are presented in the staff report.
- So, we went through first this issue is emergency, second are we still interested in the DPW site on Morris Street. Thirdly we get to what is, I think, the bigger discussion point tonight is how are we going to or what all do we want to say about the 845 North Gravenstein proposal.
- Then there are two other questions beyond that.
- I could kind of scatter a whole lot of questions and fire them out at people but I think it would be a little disorienting if we bounced around like that.
- So I'm going to ask would that serve the committee well in what you need from the Council tonight?
- Do you think it would serve the public well if we went one, two, three, and then took public comment and then four and five and took more public comment?

The Council discussed the following questions:

1. Is there a homeless emergency in the City of Sebastopol, specifically on Morris Street and Laguna Park Way that should be recognized by authorizing the Mayor to execute a Resolution Declaring a Homeless Emergency?
2. Is the PW Storage Yard still a viable option, given the concerns regarding Greenacre Homes, specifically as expressed by the Sonoma County Juvenile Justice Commission?
3. Is 845 Gravenstein Highway North a viable option, given how recently that opportunity has arisen and the relative uncertainties regarding acquisition?

4. What is the City Council's decision regarding expenses for either the PW Storage Yard option or a lease obligation for 845 Gravenstein Highway North?
5. What is the City Council's direction to Staff regarding parking changes on Morris Street and City-wide?

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Explained the process for the agenda item
- Suggested taking the first three items for discussion and then take public comment

Is there a homeless emergency in the City of Sebastopol, specifically on Morris Street and Laguna Park Way that should be recognized by authorizing the Mayor to execute a Resolution Declaring a Homeless Emergency?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The purpose of having this resolution, the declaration of a homeless emergency is to justify the actions that the Council may take later this evening.
- So as to set forth the findings that the Council would make to determine whether there is a homeless emergency.
- And, as I said, it would justify the actions being taken later.
- So, the declaration itself contains the elements that in findings which you need to make to do that.
- It's in the resolution form as are a number of whereas clauses. The whereas clauses support and detail the facts that justify that there is a homeless emergency and the resolution clauses then state that there is such an emergency.
- I won't go through each one of them. I think it's pretty apparent there is a homeless emergency.
- But the reason for this is to provide the factual basis for actions the Council may take later.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- I have a question directly related to what our City Manager/Attorney just noted.
- I'm trying to understand what the declaration for a local emergency provides for tangibly.
- It seems as though the Council would be able to take any of the other topics up and act or not act as a body without that.
- I'm trying to understand the nexus between one and the other.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- We've been advised to make sure that legally we have made the requisite findings that will support the later actions.
- So if they are ever questioned, the Council's made a formal determination that there is a homeless emergency.
- So, it's in, in an exercise of caution.
- I would tend to agree with you, Councilmember but the facts basically speak for themselves in that these actions are justified without the resolution primarily because this is by our zoning laws.
- This is actually a permitted use on the site.
- However we've been advised to exercise caution and declare a homeless emergency along with it.
- It also could be argued that we have already done so in our previous declaration again in an exercise of caution we thought it prudent for the Council to adopt the resolution this evening as well.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- I know that Santa Rosa has declared an emergency.

- That Santa Rosa's declared a homeless emergency.
- Are there other counties as well or has the county proper?

Director Svanstrom commented as follows:

- I do believe others have declared them.
- So, if you dial back the clock to 2018, the State of California released what was called H.E.A.P., homeless emergency action plan funding part of Senate Bill 2 that was passed to provide funding for housing and homeless initiatives to take advantage of that H.E.A.P. funding, a City needed to declare a homeless emergency.
- So I believe there are actually a number of cities that did submit applications as one of those requirements.
- We did that.
- We were actually granted \$142,000 to install two of the RV pads and utilities at park village that was spoken about earlier.

Councilmember Slayter commented does a local emergency declaration, does that not need to be renewed or revisited every 60 days to remain in force?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented yes, that's set forth in the resolution itself.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- If we do this declaration of emergency, we're potentially more successful in funding opportunities.
- I think the answer is yes.
- It is acknowledging that it is helpful for any future funding.

Staff stated that is correct.

Is the PW Storage Yard still a viable option, given the concerns regarding Greenacre Homes, specifically as expressed by the Sonoma County Juvenile Justice Commission?

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Let's move on to the next question, which is, is the Public Works storage yard still a viable option given the concerns regarding Green Acre Homes, specifically as expressed by the county juvenile justice commission?
- So, this is a part of why we determined that that previous location wasn't viable.
- We had comments from the juvenile justice commission because the location shared a property line with a home for juvenile residents.
- So, that was one of the issues and another issue was the costs involved with doing it.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Along with what you mentioned, there was also the financial factor that the cost to clear that particular site, which is used for multiple purposes, including buyer Public Works personnel was quite large, significantly more than any amount the City might be contributing or using for the present proposal, as well as it was problematic for other reasons, due to it being in the flood plain as well as near to or adjacent to the Laguna area.
- So it was presented California Environmental Quality Act issues as well as practical issues with regard to evacuation plans and the like.

- There's a whole list of other reasons I could go into why that site had problems identified with it.
- At the time we were reviewing that site, we really had no other viable site to compare it to once we had a viable site to compare it to, there really was no comparison.
- From the perspective of the facts I just enumerated, the Gravenstein Highway site is far superior.
- Any City funding towards the Gravenstein Highway site is backup to what is a fully budgeted, fully paid for proposition.
- The staff is exploring if required to contribute money towards that site the use of our housing funds.
- And we believe we have a way that we could utilize housing funds which would require some discussion with St. Vincent de Paul specific to that issue.
- But that is strictly the backup plan because the budget you're looking at fully funds this without City contribution.
- I don't recall that we had actually identified a source of funding for the Morris Street behind Wischemann Hall site.
- I don't know where that money would come from, and I am hoping that question's moot.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I just wanted to add to that conversation is that I think there's children everywhere in the City.
- So, for me, that's not a driving force that we did have some opposition.
- We obviously are going to have opposition no matter what site we choose.
- But the costs in our small City budget kind of lean in one direction or the other because that was a much more expensive site.
- When we moved forward on that, we did not have any of those estimates.
- So, I just wanted to add that as a comment, I'm not as concerned about that specific opposition as listed in the staff report, but the cost, I think, is a consideration.

Councilmember Rich commented I'm wondering if we could instead focus on the funding implication of this particular Public Works storage yard item before we move on to discussing the funding issues related to the Gravenstein North property.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- My question is just a general one.
- Do we have recommendations from either the unhoused or the budget subcommittee where the funds would come from if we're making a contribution?
- If you don't want to answer that question, that's fine, go on to the next

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I think that part of this is actually relevant.
- I can see Vice Mayor Gurney's thought thread here, I think, which is the Gravenstein Highway location versus the Morris Street location.
- The Gravenstein Highway location, that are shows it fully funded.
- It is not involving funding, hopefully provided we get the approvals, which we very strongly expect that we will, that that will be fully funded, not out of the City.
- The other location, which is the Morris Street behind Wischemann Hall location, the big expense there was actually moving the things that we currently have in the yard.
- So the same funding would apply except for the City was going to be providing the site improvements, the fencing, and most expensively moving the stuff that's there now to another location, which turned out to be well over \$100,000.

- So, that means that that location rather than being fully funded, that location would cost us well over \$100,000.
- So, that's the comparison between those two things.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I have a variety of budget questions but I'm going to keep them right now what I think is on task about what we're discussing and that is the overall site.
- So I wanted to verify the new dates I saw on the budget now go through December 31st, 2022.
- This will be a one-year Jan to December.
- Did I hear SAVs when they presented say we think we have it secured.
- SAVs says they're going to count on us to bring the money home.
- I think specifically it really what's in question.
- My question is, even though we think when would we know, and then, secondly, can we do this project if we don't get that \$80,000 without the City funding it?

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- That \$80,000 is proposed to come from some general fund money that the County allocated in the CDC's budget.
- The CDC has \$2 million allocated in their budget of discretionary spending.
- This is my understanding. Discretionary spending for emergency housing kinds of things.
- It's unallocated and there are various projects.
- So I called our supervisor and asked our supervisor if she knew of any funding and she said yes.
- She sent a letter to the head of the CDC asking for that \$80,000 in funding.
- So, that would still have to be approved by the CDC, but there is an ask letter from our supervisor.
- There is an ask from us, and it is sounding positive.
- But we won't know the final on that for at least a week.
- So, I believe it's a week, but I may be wrong because there may have to be a commission meeting about it. So, some time in December we would know.
- But that's where that money's coming from.
- That \$80,000 is an ask of the CDC general fund budget that is specifically for emergency housing like this.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- If I could, the specific answer to Councilmember Hinton's question in which I think is important for direction to staff also is what if in the very unlikely circumstance given the detailed description you've provided, what if it falls through. The answer is that the obligation is the City's.
- That's what's outlined in the MOU.
- And, so, as staff looks at this situation, it's likely without having a proposal for a specific fund based on what our City Manager has described to us that we would be looking at dipping into reserves even more than we have until now.
- And, so, that would be the safety net we've been reassured by staff that they would do their best to look at other funds, for instance, our affordable housing fund might be an opportunity.
- But Mayor Glass and I are very solid in our insistence that we are in a tough situation from a budgetary perspective.
- We are now as one small town actually doing something within West Sonoma County.
- All we need is \$80,000 from our supervisors to get this done.
- We don't feel that we should have to dip into our City funds.

- But we understand that the staff would need some direction and that direction would probably be reserves.
- But personally I don't see it happening.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- In our original proposal from SAVs, there was two budgets.
- There was the minimum budget and then the recommended budget.
- And our Council was going for the minimum budget.
- Now I'm only seeing one budget from SAVs.
- That's why I'm saying would we have to step up with that \$80000 if I look at the difference on the budget from before, it was about \$80,000.
- So, is this the superstar, homeless encampment for 600k now?
- Or if we didn't get that \$80000
- As a Councilmember, I would be saying maybe we need to sharpen our pencil a little bit before we just go for, you know, this differential.
- I don't see the double budgets in this budget now which of course if we get all the free money, that's great.
- Are we tonight committing to 600k no matter what?
- That's really at the end of the day my bottom-line question.

SAVS commented as follows:

- The reason why there's \$80,000 left has nothing to do with the prior budget.
- The timing that restricts how the funds can be used is what's causing this new gap.
- So, what you're actually getting is significantly more services brought to Sebastopol with actually quite a bit larger budget.
- But that's because the timing was that the \$368000 will be pulled up earlier by, like, because of who's giving the money and their timing on their books.
- There was additional funds that we brought in.
- But those funds also need to run out by September.
- And so then there's a gap till the end of the year.
- Actually you're getting a lot more and a lot more money's coming to the program.
- There's just this timing that's causing it.
- If we were allowed to stretch it we would stretch it but we are not allowed to stretch it.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I think it's worth pointing out also we're losing sight of an important player, contributor in this math equation. That's St. Vincent de Paul.
- They stepped in to purchase the property. They need their cost covered for that year that SAVs will be operating this RV village on that site.
- That's part of the deal.
- St. Vincent de Paul was clear with us that they wanted the City of Sebastopol to have some contribution toward this effort.
- They wanted the City of Sebastopol to be contributing some portion, and their suggestion was that the City of Sebastopol would cover the lease amount, the caring costs.
- So Mayor Glass, being very creative and politically astute, went to the County to see if that could be covered.

- But St. Vincent de Paul is going to be the owner of the property and they do get to drive some of the decision making here.
- That was the piece that they presented to us.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I felt that my Council colleagues would not be very excited about spending a lot more money because we already have been doing as a community so much.
- But this seemed like an unusual opportunity, since it was a large amount of funding coming in mitigating this problem.
- So, I thought we need to see if the County will step up to the plate.
- So I called and asked and I did get a commitment of advocacy.
- So, I do believe we will get that funding.
- But one never knows. Things can go wrong, but I am expecting that we get it.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I do want to point out that just framing it we're looking at options here.
- We have a bad situation on Morris Street, it's not safe, it's not healthy for any of us, neither the people on Morris Street nor the rest of our community.
- It would've cost a lot of money to move forward with the Public Works yard if we just look at it, from a financial perspective.
- The estimate is I think \$130,000 to over \$200,000.
- We're now looking at \$60,000 as a commitment for the lease amount.
- We have in the budget \$80,000 but the lease commitment and the MOU is \$60,000.
- That is substantially less. There's no perfect solution.
- So just to put it out there from a money perspective, I think we have an opportunity that is the best solution in a series of not-perfect solutions.

The Council was in consensus that Option 2 (Public Works Storage Yard) was not a viable option.

Mayor Glass opened for specific questions about SAVS proposal.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- My question is about how the City published this item tonight, the SAVs' proposal, what notice was given.
- I know it's kind of problematic for Councilmembers to receive a complicated new proposal with a new site just before a holiday, I imagine the public has the same challenge.
- Because we're dealing with something really important in a very intense time line even if there weren't a holiday.
- So I just wanted to check in for my peace of mind and also so the public know what's notice was given of this hearing, please.
- Generally, there's 500 feet around a particular space when it's a land use issue.

City Manager/City Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- This is not an item that required the notice that you referenced, Vice Mayor Gurney
- That notice was not given.
- Those were automatically given by the planning department in situations where the zoning code requires notification to neighbors.

- However, as was alluded to earlier, there was quite an outreach program begun in earnest a few days ago that's already occurring.
- And there's been a lot of publicity to this, even an article in the Press Democrat.
- At the same time, I feel very confident that the people that needed to learn of this proposal have been informed about it.
- We have at the present time almost 150 people on this call, and I recognize a number of them.
- So I believe what I've said is correct.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I also would just like to re-ask Councilmember Rich, and maybe I can say something to restate the reason why this happened at such hyper warp speed.
- Why did this happen so darn fast, which I think a lot of the public is pretty frustrated with.
- Frankly, so are we because we were still trying to get this report out and deal with this like I was supposed to be grocery shopping and dealing with Thanksgiving, and we were trying to get out to the public as fast as possible.
- And it had to do with how rapidly St. Vincent de Paul made the offer and then how rapidly we had to put together a report about the offer to the rest of the Council.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- This whole experience has been moving really quickly.
- So, Wednesday before Thanksgiving, which is less than a week ago, is when the property went into escrow.
- So, that was the point at which St. Vincent de Paul had control of the property and had an escrow closing date.
- So Wednesday before Thanksgiving that's when we learned that it was a reliable deal.
- It was only the Thursday before that this had even been presented as an option.
- But Wednesday before Thanksgiving escrow closes.
- Then on that Wednesday, City staff actually posted the staff report well in advance of Brown Act rules.
- As soon as we are humanly possible to get it done, we were really eager.
- We've done all the drafts. The only way a staff report can get done that quickly is if we're prepared with the various drafts. So we posted it.
- We also, some of you probably know, there was an eblast that went out from the City that was specifically on this topic that went out to the entire enewsletter list.
- That same day or the next day. So that went out, Wednesday, Thursday.
- Then the weekend we have our SAVs representative Adrienne Lauby out knocking on doors and speaking to people, which I think has a lot to do with the engagement that we have here.
- I also have to say that this morning I got up, and I posted a detailed report update on my City Council Website.
- I distributed that information to the 350 people who were on my email list.
- There is also an email list for those people who want to be informed of City Council meetings specifically.
- I will say that it's an amazing town where from those knocking on the doors and those emails people passed around information.
- I got emails from all the businesses on 116 who had been handed notices by various interested parties.
- So, don't want to go on, we did our best, and we will continue to do that outreach.
- SAVs is on board, has set up a tentative meeting at community church, is moving forward.
- The engagement will continue.

- It's just starting now.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I just have to add on to, this is highly unusual for government to do anything at hyper warp speed.
- Really we would not be doing it at hyper warp speed if it were not for funding.
- If we knew that funding was that same amount of funding was going to be available in March, then we would move through and have community engagement.
- We would have lots of town hall meetings.
- We would do all kinds of things if we weren't under pressure of, do you want the \$368,000 or not?
- Because that is actually money that's coming through the CoC, but it's from HUD, and it's on a specific Federal Year, and it has to be spent by specific dates or the county loses the money.
- So that's why we're in the boat we're in.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I have some specific questions as requested on this on SAVs budget.
- But I did also want to say for the public I was guilty of not opening the email till Sunday.
- I had no idea that we were looking at a second site.
- Because of Brown Act rules, we can't talk
- So I'm also kind of reeling.
- But trying to stay on task, I had some questions about the budget specifically.
- So I'm just going to list those and SAVS can address them.
- I heard them say in the proposal. I think it's page 9 of our packet about security that they provide security for the first 30 to 60 days and usually after the site gets established, they don't need necessarily security, but I'm curious about the fencing.
- So, does the fencing stay up, or is the fencing also -for that 30 to 60 days?
- So, that's question 1.
- Question 2 is we a number of money in the budget for the food program.
- I know from our Homekey project that we really were able to support our local merchants around the area.
- But I also see in the proposal under food preparation that it indicates partnerships with Redwood Empire Food Bank, which is a great organization.
- I'm just wondering if the food money is going to funnel somehow into our local community with either our local grocers or our local series or something.
- So I want to know how that food is going to be handled.
- Discussed RVs and cars. It says zero cars and 20 RVs, but when I drive down Morris, there's obviously people living in their cars.
- I can see that maybe there's a strategy to bring RVs in first because they would house more people.
- Is there really, even though it says RVs and cars throughout the proposal, there are still zero cars listed.
- Are cars not going to be allowed? If that's true, why are we saying cars and RVs?

SAVS commented as follows:

- So on the security, the 30 to 60 days and fencing, the fencing will stay.
- That's an improvement to the property.
- Right now St. Vincent de Paul is putting that in.
- We're looking at adding more solid protection to that chain link fence to better block views mostly for the neighbors.

- So fencing will stay.
- That's a permanent improvement for St. Vincent de Paul over the years.
- On the food program it's quite a small number, it comes out to \$2.34 a day.
- And, so, could we make a commitment to spending it locally? I guess, but it's not a money.
- That's over a full year with a lot of people. And it's our program to not spend money on food because we're trying to enforce dignity and independence.
- So we're trying to have people get their own food, make their own food.
- So, there's not even a lot of money to pump into a local business on that but certainly we can keep an eye on that.
- Redwood Empire Food Bank does give us our food for free.
- Cars versus RVs. So our concept is a car and RV village.
- The negotiations that we have done with Mayor Glass and Councilmember Rich is to support the RVs specifically.
- So right now we're not planning on adding cars straightforward.
- There is room. We probably have the capacity but the plan right now is the commitment is 20 RVs and support that.
- Some of these RVs also have transportation vehicles that go with them. And there is room for parking.
- So, I don't know how much you've looked at the site, but there is kind of a parking area in the front.
- And then there are a bunch of bushes and a fence. And that's where the RVs are all behind the bushes and the fence, but there's a parking lot in the front where transportation vehicles can go.
- We will have a place for transportation vehicles.
- So there might be some cars on site for people that own them.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- That makes complete sense to me.
- Thank you for those responses.
- If we can get all 20 RVs from local preference Sebastopol, then great.
- But if we can't, then I'm cool with the car.
- So just wanted to add that.
- Local preference for our homeless is my top priority.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- SAVs has been very clear, the community was very clear in messages to the ad hoc committee.
- It's clear in the comments from the City Council in the past that there was a need to make this an RV village that served Sebastopol's unhoused.
- I just want to make sure that everyone understands that SAVs has implemented a plan already to identify those who have been in Sebastopol based on seniority, and to provide spots based on seniority.
- In other words, newbies are not welcomed.
- It's the people who have become part of our community as a result of their presence here.
- That was a big dedication.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- A couple of questions about 845 specifically.
- The existing building is 684 square feet built in 1951.
- Is there any knowledge about what St. Vincent de Paul's plan is for that existing building, at least for the proposal of the one-year period of time?

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I had a conversation with our building official Steve Brown about that particular structure and also a conversation with our fire chief.
- But the chief referred me to Steve Brown.
- My question to him was, number one, is the building unsafe?
- And, number two, related, would he be requiring that the building be demolished because of safety issues?
- His observes were, number one, basically, well, I wouldn't use it, it's in really cruddy shape.
- But when it came down to safety, he said the building is safe, it can safely be used.
- And what St. Vincent de Paul, their representative said to me was that they would probably intend on using it cleaning it up, spiffing it up, and would talk to SAVs about whether they would be able to allow SAVs to use it because St. Vincent de Paul needs time to improve it.

Councilmember Slayter commented I suppose the summary there is that, yes, it's supposed to stay with whatever cleanup and improvements would be needed probably fairly minimally.

Councilmember Rich stated that is the understanding.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- The proposal is if escrow proceeds as proposed, that it would close and that St. Vincent de Paul would own the property mid-December, and that SAVs might be able to start using if this goes through, if this is an approved process by mid-January.
- And going back to concerns about the existing building -- the existing site in 1951, and I don't have the record in front of me about how many times it's changed hands but the fact that it is such an underdeveloped parcel with one small building on it leads me to believe that it has been an alternate use service station land use since its inception, since its original development.
- Therefore my hunch is that the infrastructure is incredibly lacking, and that waste that supply, that electrical service are all significantly undersized for the proposal.
- What's the plan for all those things? And that's a really important component.
- I know how impacted the skilled trades are right now.
- I also know that this is on a state route.
- If it requires any of those things you're dealing with both Caltrans and an upgrade for the electrical system, which involves dealing with PG&E.
- I have worked fairly significantly a number of times with each of those entities.
- Neither one is very rapid when it comes to these kinds of projects.
- There is no way it happens before the middle of January.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I could just say that we have had discussions about the infrastructure with our Public Works director.
- He did determine how big the sewer lateral was.
- He's doing a camera review of it in the next few days.
- He did say something about the size of it and was it would be able to serve
- We did actually have some discussions about that.
- So, not being the construction person that you are, I'm going to ask SAVs if they can respond to those questions.

SAVS commented as follows:

- We don't know the condition of everything. But we are setting up a village that's independent of infrastructure.
- So we'll have porta potties.
- We will have propane for power. And we will then be working as quickly as we can to integrate live power because that's a much better solution.
- There's no generators, there's none of that.
- So we don't need it for day one, but it will be approved alongside with St. Vincent as we can we'll take advantage of it.
- We'll have portable bathrooms, portable showers, portable everything until we can integrate with the infrastructure.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Specifically the electrical system at the Morris Street site was a significant issue for me.
- To have generators running for 10, 12, 14 hours a day, that is not a restful situation for anybody.
- Certainly not the neighbors, certainly not the residents.
- That's an untenable situation.
- So I think those are quick questions that need to be answered more than we hope and wish and intend.
- And honestly, that would be for the property owners in a lot of ways.
- So my final thing at this point will be a question about the, let's see, the zoning code.
- I looked up the zoning. This is general commercial.
- And there are a number of uses that are permitted by right, rather than by permit.
- This would not be a conditional use this is a permitted use which means no variances, to special permissions are needed to use the property in this way.
- And I think this would probably fall under our zoning code definition as a homeless shelter.
- For everybody's knowledge, the actual verbiage means a residential facility operated by a provider which provides temporary accommodations to persons or families with low income for a period of generally, not more than six months.
- Such use may also provide meals, counseling and other services as well as common area or users of the facility.
- Such facility may have individual rooms but is not developed with individual dwelling units.
- So the last part of that leads me to think the intent under this definition is a structure, a building, a facility, not something like an RV village.
- However, I think the first part is well within that definition.
- The one that got my attention was generally not more than six months.
- My reading of that is that is for the residents.
- That's not how long the facility can be in use.
- That would be absurd.
- What is the time frame, or is there, for a planning department, is that the intended definition or interpretation of the zoning ordinance in regard to this property?
- And then for SAVS and the operators, what is the time frame for a resident?
- If it is longer than six months, are we okay with that under the zoning ordinance back staff?

Director Svanstrom commented as follows:

- Yes, I have looked at this.
- My analysis didn't make it into the staff report because of the holiday week.

- I do concur that the homeless shelter definition is what this would be classified as.
- RVs are generally not fully independent dwelling units, as you just heard said, the communal areas, Port-A-Potties and all that infrastructure for them.
- The, in terms of generally not more than six months, I think that, to me that is intended not to be a permanent homeless shelter operating 24/7 for, you know, a permanent structure for many, many years.
- In this case, it is temporary, for 12 months.
- To me that still means generally a temporary use.
- Oftentimes these are, we put out fires and actually, I believe the fires for the winter shelter that's various shelters operate.
- In case, they are six to eight months or so because they're only during the winter times.
- This certainly does fit under that definition.
- And you're correct, it is a permitted use in our zoning ordinance for this zone.
- So that means, as we discussed before, there is no public hearing required for it.
- It would normally require a planning commission hearing.
- So this was done from a community church, it's in a different zone and that did require a use permit.
- And we had a meeting with the planning commission, permitted uses are still required to follow the municipal code and the zoning ordinance.
- And I have discussed with the committee the setbacks from adjacent properties.
- 20 feet from the rear.
- It sounds like they would be doing that along the sides as well from many RV structures.
- And yes, there is an ordinance for the generator noise.
- That's a good question to be answered.

Councilmember Slayter commented do you have any expectation about length of stay for these potential residents.

SAVS commented as follows:

- We are committed to these residents.
- We're not necessarily, I think what we're hearing is that we should plan for 12 months.
- After that, we'll be starting very quickly after we get into the site to look at what comes next.
- Like I say, we're not planning to be on this site beyond the 12 months at this point.
- We'll see what happens. Our commitment is to the residents.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I really appreciate Councilmember Slayter's questions and bringing the zoning ordinance to mind.
- I have some legal questions for our City Attorney, and I'm hoping the City attorney can make some sense of what I'm asking and what I'm worrying about.
- Two items. First of all, what happens if SAVs and St. Vincent DePaul have a conflict?
- What is the City's position in that situation?
- The secondary question is, does this proposal have any impact on the contract we have with West County Community Services?
- I don't know of any contact with West County Community Services.
- They were going to be engaged more if we were down on Morris Street potentially.
- But in a new location, they'll continue with the work that they have been contracted to do as contracted.
- First question, a confusing one for me.
- What happens if there's a conflict between land owner and the tenant on the property?

- Where is the City if we have an MOU?

City Manager/City Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- That's a really good question. Because SAV will be a tenant themselves with respect to St. Vincent DePaul.
- We have an MOU and operating agreement, suppose theoretically, as in this would never happen.
- It could be that SAV would be in violation of the operating agreement if they can't come to terms with the owner of the property.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented I think what you're telling me is, not only that conflicts like that are not likely to rise, but if they did, the City wouldn't have any role in the resolution of the conflict or any liability.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- We have a role in lots of things. I always offer my services.
- I currently would do that in this particular case.
- But again, theoretically, the only recourse theoretically would be the operating agreement between the City.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- A couple things regarding West County Community Services.
- The fortunate piece here is that West County Community Services is already working very cooperative with SAVs expects to continue that relationship.
- Their contract is to serve all the unhoused within the City.
- So those unhoused in the RV village are still within the City of Sebastopol.
- So there was discussion, for instance, if an individual in the RV village is needing, is going to be evicted, worst-case scenario, they'll try not to have that happen.
- But in that event, SAVs representatives would be in touch with Jennifer Lake From West County Community Services who is our full time person, outreach person, and she would be working to find another eternal I have the location for that person.
- So they have committed to working together.
- In terms of what happens if the relationship between the St. Vincent DePaul and SAVs falls apart, it is really hard to imagine that ever happening.
- But we have to remember that St. Vincent DePaul is perfectly capable of operating at an RV village if need be.
- They are operating.
- Our commitment and their commitment is to SAVs but, so it is really hard for me to even imagine but just putting it out there.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I was realizing, Councilmember Rich, that we talked about an aerial map of the location of the property and showing relative where it is to the trail and relative to where it is in the neighborhood.
- I'm thinking that might be a good thing to share so the public and our colleagues fully understand the location. Because when you're just driving by things, you don't always quite get where it is.

Councilmember Rich displayed the aerial map and commented as follows:

- If you look at that location and track where the bike trail is, and also, track the location of the Charter School, that should help people understand the orientation of this particular location in reference to the bike trail and the Charter School.
- And that's important because there was some concern.
- There was some confusion that we saw in comments about the proximity of this proposed site to Sebastopol Charter School, and to the bike trail.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I think that's really helpful and makes people really understand the location.
- There were some misunderstandings by the public thinking it was immediately adjacent to the trail, to the Charter School, and actually, Councilmember Rich, I think you measured the distance from the Charter School.
- So it's not immediately adjacent.

Councilmember Rich commented I did a Google map from one place to the other and it said a half mile.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- With that I think we agreed we would go through questions 1, 2, and 3 before we took public comment.
- So number 3, is it a viable option given how recently that opportunity has arisen and the relative uncertainties regarding acquisition?
- So the relative uncertainty regarding acquisition is that escrow doesn't close until the 6th or the 7th.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Escrow is scheduled to close December 6th.
- This offer as I understand it is an all cash offer.
- It is not conditioned on examinations of the property or any sort of due diligence.
- There are the question marks that might occur if this was a formal lending arrangement.
- My understanding is that it is being privately funded. And through a cash offer.
- So that provides some additional security and certainty for us.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- That brings us back to the question, is this a viable location?
- So I think what we can talk about is, first of all, we're looking at a project that is we believe 100% funded.
- But we don't know that absolutely for sure yet.
- We believe that this, the location will close escrow on the 6th.
- And we believe that SAVs and St. Vincent DePaul will have a lease agreement in place once the property closes escrow.
- So that leaves us with a question of what are the other variables?

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- Going back on my time machine, this is a parcel that had, I suppose it would be a question for a planning director.
- This is a parts that he will had a mixed use development that was through design review, and had basic entitlements in place, and then for economic reasons, was shelved?

Director Svanstrom commented as follows:

- That is correct

- It was both commercial and residential
- It was 11 units and then three commercial spaces that totaled just over 12,000 square feet.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- I remember, the Council discussed briefly.
- There was a developer from Southern California who was interested in this parcel for a potential cannabis dispensary.
- The Council talked about that. Probably a couple years ago. In that time frame.
- I don't think there were ever any proposals but I had conversations over the years with interested parties.
- One was looking at an auto parts store.
- Another was looking at another use that I think probably would have had some question marks popping over residents' heads.
- So this is a parcel of interest for a lot of people.
- So I appreciate that we have 143 folks now in attendance.
- I'm looking forward to hearing public comment.

Mayor Glass called for a break at 8:20 pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:31 pm.

Chris Grabill, SVDP was in attendance and commented as follows:

- Full disclosure, Jack Tibbetts has been the lead on this acquisition as the E.D.
- I am the director of housing and shelter services for St. Vincent.
- My focus is the NCS shelter sites and the current home key application for our motel redevelopment.
- So I apologize if I don't have the same level of detail that Jack would have.
- He did have to step out to go to his City Councilmember for the City of Santa Rosa.
- So he apologizes.
- I can certainly answer some questions that Jack has briefed me on.
- I was able to visit the site yesterday and I'll do my best.

Councilmember Slayter commented the first question is regarding the existing building and any particular plans for that existing building?

Mr. Grabill commented as follows:

- We don't have a current plan for that existing building.
- It is something that we would discuss with SAVs and the City of Sebastopol.
- We were interested to hear more from the building official and the fire Marshal, what the potential uses could be but that could be something that we would want to discuss with SAVs And your City staff to see what that would be.
- We don't see any glaring problems with the building.
- It just needs a good makeover or clean-up.
- We aren't aware of any significant issues with the building in terms of health and safety.
- As you know better than most.
- Those can change if there is discovery.
- We have not been made aware of any of that so far.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- So some of my other questions were answered by SAVs in the way that the site will function.

- Portable shower, restroom facilities, and also, a portable kitchen.
- I see that on the site plan that was provided in the supplemental information from SAVs.
- So waste water, that doesn't sound like a significant issue.
- Fresh water supply is probably a little easier to deal with.
- Clearly fresh water will be needed and I appreciate that you may not have any of these answers.
- Also the electrical service.
- My hunch is that the local part of our electric grid in the City is probably undersized in regard to the site.
- Certainly for this number of residents.
- And those types of upgrades can take significant time to install.
- So any information you have about any of those things, that would be interesting to note.
- If you don't know, that's also appreciated.

Mr. Grabill commented as follows:

- So I know very little about the existing service capacity
- It was one of my bullet points when doing the debriefing with the Executive Director Tibbetts about this yesterday.
- As you mentioned, doing another transformer upgrade or a power redesign from PG&E.
- They make you use their own engineers and it can be lengthy.
- What we would say and I think SAVs is very well versed in this.
- In an interim period, we would be able to operate safely and effectively with, for instance, when we first got there, we did not have grid power. We didn't have sewer. We did not have water.
- We were still able to open within essentially 14 days of that being moved forward.
- So I think where there's a will, there is a way to get it done safely.
- We're certainly exploring all of those options and the realities of those time lines in terms of connection to the grid and those sorts of things.

Mayor Glass opened public comment.

Kate Haug commented as follows:

- I have a few questions that have not been addressed.
- The first is what happens if SAVs can only transition 10 out of the 35 residents into housing by the end of 2022?
- What is the exit strategy at the end of 2022 when the funding runs out?
- Will the citizens of Sebastopol be liable for housing the people who don't transition to permanent housing?
- My next question is, how many people who live on Morris Street and Laguna Park Way have committed to moving to this RV village?
- What happens to those who decide they don't want to move to the RV village?
- Will they remain on Morris Street and Laguna Park Way or be able to move to other parts of Sebastopol because we don't have any Citywide restrictions on RV parking?
- Will we end up with people who refuse service in our neighborhoods and around the parks?
- Are there any sobriety requirements?
- Can residents have visitors?
- If SAVs has been working on Morris Street for more than a year, how many people have they transitioned into permanent housing?

- It seems if they've been working with this community in this area and they were good at transitioning people into permanent housing, our homeless community would have not expanded during the last year.
- Last December, we converted our only downtown hotel to homeless housing.
- This December we're in a homeless emergency.

John Marian commented as follows:

- Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I just wanted to address a couple things.
- I live very close to where this is.
- I just drove to taco bell to pick up something to eat.
- The trail is less than a mile which you were talking about. It's not a half mile. It's a half mile from my own house.
- I've worked in San Francisco the past 23 years. Very familiar with homelessness.
- It tends to bring a lot of things. Mainly trash, drug abuse and substance abuse.
- How will the Council handle excessive litter, excessive feces and drug abuse that will likely spill over to the trail?
- To the adjacent school? And to the neighborhoods nearby?
- It is something to weigh.
- It is easy to pay \$600,000. I could pay \$600,000 right now and buy the land.
- It is much harder to continue to shepherd that community.
- And I don't think the City of San Francisco has gotten a handle on it in 23 years, they haven't gotten a handle on it.
- I'm not sure Sebastopol will be able to do it.
- I hope you've thought it through.
- Because the problem is, you actually open yourself to liabilities.

Mia Del Prete commented as follows:

- I'm here to speak against the movement of the homeless from the Morris Street to the property on Highway 116.
- Although I am very unhappy with the conditions on Morris Street, I am fully against this move.
- The agenda did not have any back-up information for me to review, so I appreciate the presentation that was provided tonight.
- My question to the Council are as follows.
- What happens to the camp after the year of funning?
- Will the City become responsible for funding the camp after the funding goes away?
- Will the City be legally permitted to close the camp once it has been established?
- It still isn't clear where the additional vehicles will be allowed to park.
- Will there be no overnight parking signs placed along Highway 116 and in the business parking lots?
- What will happen to the homeless that refuse to move to the new location?
- I am deep will he concerned for the safety and security of the businesses and neighborhoods in the area.
- Will our police department have the resources to respond to complaints about the camp?
- There's only about three months of security allocated in the budget that we saw this evening.
- What is your man for continued security?
- I respectfully request that you do not move forward with a yes vote.
- You don't even have confirmation that you will receive the \$80,000 from the County.
- Regardless of the funding, it is not prudent for you to take action so quickly based on the unanswered questions the lack of funds, and the impact on our businesses and neighborhoods.

Mark commented as follows:

- My comments are pretty simple.
- We have not managed Morris Street well at all.
- For some reason, the police department has not been given the power to even enforce the most basic rules. The laws.
- I happen to go to a gym nearby every day. And I see, early, early in the morning, and I see drug deals being done almost every day. A car drives up. Somebody drives out. They do a deal and they go on.
- Then the trash. If my neighborhood if I left trash out like that, I would get a citation almost immediately.
- So I can't understand, how can we go to a new location when we haven't managed our existing location well at all?
- I'm part of, how would you propose to keep the street problem that currently exists from reappearing?
- Say you move some people over here?
- All these questions are being raised.
- When are the answers going to be given to all these really good questions before you vote on something that you're hearing with a lot of questions that can't be answered in this format?
- So that is our question.
- , I look at the trash there on Morris Street now. The bins are always overflowing.
- The City for some reason hasn't even managed that well.
- How are we going to manage a new location when we haven't even managed the existing location?

Michelle Kimble commented as follows:

- I live and work two blocks away from the proposed site.
- I shop at Lucky's, I go to the vet, to Rotary at the community church, I go to taco bell.
- I literally walk there every day.
- What is going to happen will affect me greatly.
- I have a lot of questions and a lot of concerns and a lot of research tad, frankly, and processing mentally.
- So I didn't have someone visit me at my door.
- I read about it today in the press Democrat.
- It's just too fast for me.
- So that's my comment.
- I think we have a problem with homelessness.
- I think the funding is very attractive but I ask that we slow it down.

Sean commented as follows:

- The budget is the overriding criteria for this decision.
- I'm interested in knowing more about the objections to the other sight with respect to Green Acre and why those same objections wouldn't be relevant to this new location given its proximity to the school?
- And I'm eager to know when these questions will be answered.

Doug Bishop commented as follows:

- I think you're taking on this problem that definitely needs to be addressed.
- It is my understanding is that it was to address the first three questions but it looks like we're going all over.
- My first concern is I know the site, I'm familiar with the site.
- My business is right down the street.

- My partner and I even considered buying this piece of property a year and a half ago so I'm familiar with the building.
- What I don't see is the money it will take to develop the property.
- There is a lot of demolition that needs to happen in the back of this property with concrete and the old foundation to get it accessible for 20 RVs.
- That hasn't been addressed.
- I don't know if that is on St. Vin sent DePaul?
- But the numbers aren't realistic.
- Someone will need to come up with more money.
- Since we've gotten into other topics, I agree that something like this needs to happen.
- Something needs to be done on the other end to eliminate the street housing taking place right now.
- Permits for RVs or something to keep this from happening in both areas.
- We'll have both problems.
- If we move forward with this, I would rather it not be here.
- Something has to be done on the back end or we'll have a larger problem.

Omar Figueroa commented as follows:

- I'm a resident small business owner and parent here in Sebastopol.
- My two boys are students at the Charter School which would be adversely impact by establishing this project a short walk away.
- I object to this project being rushed and agree with our neighbors that more community outreach is needed before the City Council makes a final decision.
- At this time, this is not the right direction for us to go.
- My biggest concern is that it is at risk to become a place where okay panther will engage in unacceptable conduct that they are not allowed to engage in on site such as drug dealing.
- We've learned that it will not be prohibited.
- So we can anticipate that some addicts welcome there.
- It is right next to the trail.
- Many parents are concerned about trash, human waste, loitering and drug dealing along the trail and we have not heard about any plans to alleviate our concerns for the safety of our children.
- There is no plan to protect our children who travel Lake The trail to get to and from school and no funds budgeted for that purpose.
- This is not a viable plan at this time.
- A lot more community outreach is required before a final dig is arrived at.
- We are still waiting to see if the county will pay \$60,000 for rent and the money that may or may not materialize.
- This is premature and it is evidence that this has not been fully thought through.
- Please come up with better solutions.

Loretta Castleberry commented as follows:

- My comment is that we have Coaches Corner on Morris Street and we've been dealing with this issue of homelessness for over five years.
- We've been complaining about the black car that every morning does drug deals.
- Our clients at our business complain about it every morning.
- So today they saw the drug deal, they saw the smoking of the, whatever it was they were doing in the car.
- Called the police. Every day there is a problem.

- So if this is going through, we have to make sure that the parking is enforced, Morris Street included.
- We were told the hotel was going on, that would solve the problem. All it did was bring more.
- We have to address the parking problem.
- That is the real issue here in our main part of our City.
- Perhaps it can be controlled, a resource for these people.
- Wherever it is located.
- The issue on the street is a hazard.
- A safety hazard and a hazard for all of us business owners, And especially for our kids.

Courtney Klein commented as follows:

- Good evening, City Councilmembers and Sebastopol citizens.
- I am representing myself my own time as a private citizen.
- I support the proposal for an RV village 100%.
- Services for vulnerable individuals because I believe in mitigating the humanitarian crisis of homelessness in the bay area with a trauma informed pragmatic social justice lens.
- I just hope that if you or I suffer a brain injury due to a tragic event or if we lose our entire family and employment to a wildfire, catastrophe, or if any of us have to cope with intrusive, unrelenting thoughts with the numbing effects of a substance after, say, a traumatic divorce or sexual assault, that my community would not recoil in disgust at me.
- If our privileged community will not accept anything but perfection, which is something that I see a lot.
- Oh, this site doesn't work because of this. Well, that doesn't work either. No, no, no. Then we derail this project.
- We push the unsheltered out of our community and we dump this crisis on to socioeconomically disadvantaged communities which basically means that we are perpetuating systemic racism.
- So I 100% support this.
- I know many of you may feel whip lashed by this proposal because it is so quick but that is the callous nature of the bureaucratic social systems and this is what we have to deal with.

Chris Topham commented as follows:

- I'm with the Independent Charter School located at 1111 Gravenstein Highway North located 1397 feet, the equivalent of a quarter mile from the proposed site. Not half a mile as reportedly reported.
- I sent a letter to the City Council regarding our concerns.
- I also forwarded a letter from our attorney with the legal services regarding the legal concerns about a City sanctioned homeless camp located so close to a school.
- I am baffled that there was no direct outreach made to the school with this proposal where over 200 Sebastopol families drop off their 265 children ages 5 to 14.
- It is realistic if this homeless village is approved, we can expect an increase of problems for our campus and new problems for our hundreds of Sebastopol families, similar to what other schools near homeless camps have experienced.
- It is frankly naive to think that the homeless residents will not wander on to our campus.
- I wrote a report to the police chief regarding his experiences with defiant RV owners along Morris Street who according to you would have seniority for staying at the village.
- I appreciate the concept of the program and the homeless RV village but I don't agree with the location next to an elementary school.
- Especially considering the lack of communication with the school before making a decision.

Vanessa Raff commented as follows:

- This is incredibly deep is that a complex issue. Thank you for your time on it.
- I understand and appreciate the reasons why this is moving so quickly however, I think it is reckless.
- There are young, young children who live about 500 feet away from this propose will site and there is no time given to do our due diligence.
- I heard that there would be rules.
- We have no idea if there will be a curfew.
- It is so vague and so fast.
- There is just not enough transparency what it will look like.
- Very unnerving as a parent of a very young child who lives very close.
- To clarify the school which my children attend, you do directly have to cross this site.
- Because there is no shoulder or a sidewalk or any sort of bike path.
- It seems reckless to move so quickly when there are children who live so close to the site.

Tom commented as follows:

- I live right next to the community church.
- I would like to speak in favor of the project.
- There has been parking for homeless right across our fence from our backyard for quite a few years.
- We hardly know they're there. It is well managed.
- Soon there will be some homeless people there.
- Nothing is perfect and you know, there's going to be some problems.
- We're only talking about 20 RVs. And most of these people, they don't want to be homeless.
- It is a very difficult situation.
- There are mental health issues, drug issues.
- We had that throughout our whole society.
- We need to treat them as humane as we can.
- They're not animals in a zoo.
- They're people like you and I that could very easily be homeless in a short amount of time. Especially in this community.
- Things are so expensive.
- We need to help these folks.
- And nobody will be happy with any site.
- I think that's a good site for it and I hope you go ahead with it and I commend the Council for all the hard work.
- I think we can do a good job at it.

Mary Pozzi commented as follows:

- I have a child at Sebastopol Charter.
- I didn't hear the word safety.
- This is going so rapidly.
- How can we not consider the safety of those 5-year-Olds, 6-year-Olds walking, riding their bicycle to school?
- They have to go past this RV village.
- I am very concerned that this decision is being made without even consulting Chris Topham, for example.
- If anything happens to a child, we can never, ever take that scar away.
- I am concerned so my question is how can we keep our kids safe?
- Have you looked at other examples?

- There was a shelter.
- I know it is very different than the village.
- There were numerous issues with Guerneville elementary school.
- Every school has a buffer zone where toxics are not permitted.
- What if there are needles?
- How can our school be safe?
- I thought some of the presentation was vague.
- What are the rules about hanging out? Because a fence is not going to keep people in.
- I'm concerned about what happens?
- If this becomes an issue with our students?
- Also, there were some vague questions about security.
- I hope this is not the site that my children will see every day.

Mike Sano commented as follows:

- I used to live in Jersey I moved here from Jersey.
- I think there's not very much of a homeless problem compared to Jersey.
- Even in Jersey, there were so many homeless. But it was not even a problem because you know, they're friendly.
- We played games with them. I think it is fine.
- The homeless people here, I'm not scared of them. They're fun to be around.
- I like them. I think we need to not think of this as a problem.
- That's pretty much what I have to say.

Britton Mansell commented as follows:

- I've lived in the community pretty much my whole life.
- I work in the Richmond area and I work in public transportation.
- Outside our building, we've had a lot of problems we've seen down Morris Street.
- You have a lot of homelessness, drugs.
- We really can't get rid of it.
- There is no way to work with the people.
- It just seems to get worse and worse.
- If they do move up this way and you put them over there, if there is no, more people will just come up behind them there.
- So we'll keep adding and adding to the problem.
- So I don't think it is a good idea.
- I have three kids that ride their bikes down that way. I don't think it is a good idea on the 116 path.
- There should be somewhere else to go.

Arthur George commented as follows:

- West County Homeless Advocates.
- As the yard is not feasible, we appreciate the pivot on short notice to the new proposed site.
- I would like to address some of the concerns that have been expressed tonight and in the written public comment.
- Portable dumpsters will be in place.
- There was no formal management plan on Morris Street ever.
- This site does have a management plan for a contained site.

- No sex offenders will be allowed to live in the village.
- Applicants will be checked to see if they are public offenders and prohibited if they are.
- Registered sex offenders are already prohibited by state law from living within 2,000 feet of a school.
- The village is said to be just under 1,400 feet from the charter school and thus state law already creates a barrier.
- The new site relieving downtown, on to the former industrial site as the best urban planning and management practices recommend.
- It is served by the bus shuttle and integrated along a business boulevard.
- This village respectfully is near but not in the residential neighborhood.
- Again on, a commercial boulevard that was formerly industrial space.
- It is set back from the street and particularly children will not be required to walk through the site.

Vicki commented as follows:

- I'm very close to the proposed site.
- I feel the project is being rushed with very little notice to neighbors and businesses.
- I don't think enough research has gone into the potential impact on the nearby neighborhoods and schools and businesses.
- I do not support this project and I don't think it is a solution.
- I think it will just expand the current problem that we have.
- And I think this site is just too close to the trail also which there is already a problem of homeless hanging out there.
- And I live very close to the trail and I feel unsafe already.
- I can't imagine having more people cutting through our property to get to the trail.

Jill Bottomley commented as follows:

- I work for the Charter School Foundation, the fundraising entity for the Charter School and we're the property owners.
- I am coming as a parent and as a person with experience as a steward of a public park in Petaluma working with friends of the Petaluma river, which was about the same distance, if not further from the Mary Isaac center.
- As this proposed site is from the school.
- What I witnessed was that there does tend to be a lot of overflow when there are services provided.
- When that happens, the overflow isn't always managed very well.
- So my questions are about what plans the City has in place to address the potential overflow of some of the issues people are having?
- People are raising, such as, unsafe behavior when we already have some issues with the campus and people in the area using it as a park. We installed gates.
- It is a lot to manage trying to keep our campus as well maintained as it is.
- Schools are very stretched.
- We can't install gates for a walking trail.
- I am interested in hearing what the resources are to support the school, more than is being done now if the impact is greater.

Edda Loranger commented as follows:

- I am a parent at the school.
- I have a lot of concerns and I am incredibly surprised at how fast this project is moving.

- When I was, I've been listening to this whole meeting and I find curious that these various groups have been working and talking with the principal and they haven't been talking with our school's principal.
- And I know that this site has come up just in the past week or so.
- But I don't feel budget reasons is reason enough to be pushing such a big project through.
- It will cost \$600,000 just because of this one opportunity.
- I feel like opportunities will come again but the safety and well-being of our children is a thing that should be most important.

Oliver Marks commented as follows:

- I would like to broaden the conversation, it speaks volumes of what citizens think locally.
- I would like to know, on the call from District 5. Sonoma County is spending \$92 million on the homeless over the last two years.
- We just spent three hours on a Council meeting, \$600,000 that may be given to some people to park some RVs in an empty industrial lot for six months.
- It doesn't make any kind of sense. Apart from that it feels very, very rushed.
- The Park Village last year had a major fire which seems to have been glossed over when we were talking about how smoothly everything has run.
- We really need the parking permits to get this under control.
- The SAVs idea is wonderful where people can live in tiny homes on county roads. But in the middle of a small place with a \$10 million budget, it's nuts.
- As people are sitting on call, it is a great idea to browse through the written comments.

Doug commented as follows:

- I live on Norlee Street and have for a long time.
- I completely understand the need for a solution. But we haven't had just jump at any solution.
- We should jump at a good solution.
- No matter what we do, it will have a long term impact, even a one-year deal will have a long-term impact.
- The location right next to a liquor store, right next to a lot of available unsupervised parking lots has ready access to the trail.
- It's not a half mile.
- My son walks through the high school every day.
- You can get on that trail very quickly.
- Over the years, we've seen mattresses and things like that strewn back there.
- The idea that this will not spill over is wishful thinking.
- The speed in which this is happening given that is very, very concerning.
- So lots of concern about the long term impact for a short term solution.

Mary Goodenough commented as follows:

- I just want to express my appreciation for everybody who has been working so hard on these problems.
- They are pressing.
- I work very close to the school.
- I live downtown.
- I have an emotional response and an intellectual response.
- The first is get ready for what is happening down in the Laguna.
- Take up the resources now.
- This could be a very positive community project.

David commented as follows:

- I have two students at the Sebastopol Charter School.
- I do appreciate the discussion.
- I've been listening the whole time and a couple of things that really do strike me about this.
- I appreciate the discussion regarding homelessness and so forth.
- I think what is really sort of getting particularly in all these comments is sort of the issue of safety and proximity to the school which is quite concerning given the sort of absence of process.
- There seems to be very little transparency. Very little documentation.
- I appreciated Mr. George's comments earlier
- I don't think anyone has seen that or been engaged other than the small conversations that seemed to happen over the last week.
- I think this is quite a large decision that will be made and I don't think a week is long enough to deliberate and think about it systematically and deliberately.
- It is going a little too fast.
- I want to end on some of the questions about who will pay for this.
- There is a lot that has to get done.
- And working on construction projects, tearing down a building, making everything graded.
- That will be a lot more than \$600,000.

Manual Garcia commented as follows:

- My family and I are literal next door neighbor to the facility being proposed.
- We are the closest, I could walk outside and show you the property if I wanted to and not once have we been reached out by anyone about the proposition.
- It wasn't until two days ago we had a neighbor pass us a flyer about the proposition and what this could mean for my family.
- I can only imagine how uninformed the community is on this situation.
- I have lived in this area for 18 years and it has been beautiful to see businesses grow in my area.
- They will be negatively impacted by this.
- I hope they can slow this down and find a real location.
- I am concerned that this seems to have been planned for a while and not until now did we hear about this.
- Those are our major concerns with this facility and many more.

Riley Misbach commented as follows:

- My question why must we accommodate these RVs when there are locations for camping.
- Recreational vehicles are a nonessential mode of transportation and or living accommodation.
- How many are paying the to meet California motor vehicle laws, smog checked, insured properly, let alone safe to drive on public roads.
- There should be a location to help people get back on their feet but accommodating large hazardous vehicles that are regularly being used for recreational drug use is not a sustainable method.

Jill commented as follows:

- I wanted to first of all validate many of the concerns people are expressing.
- As a business owner and having gone through this rushed process last year with the Sebastopol inn, I hear all of you and I can definitely tell you that there are issues after a site turns into homeless housing.
- We had a large spillover.

- We have numerous issues with the bathrooms being broken.
- I had a person who lives in the Sebastopol inn now defense indicate outside my business recently, despite having housing.
- I'm not deluded in thinking anything I have to say will change what will happen here.
- I fought this and expressed so many concerns last area that were never addressed and here we are.
- But what I would like to bring up is the fact that if this is going to happen, we need to be addressing the issue of why this is happening.
- We need to have parking permits. Many cities in the state of California have instituted RV parking permits.
- That's because the 72-hour rule does not work.
- I put that to test last week because Councilmember Slayter slated it would work.
- The police officer here in Sebastopol told me the RV on our street right now, he could not do anything about it other than ask them to move and they could roll their tires and they could stay there.
- We have to have something that is tangible and can really keep people from parking in front of our houses.

Myriah Volk commented as follows:

- I'm a trustee at the Sebastopol Union School District Board.
- An increasing conversation in our meetings is based on the homeless population, monthly, Chris gives his report and there is a period of time where we discuss whether there was someone homeless sleeping on a campus or defecating.
- These are next door to the encampments.
- I had the opportunity today to sit down on a zoom with Senator McGuire.
- One of my concerns that I brought to him was this increase in homeless activity on our campuses.
- And you know, in turn, the safety of our children being an issue.
- He offered actually to come to Sebastopol in January and look around. Take a look at our campuses, the homeless encampments.
- I wanted to perhaps include the City Council, maybe join us on a walk-through while we have the opportunity offered here
- It is one thing to hear about something. It is another to see it with your own eyes.
- Thank you for dealing with this.

Clark Pappa commented as follows:

- I heard about this project for the first time this afternoon and thought I would jump on a call.
- I live close by.
- I'm somewhat disturbed, just listening to all the comments and this process here.
- I think this project could end up being something wonderful.
- I think it could also be needed in so many ways we don't know.
- It just seems half baked and rushed and I'm really concerned that a lot of the poignant questions being raised here will go unanswered.

Lenekas commented as follows:

- First I want to say thank you to the Council for all your hard work on this.
- I have a question. And that is, it looked like by the figures that we're hearing that it will be about \$600,000 that is being spent to house 20 to 40 people for one area.
- That's the budget for 2022.

- And you know, that comes between \$15,000 to \$30,000, depending on how many they house, \$15,000 to \$30,000 per person.
- And I'm just wondering if that is really the best way to serve these people. If it is only 20 people they end up housing, that's \$2500 a month.
- And I just wonder, rather than putting 20 people in RVs on a small property with a fence around them, and outhouses, is that how they would want that money spent on them?
- I prefer having it go to a bun one bedroom apartment if I were them.

Susan Bryer commented as follows:

- One thing I do echo others, the incredible work that has gone on to get to this point and I know it is such a problem.
- I walk and ride my bike.
- It is extremely disturbing as we would all agree.
- I have just this evening, I guess I have concerns for the long term viability of the management of the site, which is trying to its safe function.
- For example, the current safe manager, the description of advertising for a full time individual at \$22 an hour, which I mean is not even the \$23 an hour recommended, Sonoma County minimum wage, to what will obviously be a very complex undertaking.
- So there is some concern about the realization of what will be happening and who will be staffing it.
- Second is the rushing scenario. This was just put into escrow. Expect to it chose for a property that was on the market 276 days prior.
- And now this all occurs in two weeks with a property transaction.
- Maybe there is a lot we don't understand.

Don commented as follows:

- I am really disturbed that this is being shoved down the community's throat in the way that it is.
- The urgency.
- It is just not only disrespectful, but it is irresponsible that this is even being proposed with a week's notice.
- That no one was contacted who lived nearby. That the school wasn't contacted.
- I've worked homeless for 30 years.
- To matter what you think it is about, it is what all the people are talking about here.
- I appreciated that man who mentioned 23 years, San Francisco, hasn't solved the homeless problem.
- This is Sebastopol. My home town. I was born and raised here. And you're turning it into a homeless camp. With the homeless hotel, with all the things that you're doing.
- You're trying to turn it into San Francisco, I think, but it is not the small town that I grew up in.
- And it is not about what Sebastopol can facilitate.
- That's what the homeless community brings. Mental illness, drug addiction, theft. No one mentioned stealing.
- That will happen in my community now.
- And another thing, it is most disturbing that you've made up your minds and you're going to ram this down our throats anyway.
- I find that irresponsibility to a City Council to take that approach to serving the community.

Sorel commented as follows:

- I want to thank everybody for the time and work put in.

- We are parents of three young boys who attend the charter.
- And I too feel like this is rushed. Can you not get an extension?
- If you go over a day, can you not get an extension getting the funds?
- Mainly because a lot of the questions and concerns will come up after this meeting.
- We have not had time to process all of what this could mean.
- Our campus will be directly exposed to this community. Our campus is open to the trail. There is no room between.
- And our children are running that track every day. In groups but alone.
- Walking to the bathroom to the campus alone.
- It is concerning that the spillover from what could possibly happen that our school could be subjected to it.
- I hope you can slow down and not make a move right now and let's find a better site and location for this project.

Dan commented as follows:

- I'm one of the co-owners of Sebastopol Hardware with my partner Doug who spoke earlier.
- I agree, I want to say thank you to the Council for the work you're doing and we do agree this is a major issue that needs to be taken up.
- I can tell you first hand from my standpoint, I deal with a will the of theft issues.
- The majority of the issues come from our City, a lot of people coming up the trail, coming from Sebastopol hardware, we have to deal with the aftermath of dealing with them personally or not catching them until after.
- That's a huge dollar impact to us. We don't have the revenues.
- We have to deal with these people coming through.
- We mentioned earlier the guy with the black car near the gym. I personally have had him arrested myself at least once. And I know that he broke into the laundromat.
- What is the Council going to do with people who don't want to go into the facility?
- Who don't want to ad hear to the policies and the safety?
- Also, what will we do to not have this explode into Lucky's parking lot on main street where it is already an issue for us.
- I think it is rushed. We just found out about this today. We didn't know about the plans.
- Two and a half, three years ago, it has been on the market for over three years.
- I think it is pretty rushed.
- We would like a little more thought process before we move forward.

Charity commented as follows:

- I want to say that I've appreciated listening to the presentation and all the public comments.
- I wish that you had given the public comment section a little more time.
- I realize that you don't want to stay here until midnight.
- The City schools stay until midnight and give people the time allotted and I wish that you had given the public more time considering how rushed this has been, to rush through that.
- It's a little disappointing.
- I trust that you'll come up with the right decision.
- I don't have necessarily a position at this time.
- I have appreciated listening to what is happening.

Max commented as follows:

- When I first heard about the project this afternoon, I thought that it was mentioning the property on 116 and Stony Point, in a more rural area.
- Then I realized it is just about a quarter mile from my house.
- And that brings me to point B.
- Aside from thinking a more rural area maybe available given the amount of public lands within Sonoma County, the time line, I think others have mentioned that so I won't repeat it.
- Having just come from L.A., I can tell you from personal experience that although well intentioned and well may know, providing services in one area over an extended period of time does tend to spread into other areas.
- Other people voiced this as well.
- My concern would go toward the character of the area
- Just changing permanently over time because it is situated close to so many other parking lots and very low to set up, sort of spreading out in that area.

Valerie Stewart commented as follows:

- I am a real estate agent.
- I've been working here 30 years in West county.
- And I am, I have two daughters.
- We live about a block and a half from the site and I'm concerned for my daughter's safety, since she rides her skate board up and down that trail.
- It has been increasingly worse with that trail.
- And that I know property has been for sale for almost 300 days.
- I know there are some environmental issues and I'm not sure if the buyers have looked into that.

Emily commented as follows:

- I submitted some comments by email this morning.
- I just found out about this as well and I've enjoyed sitting on this call.
- I just moved here from San Francisco.
- I can tell you that homeless encampments do not work.
- We moved here specifically to give our children a better quality of life than what we had in San Francisco and we have had mine here specifically to go to this school.
- The thought that my 6-year-old child will be 1,300 feet from drug users is appalling to me.
- It has already been stated that drug dealing will be tolerated, will not be tolerated but drug use will be.
- It seems like everyone has already made up their mind that this will happen over two weeks during a holiday and a pandemic.
- The lack of transparency is appalling.
- I can tell you, we've had these issues with school boards in San Francisco. You can read all about them.
- If it happens, I imagine there is action that school board will take.
- It seems like the major driver is money.
- Just because someone offers you money, it doesn't mean you need to take it.
- You have to think this through.
- It is clear there is a drug problem at the Morris Street location.
- The woman who spoke in the beginning said it will be all the same people.
- The long term residents coming over from that location.

Dan commented as follows:

- I'm a dad to a son at the Charter School.
- Just the fact that a friend of mine told me to come on this and listening to everything that is going on, shame on whoever is putting this together.
- We should definitely have their names and know who has been kind of making this move.
- The fact that nobody business-wise, school knows, teachers know, nobody knows this has been going on and that this is happening is such a rush time.
- Shame on you.
- This is a complete failure to us and we need to somehow figure out who is motivating this activity and do our best to shut this down.
- Absolutely appalling that they would put a homeless encampment next to an elementary school, preschools, public walkway pathway.
- Absolutely shame on you.
- It has to be money driven.
- There is no way anybody using their heart and mind would push this forward.

Bob commented as follows:

- I would like the back that last comment of shame.
- The problem that has been going on every morning when I pull in to drop my daughter off down in front of the police station, watching the constant activity going on down there the last year and a half is appalling.
- The fact that Sebastopol hasn't been able to keep stuff clean down at Morris Street, why should we think it can get better up next to the school where one of my other children goes to.
- The safety is primary. But secondary, the budget will double.
- As a general contractor, I can tell you right now, that budget is awash.
- The safety of the children is much more important than money.
- The City will fold on money and who will pick up the pieces?
- Safety is my first and foremost concern of it spilling over into not only the shopping center across the street which is the route of most of the children that go in and out of that Charter School every single day.
- The security. What kind of security will there be on this street? Every day before and after school?

Kaitlyn commented as follows:

- We live about a mile and a half away.
- We were very curious on what would happen on the November 16 meeting.
- Interested in the public process.
- We live very close.
- Our daughter is possibly going to be going to that Charter School right there.
- I think I'm most confused about the speed this is happening and the lack of communication.
- My other question is, will these questions be categorized somewhere? And a response given?
- Or is this more of a steam venting exercise right now?
- That's number two. Number three, if we're taking them most likely from Morris Street, will Morris Street be subject to a little stricter observation?
- We have a child who uses the skate park every day.
- And it is very politically incorrect to speak out against this.
- I don't think any of us are against the unhoused
- Will Morris Street simply have more open slots for people to come in?

- Will there be a place to look at responses from the City to these questions?
- What is the plan for Morris Street?
- I wish there would have been more time.

City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Questions from Public:

- Transitioning of residents – when?
- Will they be able to move around freely
- Who is responsible when funding runs out
- What happens when people refuse to leave
- Visitors
- Sobriety
- Litter
- Security
- Police enforcement
- Permitted to close encampment
- Objections from Justice Center
- Where will additional cars park
- No parking on 116 or business lots
- Demotion removal costs
- Trash
- Human Waste
- Drugs
- Safety of Children
- Funding not secured
- Curfew
- Looked at other examples (Guerneville)/numerous issues with elementary school
- What if needles
- How can school be safe
- Rules for hanging out
- Overflow of issues people raising (unsafe behavior)
- Walk through with Charter School and Senator Maguire
- Long term management of site/Who staffing
- Rushed/no outreach/school not contacted
- Extension on use of Funds?
- Concern with timeline/budget
- Morris Street enforcement

Councilmember Rich commented as follows and responded to public comments as follows:

- I want to confirm that, I just want to recognize the wonderful aspect of people coming to this meeting And expressing their concerns bluntly and honestly. And sharing them.
- I know this has felt like quick process.
- The Mand I have felt like it is a quick process so it is great that everyone is here and being honest about their concerns.
- I have a list of topics. A number of them relate to the RV village.

- I'm wondering if we want to go through those as a group and request that SAVs respond to provide some information about those?
- I just saw Jack Tibbetts in the room. If there is some point I need to gather more information regarding the St. Vincent DePaul purchase. Of the site.
- So what will be the security safety police arrangements?
- How will trash and needles be handled?
- So let's start with the security and safety procedures.
- How will security and safety be handled?
- At the proposed RV village?
- I think that's a question for Adrienne of SAVs?

SAVS, responded as follows:

- We will have some paid security, at least with, primarily because of the concerns of neighbors.
- It is pretty well established that is not necessary.
- People are worried and nervous so we'll have paid security.
- We'll have a 24/7 hotline that you can call and paid staff who are willing to come out.
- Go on the trail or, I don't know what kind of problems might come up.
- We want to be responsive.

Councilmember Rich commented in terms security and safety, my understanding is that there is money budgeted in for 24/7 professional security for 30 to 60 days. Is that correct?

SAVS, commented as follows:

- That's right. We have money in our budget.
- It's not enough for 24 hours for 12 months.
- We will work the community.
- We're planning a security advisory group which I hope some of you will want to join, assuming we get this far.
- We will work with police and the City Council.
- If it needs to be more security for a longer period, we'll find the money to do it.
- We'll be doing some trash pick-up and patrols.
- There are requirements for work.
- So part of that will be from their work but also staff people out working in the neighborhood.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows

- To reinforce that comment, when we are working at the Morris Street situation as an example.
- The Community Center expressed concern about needing security during concerts and events.
- We heard them address that problem by committee.
- Nevertheless, the big area of concern regarding overflow of activity, on to the trail and elsewhere on the trail that the children would have to be confronted by, and/or at neighboring businesses of the it is a behavior, and how is that behavior from overflowing into the community.

SAVS, commented as follows:

- The trash issue should not be an issue.
- When I said we think of homeless camps, we think of what we see on the streets where people do not have the right encouragement.

- By the way, a lot of dumping by neighbors.
- Nobody takes a mattress and dumps on the trail because they're homeless.
- I don't think trash will be an issue.
- We'll have rules about people. We have a good neighbor policy.
- If individuals are out there bothering people on any level that will be addressed in our disciplinary policy and they'll have to leave if they are not able to change their behavior.
- Get along with each other and with the neighborhood.
- We can make that happen.
- People are concerned about homeless people being around services during the day.
- A lot of those situations where overnight bed situations, they're forced to leave in the morning and find something to do during the day.
- And here, this is a home for them. So they will be staying at home rather than being out and about.
- When it comes to all the things like trash, we have full trash services.
- This is a running operation.
- This is a, do you see trash coming out of your local RV camp ground?
- No.
- Because it has services.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- The overflow of the presence of RV village residents on the trails.
- And the potential encounters with children on the trails.
- Any comment or input?

SAVs commented as follows:

- People are allowed to have their lives.
- They're allowed to use the trail.
- If there are problems, we'll hear about it and deal with it.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I think a lot of this is with the engagement with the community.
- In if they're willing to meet with them the next question is parking enforcement.
- I think we can bump that.
- That's a later topic that will be addressed by the City Council.
- There was a question about the safety of the children generally.
- And I think you've addressed the concrete issues regarding behavior and rules in the RV village.
- There was a question about why the school had not been consulted.
- Many questions regarding timing.
- I'll address those.
- We on Wednesday knew that this property was in escrow and very promptly got out to the public to try to do the outreach.
- There is no sneaky behind the scenes dealing that went on here.
- We are fortunate to have St. Vin sent DePaul step up and purchase this property.
- There was a question about the budget and whether the costs were appropriate.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I would like to say quickly, that budget includes operating a site.

- SAVS I'm sure they will want to respond to this.
- My understanding is it is the operations for the site
- We've had many contractors say it will cost a lot more to get it cleaned up.
- My understanding is the arrangement with SAVs and St. Vincent DePaul, is that St. Vincent DePaul will prep the site and make it ready for prime time
- I believe that the executive director have St. Vincent is online

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- So the specific question was, who will be responsible for the fencing of the site improvements, fencing, grading, because that was not included in the budget.
- The short answer is that is St. Vincent DePaul's responsibility and they said they will do that.

Jack Tibbetts commented as follows:

- Our intent is to definitely do the fencing and the grading of the staging area.
- That is what we are committed to doing.
- So we talked about the children walking by. The children will not be walking through the RV village.
- I think the reference was that they would be walking by the sidewalk in front of this property.
- There was a question about the impact of the environmental
- It is too soon to know without having completed phase one.
- That's something we are hoping to complete before moving anybody over.
- Based on preliminary disclosures we have about the property, we don't suspect there is any reason to be concerned.
- That's why we decided to move ahead.
- We would not have done that if we felt there were red flags.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- There was a question about how problems would be handled.
- You referenced disciplinary process that would be used including if necessary eviction.

SAVS commented as follows:

- That's right. We have a very robust disciplinary process and rule making process.
- In the interests of time, I don't want to go into all the details.
- Basically we're trying to balance the rights of these human beings to make some of their own decisions.
- I think people will be pretty happy with what we end up with and we have both the staff to make it work as we go forward.

Councilmember Rich commented also talking with the police chief, and got confirmation that he would provide the necessary support.

SAVS commented as follows:

- That's right. We won't have to use vigilante justice.
- SAVS asked Mr. Tibbets to respond to a similar program in Santa Rosa that is around several schools.

Jack Tibbetts commented as follows:

- I would argue that the trailer site might even have more schools than this particular site.
- We've had zero incidents.

- We've had zero incidents there and it has been interesting to observe this process tonight because it is really reminiscent.
- We stood in front of 400 concerned monitors about two years ago.
- And I am pleased to report we've had zero incidents at Oakmont proper.
- It helped shape policy, it made our process completely transparent between the neighbors in close proximity and what we do there.
- So much so now when new villages are going up throughout the country, we have called upon Oakmont to provide the perspective and even go so far as to provide support for these communities.
- The most important thing we've witnessed, it was our learning experience.
- It something I'm so proud of. We did it against tremendous public opposition.
- The one thing that was completely transformational about it was the new found accountability.
- I think people see them existing in an environment where they do have nothing to lose.
- The public rightfully gets concerned when they hear about that coming to their neighborhood.
- What we found and Tim Miller commented this earlier.
- Once you give them a safe space to exist, a meal, a chance, all of a sudden they're accountable.
- I think that's why we've had zero incidents.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- That brings us to support for the school.
- And concern about the location being too close to the school.
- I think you've made it clear that you would like specific meetings with the school, correct?

SAVS commented as follows:

- I would like to apologize for not reaching out more formally and more aggressively to everybody.
- It has been really overwhelming this last ten days, trying to get to where we are tonight.
- I know it is stressful.
- And as much as it is my fault, I'll say I'm sorry.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm not sure how you could have done it more quickly but that's kind and compassionate of you.
- And we all need to recognize that we need to be compassionate.
- It is not just the unhoused.
- Their needs are important but the entire community is suffering with anxiety about this.
- There are a few remaining issues raised here.
- We talked about being too close to the school.
- I just have to say, I did a Google maps thing to say walking or driving. And I came up with .4 miles.
- 2112 feet.
- I don't think it is really relevant. What is relevant is not the number of miles or the distance but the clear concerns of the parents and the need to address them.
- They were interested in the other locations.
- I'm sure you'll confirm this, because it was a shared fence line. That was very close.

SAVS stated it was a residential place for at risk children living there 24/7.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Then there was a big question about exit strategy.

- What happens at the end?
- Would the City be obligation to move the RVs?

SAVS commented we are committed to clearing the site.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I think the other thing we need to say about it. The goal of a site like this is to provide transition for people to get their lives together.
- There are some people that may want to live in RVs permanently. But this is not a permanent site.
- What we need to work as a county, permanent locations for RV villages and this is not that prospective site.
- We may, if we get this site going, we will immediately be looking for new permanent sites. Around West county.
- So RV villages, that can be permanent are on the horizon but this is not that site.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Which is, is this the best solution?
- I have to put it out there, folks. We have a problem in Sebastopol.
- We have RVs living in inhumane, unhealthy, unsafe conditions on Morris Street, sentencing into Laguna parkway and broadening beyond that.
- We need to be proactive to find a managed space that ensures oversight, that ensures accountability.
- A sense of ownership and commitment with people who are overseeing what is going on and making sure that we won't have all the things you're concerned about.
- This is our opportunity.
- It is either this or we leave the situation on Morris Street.
- I think that would not help us, the community, the unhoused.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- One of them was why can't we get an extension on the funds so we can extend the process?
- And actually that's because it is Federal Funding. It is coming, through a county agency.
- There are very specific guidelines.
- We just found out all the money has to be spent by the end of June so no, no delay in funding the \$368,000.
- We can't get an extension on.
- So the one big chunk is the problem.
- I am the first to agree. Why was this so rushed?
- We've explained a number of times the property just went into escrow.
- It's been the Thanksgiving holiday. Half of our staff was off on vacation.
- We have tried to get through this as rapidly as possible.
- But this is the problem.
- This is a very problematic way to do something.
- We have rushed this process way too much.
- But it's one of those yes or no questions.
- Are we going to make it happen or not?
- I wish we could change the parameters we're working under but we can't that so that's the essential decision.

- Will we say yes to a mitigating problem?
- Will we say yes to doing something of a solution to a problem?
- It won't solve all of our some of the other question that was asked by many people, so are we going to do this?
- Will it just open up more spots on Morris Street?
- So one of the other issues before the Council is giving direction to staff to come back to the Council with parking solutions and solutions to how we don't just move the problem one place and then fill up the problem as it gifts already.
- So that's a question that was on this list.
- So then another one is the funding is not secured. It is close to being secured.
- There are two other chunks that have to be approved by the board. All of those are very, very close.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed question of more people moving into the parking lots that are nearby.
- Why would that happen when this is a managed site?
- Will more people park nearby to the site?
- Why it would not be an attractant?

SAVS commented as follows:

- There is nothing to come forward to.
- It is not like we're having an open meal once a day or something.
- There are 2,000 people sleeping outside tonight.
- Some of them are going to end up in that parking lot.
- We all have to try to deal with it as humanely and positively as we can.
- I don't see this being an attraction. There is nothing to attract.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I just wanted, for the public's purposes, recognize that yes, there are details that haven't been laid out yet.
- The plan is to lay all of that out. It is there.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- We actually have two more questions on here.
- I would like to check in with the rest of my colleagues and find out what everybody is thinking about our process and where we need to go from here.
- There are two more questions that were in the staff report.
- One being, what is the City Council's decision regarding expenses, or a lease obligation for the site?
- And the second one is, what is the direction regarding parking changes on Morris Street and City wide?
- So those are two questions that remain open.
- We all agree that the other site was not viable.
- So now the question comes down to, what about this site?
- I would like to check in with my colleagues and see what they're feeling about it and what they think before we go on to the two other questions.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I would like us to keep discussing this tonight while we're all here.

- I'm a little concerned about our business, item number two, especially if Leo Chyi is waiting around.
- I do have a question that might help the public. Well, two-thirds are still with us, it looks like, at this 10:30 hour.
- I believe as we go forward, there are certain critical dates where answers are either going to fall into place or fall out of place. Escrow will either close on the 6th or it won't.
- We have December 7th if there are additional issues to talk before the I believe there is a date when the staff is supposed to come back on the parking policy for the entire City.
- There are moments where it either goes forward with answers and more complete information or it stops in its tracks.
- And I think if there are other ones than those I've mentioned, I think it would be really important to know that now. So our members of the public have this surrounding neighborhood to this site can participate in those discussions.
- Is it coming back December 21st? Did I get that date right?
- If there are issues with moving in, is that a make or break date?
- I think that would be something helpful to have if we don't get it all lined up tonight.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- The upcoming dates are November 30, December 6 is when escrow would close, December 7 is our next City Council meeting and that would be the date when if the MOU regarding the site is approved tonight, the operation agreement would come back to the City Council on December 7th.
- Then it is the December 21 City Council meeting when we are proposing that the request comes back with a planning, with a parking plan. Followed by mid-January, when the move-in would occur.
- So everything is pretty domino related.
- It will be really hard, for instance, if we don't make a decision regarding the MOU to get what we have done. For instance, the operations agreement done in time to have all of those details solidified.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I think you said what I said. I had those dates so that's good.
- The only thing was the December 7 would be the operations agreement.

Councilmember Rich stated that is correct.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- I have some questions.
- My questions and comments are related to what the Vice Mayor just asked.
- So right now, what if anything, is there a critical item that's needed action wise by the Council?

Councilmember Rich commented approval of the MOU.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- I believe it requires an operating agreement entered into prior to the funding deadline.
- Or else, there would be no reason to seek Council approval of an operating agreement.
- So if the Council theoretically did not approve an operating agreement on December 7, I would say the deal would fall through.

Councilmember Slayter commented so there is a legal way that the Council can pull the plug, if that's the Council's decision.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented if the Council states the operating agreement is not approved, the deal will fall through.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- My feeling about this evening is, I think that we can continue to discuss minutia of this proposal.
- I'm not sure any of us are well served by that right now.
- I think for me, I need time to process the proposal. I need time to process public comment.
- I literally have dozens of e-mails on this that I have not had time to look at because they came in today.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- That means that if we don't approve it tonight, then there's no way to make the deadlines.
- Is that what I'm understanding?

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I don't know how we could, but this is a question probably for SAVS
- I'd look to our City Manager, but the timing seems really tight, because our next City Council meeting is December 7.
- Where does that leave SAVS if you don't get an MOU until December 7?

SAVS commented as follows:

- We were told that a "yes" vote tonight probably was enough to get this money, with all the other things that we got together and we did.
- If you all don't agree to that tonight, I think we'll probably go somewhere else.
- We have another offer from another town, in another location, and we just can't -- it's too tight for us.
- We're going to lose the money, if you all decide at the last minute that it's not right for Sebastopol.
- I mean, certainly that's your right, but we're not willing to lose this money.
- We need to do something for all those people with it.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Just following up on the question if we approve, as a City Council, the MOU tonight, I just want to make sure that we have an operations agreement that is intended to be presented December 7.
- I think what you're hearing, what the Council is asking is, if that operations agreement is not approved by the City Council, does that nix the deal?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The City has to approve, not just the use of the site but all the operational provisions.
- I'm a little concerned hearing SAVS say that it has to have the MOU approved to have the funding, which I understand, but what would happen with SAVS if the City did not approve the operational agreement, I would have to say, the deal would fall through.
- The City has the right to approve the operational details.
- If City Council does not approve the operational details, I just think there cannot be an agreement going forward between the parties.
- They are at an impasse over the operations of the site, and there would be no deal.
- What happens to the funding under those circumstances, I don't know.
- It's easy to answer the question about the MOU now, because SAVS just said they're going to go elsewhere if you don't approve the MOU this evening.
- So hearing that, I would say you have to approve the MOU this evening.

- Now the parties to any agreement are required to operate in good faith.
- There's an actual provision for that in California state law that says you have to operate in good faith.
- What would happen if the City Council approved the MOU, and seemingly without a valid reason, refused to approve the operating agreement?
- I think the parties are supposed to operate in good faith, so I think the assumption would be that if we come back with an operating agreement that is presumably acceptable because all the operational steps are covered, I think the expectation would be the City Council would approve that on December 7, because there's no real, valid reason for saying no.
- So part of me says, if the Council doesn't want to do this deal, we better decide tonight and vote "no" on the MOU.
- Because if you go forward with the MOU, SAVS is going to rely on that and the Council is required to act in good faith in considering the development agreement.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I personally agree wholeheartedly.
- We need to make a decision tonight and decide that either we're going to grab this opportunity and make the most of it with the resources that have been offered and be forthright about it, or release these people, who have been with us from the beginning, to go take their good works elsewhere. Then we lose the opportunity, folks, and the RVs stay on Morris, and so much for all the parking stuff.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I'd like to just finish my feedback here, where I'm at right now.
- So I'm glad to have that clarified, because I just wanted to be really clear about what we're doing.
- The other understanding that I had about tonight is that it is a benefit to us to pass the homelessness state of emergency.
- That was what I heard earlier.
- Just kind of jumping out, since now we're talking about having heard the public, and I started to make notes, and I know that a lot of public, I think, jumped on the call because they heard about it.
- They said it, today, where we've been talking about it for awhile.
- I just wanted to recap, the site we had decided to at least move forward and vet how much that would cost us, the original site there, behind Youth Annex was by the Laguna, by a Community Center, by baseball fields, Morris Street, had Analy High School, and obviously had Greenacre Homes, where children are served. And of course, we heard from the Sonoma County Juvenile Justice Commission.
- For me this is a better site.
- I just wanted to also remind the public that maybe jumped on later, it's a one-year program.
- I have a lot of faith in St. Vincent's and a lot of faith in what I've been hearing from SAVS to run the program.
- I also feel a lot of the public isn't as familiar as we are, as elected officials, with the 9th Circuit decision with the City of Boise.
- This is step one, as I think everybody talked about, to then solve some of the other problems that we've been dealing with, with homelessness on Morris Street, for at least as long as I've been elected.
- I don't want to jump too far ahead, but certainly, this isn't the first time we've discussed this.
- We've discussed this at numerous times over five years, and again, I would, frankly, be in favor of moving forward, as I stated earlier, with this new site.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I think Councilmember Hinton just did a really excellent and very short recap.

- I'm going to make use of it and say I'm thinking similarly, but I do have a process question for us tonight.
- Are we going to talk about the parking policy issue?
- I bring that up because I'm wondering if that isn't one of the off-ramps that Councilmember Slayer mentioned.
- When you look at Recommendation #4 from the committee about changes on Morris Street and Citywide, we are looking at making a commitment to clear Morris Street, change parking rules with the recommendation from staff, and not allow move-in to this site until this parking policy works out.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- We believe the Council should make the commitment and direct staff to formulate a plan to clear Morris Street.
- I believe the Council should be definitive about that.
- Council should also direct staff to come back on December 21 with options for the Council to consider to make changes in parking rules Citywide, as the staff report indicates.
- But those are two completely separate subjects.
- We already have legal clearance from our outside legal Counsel, who's an expert in the area involving the Boise decision, etc., that with the approval of this MOU, with the approval of an operating agreement, we will legally be able to clear Morris Street.
- So the exact how to do that, we will do that in conjunction with the timing of moving those vehicles off Morris Street to the Grav Highway North site.
- That's an entirely separate subject, the nature and timing of the Citywide parking rule changes.
- There are several options for that.
- We have the police chief already working on that.
- Now, there are several different ideas.
- They will take some time to implement, so I'm separating those subjects out.
- We will be able to clear Morris Street and have a plan for that, and that can happen with the moving of the vehicles from Morris over to the RV site and RV village, but the Citywide parking may take some time to implement and will require a full Council analysis of various options.
- Again, that takes some time to do.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Item 4C directs City staff to submit this plan with an outline of relevant alternatives to the Council on December 21, so I'm anticipating the Citywide parking policy is coming back December 21st.
- Have I misunderstood that item?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Yes, but I'm explaining also that what staff will be able to come back with are some broad outlines of different approaches to handle Citywide parking issues.
- So the Council will have to discuss, prepare options, and give further guidance on December 21, come back with the detailed procedures to accomplish that change.
- That's why I'm, again, separating the issues of clear Morris Street on the one hand, and on the other hand, Citywide parking changes.
- There's a number of ways we could approach that.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- It sounds like what you're saying is that yes, the proposal of options could come back on December 21, and yes, the clearing of Morris could occur before the RVs are moved from Morris Street, but that the Citywide implementation might have to wait until after that?
- Is that what I'm hearing?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Likely so, because some of the ideas that we've been talking about for Citywide parking rule changes involve an involved permit process, might involve hiring somebody to actually administer it.
- There's a number.
- Some of them are simpler than that, different approaches, vehicles over a certain weight, and so forth.
- I mean, there are a number of ways to approach that, and the chief is working up options for the Council to consider.
- But they will take time to discuss, and they will take time to implement.
- If vehicles move off of Morris Street, I don't want to get into the details other than the clearing of Morris Street.
- If vehicles move off of Morris Street, we still can impose Citywide parking rules that will accomplish the goal of the Council, which is to restrain vehicles from going into certain areas of the City.

Councilmember Rich commented we just rely on the language that's in there, because it says, "make a commitment to prohibiting RVs from moving into an RV village, as described in the staff board, until the parking concerns described here have been addressed and resolved."

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- My issues surrounding this has to do with process of equity.
- We have property owners, commercial property owners in this section of town who have made significant and substantial investments into their property.
- There's a brand new, gorgeous building literally right across the street.
- The good folks at that locally-owned financial institution, they desperately need to be involved in this process.
- We heard from the tremendous folks at Sebastopol Hardware. Is there a more Sebastopol business than that one? No. It's right there. It's the first name in their name.
- It's the process equity that is kind of troubling to me, and I fully understand the speed with which this is moving, and I understand the reasons for it.
- I've been in government long enough that I get that.
- The difficulty that I'm having is, how do we ask a commercial property owner putting millions of dollars into a business or a property to run a business out of it, to go through Hoop A, Hoop B, all the way through Hoop ZZ before approval is granted.
- Then even that, "Oh, you can't have three signs.
- You can only have two signs, and they need to be X number of square feet." And all of those things are really important, but it feels like there's a lack of equity in the process.
- I also understand, Councilmember Hinton brought up the Boise decision, and the ability for the City to have a legal leg to stand on in order to affect change in other places where other businesses have been affected for almost a decade, honestly, on Morris Street.
- Where's the equity in that?
- I guess where I'm going with this is, there are no super great solutions here.
- Then the other thing is that it's really easy for people with privilege to sit around, and we can define "security." To me, that's an absurdly impossible fantasy for most people on the Earth.

- How do all those millions of people in refugee camps or all the maybe billions in impoverished nations -- The notion is a luxury, that we are even able to take eating and shelter for granted.
- We are free to have that security and to pursue a happy life, and so many others are not.
- Coming from that place, feeling like it's up to us to make that decision is coming from a place of privilege and fortune, and there's not much that I can do to change that for myself.
- I don't think that there's anything that we can do to change that for any of us on the Council or even us in the community, but we can choose to make a small difference in the lives of people that we can affect, and we need to use our place of privilege to make that effect.
- I am a little uncomfortable moving forward, just because of the rush.
- I'm a little uncomfortable moving forward because of the inequity that I'm feeling, but I'm also understanding that maybe it's my place to be a little uncomfortable right now.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- Very eloquently stated.
- So with that, I think what remains for us to decide is and what I am hearing is a willingness to go forward with an MOU. I think that's what I'm hearing.
- Then the other issues that would remain are the parking issue, directing staff to move forward with that, and then the possibility of funding if something goes wrong with our funding plans.
- And that pertains only, I believe, to the \$80,000.
- Councilmember Rich commented as follows:
- I just want to validate, given the conversation a few minutes ago, hopefully SAVS understands that what's being discussed here is a commitment, not just to signing an MOU and then backing out at the operations stage.
- I'm hoping that you're hearing a commitment to the full process to, if the MOU is signed, then this City Council understands that in good faith, they would be moving towards the operations agreement.
- I think our City manager was pretty clear about that.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- So the operations agreement would be coming back December 7th.
- That's my understanding, correct?
- So will the committee for the unhoused be working with SAVS to go through any wrinkles so that we don't have a very long discussion on December 7th?
- Other than information and the questions that we might have, and what other Councilmembers will work out?
- Meanwhile, you guys will have done a great deal of the legwork.

Councilmember Rich stated yes.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The reality is that we have like, two days to put an operating agreement together, so it's going to be along the line of fleshing out what SAVS will do in more detail, many of the things you've already heard this evening, so they will all be familiar.
- It'll be basically an Exhibit A, that being their proposal, and the operational agreement will be rather simple, in terms that they've agreed to provide the services that are enumerated there.
- There's nothing more exotic that we'll be able to do with that, given that it has to return on December 7 and the packet is due to be released for that.
- In a matter of hours, almost.

SAVS commented as follows:

- We've had a long-standing operating manual.
- That's the basis for the operating agreement, and what I've talked about with Councilperson Rich today was, any specific items that are coming up to this location will be also in there in an appendix.
- So here's our, whatever it is, already 20-page-long operating manual.
- It lays out all these things we've talked about in great detail already.
- That's a done document.
- And then we'll be adding in site-specific area, talking about the Charter School and whatever else we need to talk about.
- So it's not a laborious process on our end to turn that around quickly.

MOTION:

Councilmember Hinton moved and Councilmember Rich seconded the motion to approve the Resolution Proclaiming the Existence of a Local Homeless Emergency in the City of Sebastopol.

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

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved Resolution Proclaiming the Existence of a Local Homeless Emergency in the City of Sebastopol.

Minute Order Number: 2021-299

Resolution Number: 6386-2021

2. PW Storage Yard:

- a. The Committee requests that the Council discontinue consideration of the PW Storage Yard as a viable location for the RV Village Pilot Program.

Council was in consensus to not approve Public Works Storage Yard as a viable site.

3. 845 Gravenstein Highway North: If the acquisition is moving forward, the Committee recommends that the City Council consider the following action:

- a. Select the 845 Gravenstein Highway North site as the location for the temporary RV Village.
- b. Determine with the assistance of staff input during the November 30 meeting the possible options for funding reimbursement to SAVS of the estimated \$60,000 in lease payments required for use of the property at 845 Gravenstein Highway North.
- c. Make a decision regarding funding options for the \$60,000 needed to support the 845 Gravenstein Highway North property as the location for the temporary RV Village.
- d. Discuss, edit as needed, and approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) included here as Attachment #3.
- e. Authorize the City Manager and/or Mayor to execute the MOU confirming the City Council's commitments as reflected in the MOU and other City Council direction offered during the November 30 meeting. Direct that this MOU be finalized and delivered no later than Friday December 3 to the SAVS Board of Directors.
- f. Authorize the Ad Hoc Committee to continue to work with SAVS to finalize an operational agreement between the City and SAVS. Direct the Ad Hoc Committee to return to the City Council to approve

that operational agreement at the December 7 City Council meeting.

Council Discussion:

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I was just trying to figure out if we needed to actually talk about the MOU first
- Let's go ahead and talk about funding.
- So the issue with funding is, what happens if the \$80,000 that we're expecting to receive from the County falls through?
- Is the City Council willing to explore other options, including knowing that we have a fallback, that we can use our reserve funds or perhaps our affordable housing funds to fill in that shortfall?

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- I am deeply uncomfortable with the idea of dipping further into our reserves.
- I'm not sure what the balance of our affordable housing fund is right now, whether or not there's adequate coverage in there.
- With the State's projected surplus of funds and with other federal potential for funding, I would put dipping into our general reserves as my very, very last choice, knowing that there's other things out there right now.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Please remind me about the timing.
- I think I remember that the decision on the \$80,000 is happening next week, like maybe December 6th.
- Isn't it happening really soon, hopefully before our December 7th meeting?

Mayor Glass commented I believe it's December 7th.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm thinking if perhaps Councilmember Slayter would be more comfortable saying we'll dip into reserves only if that fails on December 7th, only if that doesn't come through.
- It's up to him to speak to his own comfort level.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- My comment stands.
- Dipping into reserves is my very last choice, and I have no control over what the county decides.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Can we ask our City manager for some direction on what exactly staff needs from us in terms of a decision? One of the questions that Councilmember Slayter posed was, what's the balance in our affordable housing fund, which is significantly more than the \$80,000 that we're talking about.
- It's actually \$60,000 that we need.
- But that's all kind of up in the air, because it's not entirely clear whether that's an appropriate use of those funds, so that's all a little up in the air.
- Was there any further resolution about those funds?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- As I mentioned, I think that the committee we would have to talk to St. Vincent de Paul about that issue, because we believe that there may need to be a deed restriction of some sort that commits the site to future use for affordable housing.
- So that is something we would have to discuss with St. Vincent de Paul.
- That is out of our control.
- They would have to agree to something like that, following which, we believe we have the legal right to utilize our affordable housing funds for this money.
- There is a possibility that would not happen.
- So we have a way to do it, but there are some strings or conditions attached.

Jack Tibbetts commented as follows:

- St. Vincent de Paul would have a problem with the deed restriction being applied to the property if legally, that could somehow be released in the event that we chose to sell the property, but my understanding is that deed restrictions typically run with the property.
- So that would be a concern.
- As long as St. Vincent owns it, our intent is to use it for people who would absolutely qualify for the extremely low or low-income category.
- But again, if something fell through -- Let's say, for example, we're applying for an affordable housing community down the road and your planning commission votes it down, we'd want to be able to sell it as an unrestricted use.
- We could maybe sidebar off about that, Mr. City Manager, but that's where we come from.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- I understand that and that's one of the reasons I hesitate a little bit there.
- Those discussions would have to take place.
- There's also an exposure issue.
- That is to say, there may be risk to be evaluated, things like that.
- I still feel confident we could use the money.
- We would figure out a way to do that, but I can't guarantee it.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- When we were looking at the other site, I thought it might be appropriate to pull out of our building and grounds reserve fund.
- That wouldn't be out of the general fund.
- Obviously, we pull out of that generally when we own the property, however, we've already determined tonight that this site is actually saving the City money.
- So is that a possibility at all, pulling out of that reserve for this one-year period?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- We don't own this site. This is not a publicly owned piece of property.
- This is private property, and that's the issue, I think potentially, with using those monies.
- With the site behind the Youth Annex, it's completely different.
- We control that site. Legally, it belongs to us.
- We have more leeway over what funds we can use for a site that's publicly owned.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- One of the things, I would think, is if for some reason, this \$60,000 fell through, I would certainly think we would look for other sources of funding, at the state level or even perhaps federal money, but mostly from the State level.
- I find it unlikely that this money is going to fall through.
- If it does fall through, I think the backup plan would be to apply for a grant that would help with this project.
- But there's still, of course, the possibility that wouldn't happen, and it still needs to come in a very short timeframe.
- So we could commit to using either our affordable housing funds or a reserve to guarantee that we're going to make this work, and if something went wrong and we had to use the money, then we should apply for another grant from another source.
- We shouldn't just roll over and go, "Oh, no. Oh, no. There goes \$60,000."
- We should definitely keep pursuing other sources of funding.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- My suggestion would be that we recognize Councilmember Slayter's discomfort about using reserves
- I'm uncomfortable with that.
- However, as Councilmember Slayter so eloquently put it, we have an opportunity here to do something that's good, even though it's uncomfortable.
- We cannot sign this MOU without ensuring, without promising that we're going to come up with that \$60,000.
- I think we just have to make a commitment to pursue it.
- Mayor Glass, you and I as the ad hoc committee, recognizing the discomfort that our fellow City Councilmembers feel about dipping into reserves, and ask them to trust us to make it happen.
- Rely on reserves as the insurance.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm not articulate at this time of night, but I do have this confidence.
- I think this is a good plan.
- I believe it's what the Mayor was outlining, our first choice step might be to pay from the affordable housing fund and direct City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin to work with Jack Tibbetts to figure out how the deed restriction can work for both sides so that we can lawfully use those monies.
- If that falls through for some reason, then we use the reserves and perhaps we can ask St. Vincent de Paul to allow us to delay our payments to them.
- It gives us time to apply for grants so we're not actually going to use our reserves.
- We're going to wait for the grant allocations to come in.
- I'm trying to like, do something with confidence and faith that it's going to work out, because we've just got to get time to let the next step work itself out.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I think that we could
- We actually don't have to go through all the machinations of that affordable housing deed restriction agreement in order to use those funds immediately, because we're probably going to know about the \$80,000 in very short order, and we're probably not even going to get time to do the polling, schedule a meeting to talk about it.
- So hopefully, we will know that we have that funding before we even have to get there, but we still need to agree to what you just said.

- We still need to move forward with saying, "Okay, these are the order of priorities for staff to move forward to guaranteeing that we have the funding that's required."

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I think it's important for those members of the public who are still here, who expressed concern about input and engagement, to make sure that they understand that the intent and the plan that's already being implemented is for SAVS to have continuing engagement with the school and other community members, beginning this coming week and continuing weekly, and then as needed by the community throughout the year.
- We have a tentative date Thursday evening at 5:00.
- If we could encourage those people to e-mail Mary with their e-mail address so that Adrienne could reach out to them, I think that would be good.
- But I want to make that commitment clear for continuing engagement, because we've heard that need very clearly tonight.

MOTION:

Councilmember Rich moved and Vice Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to approve the 845 Gravenstein Highway North site as the location for the temporary RV village, and that funding be allocated, if needed, out of the City funds, initially from the affordable housing funds, if that is workable, and only as a last option, out of City reserves.

Discussion:

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- Add one more part to it.
- In the event that we have to turn to the reserves, that we would apply for grants to cover the expense and restore those reserves if we were successful.

Councilmember Rich amended her motion and Vice Mayor Gurney seconded the amendment to approve:

1. the use of 845 Gravenstein Highway North as a site for the temporary RV village, that if funding is allocated if needed, and that the funds would be prioritized from the affordable housing funds
2. City staff to work it out in discussions with St. Vincent de Paul as to the requirements, or if necessary, to go to the use of the City's reserve funds, and that the City apply for grants to cover the expense of the use of the reserve funds, if needed.
3. Restore the reserves if we're successful on the grant application.
4. The "or go to reserves" include an "or, as a last resort, go to reserves."

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

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved amendment to approve:

1. the use of 845 Gravenstein Highway North as a site for the temporary RV village, that if funding is allocated if needed, and that the funds would be prioritized from the affordable housing funds

2. City staff to work it out in discussions with St. Vincent de Paul as to the requirements, or if necessary, to go to the use of the City's reserve funds, and that the City apply for grants to cover the expense of the use of the reserve funds, if needed.
3. Restore the reserves if we're successful on the grant application.
4. The "or go to reserves" include an "or, as a last resort, go to reserves."

Minute Order Number: 2021-299

Council discussion regarding MOU:

Mayor Glass commented there was a question about whether the MOU needed to be edited.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented that was inserted in the staff report just as a reminder that the Council could make changes in the MOU if it wished and it could still pass it this evening. But so far, I haven't heard anyone mention anything that requires an edit.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- This is what I don't understand. the MOU goes from January 1st to December 31st, and we have tenancy potentially starting sometime in late January.
- I don't know why it doesn't start and run for one year from the first date of tenancy.
- Why are we paying, for instance, the month of January, if people can't move in because the cement piers end up being a problem, or something we can't anticipate now.
- Why doesn't it start with the first date of tenancy?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented I believe it's tied to the financing commitment that SAVS has.

The Council discussed Morris Street actions.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- You're not going to be able to pass them on December 21. You will not be in a position to pass.
- We cannot meet the timeline and have them in place either.
- Morris Street is different. We will commit to doing Morris Street.
- We cannot have Citywide parking in place at the time the RVs start to move.
- It could end up being a zoning ordinance change or something that's going to take a month or a longer public process.

Councilmember Rich moved and Vice Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to approve Authorize the City Manager and/or Mayor to execute the MOU confirming the City Council's commitments as reflected in the MOU and other City Council direction offered during the November 30 meeting. Direct that this MOU be finalized and delivered no later than Friday December 3 to the SAVS Board of Directors.

Discussion:

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I have something to say, and that's, this MOU, I have really wrung my hands over this, the speed and the lack of public process or the lack of engagement with the public through this process.
- I'm losing sleep over it.
- It's not that I don't think that this is going to be a successful project and it's not that I don't think that this is a good idea.

- I have been very, very concerned about, because the site changed from one place to another so quickly, and so now we have a lot of blowback from the public because that happened.
- I found this very disturbing and very upsetting.
- However, I am going to vote in favor of this MOU because I believe that this is the right direction to go.
- I believe that this could be a pilot project and that hopefully we can take this out of its temporary location and in the long run, have this as a pilot project for other RV parking projects that I would hope that we see throughout Sonoma County as an actually relatively affordable solution to housing people who are already living in RVs, but who don't have a safe and legal place to park.
- So that's why I'm doing this.
- I am really distressed about how quickly we had to do this, but this is a yes or no, and so I think we have to take the leap, as Councilmember Slayter said earlier.
- It's that we're in the discomfort zone here.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I understand how you're wringing your hands, because it really is not the Sebastopol way to do something in a hurry without extensive public comment and additional comment and additional reflection and more discussion after that.
- We've been very deliberative in public a long time.
- But I want to encourage us to take this leap for this example -- the majority of us, we had confidence the transition of the Sebastopol into Elderberry Commons, and while that was a slightly longer process, it was still shorter than the typical Sebastopol deliberative way.
- We've done that successfully, to the point now where other cities, Windsor, and it's either Petaluma or Rohnert Park, are now interested in the turnkey, Homekey project and wanting to convert their hotels similar to the way we've done so.
- I think in great measure, we know our collaborative partners that we're working with.
- They have excellent track records, and it's a matter of, like you say, just taking that leap and being confident and doing the work to make it a success.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I just wanted to reiterate as well, before we take this vote, I literally opened this on Sunday.
- I was not part of the subcommittee.
- We were, I thought, discussing the site that we had indicated that we were researching on, and so, I understand everybody feeling just a little shellshocked.
- I've got a number of calls today, but as we heard, we either have to pull the trigger tonight or we have to lose the project, and as I stated earlier and the City Manager stated, we can't solve our Citywide problem without coming up with another solution.
- It's got to go somewhere, so for people that maybe attended the meeting on the other project, we had a lot of public comment as well that people didn't want it
- So it feels really hard, but it's a one-year project, and it's getting the support people need that are currently living on our streets and getting us in a position for the long haul.
- I just wanted to make that comment as well.

Mayor Glass commented most important is that we really make a commitment, starting tomorrow, to doing the outreach and dealing with this very uncomfortable position of people that are unhappy, and working to bring them into the process and reassuring them that this is going to be a successful project, which I know that SAVS and St. Vincent will be doing.

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- We had a member of the public say that Sebastopol isn't the community that he was born and raised in, and that comment we hear with some regularity over a wide variety of issues.
- I completely agree with that comment -- this is not the community that many were born and raised into.
- The community where I was born and raised, I'm a fifth generation from a county that's very near here, that's not the community that I was born and raised in, but guess what?
- We have to try to do something better.
- If small communities across this state and across this country don't start chipping away at homelessness, then the community that our kids and our grandkids come into is going to be so far worse than what we have right now, it's unfathomable.
- So, discomfort? Yes.
- Voting to approve this? Yes.

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

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved Councilmember Rich moved and Vice Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to approve Authorize the City Manager and/or Mayor to execute the MOU confirming the City Council's commitments as reflected in the MOU and other City Council direction offered during the November 30 meeting. Direct that this MOU be finalized and delivered no later than Friday December 3 to the SAVS Board of Directors. Minute Order Number: 2021-299

f. Authorize the Ad Hoc Committee and staff to continue to work with SAVS to finalize an operational agreement between the City and SAVS. Direct the Ad Hoc Committee to return to the City Council to approve that operational agreement at the December 7 City Council meeting.

Vice Mayor Gurney moved and Councilmember Hinton seconded the motion to approve Authorize the Ad Hoc Committee and staff to continue to work with SAVS to finalize an operational agreement between the City and SAVS. Direct the Ad Hoc Committee to return to the City Council to approve that operational agreement at the December 7 City Council meeting.

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

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved Authorize the Ad Hoc Committee and staff to continue to work with SAVS to finalize an operational agreement between the City and SAVS. Direct the Ad Hoc Committee to return to the City Council to approve that operational agreement at the December 7 City Council meeting. Minute Order Number: 2021-299

4. Parking Changes on Morris Street and City-wide: The Committee recommends that the City Council take the following actions:

- a. Make a commitment to clearing Morris Street, and supporting parking rule changes, as needed, to protect Morris Street as well as the neighborhoods from developing overnight parking problems in the future.
- b. Direct City Staff to develop a practical, enforceable, realistic plan to do the following: (1) clear Morris Street, (2) modify and enforce parking rules on Morris Street to prevent future collection of overnight lived-in vehicles on that street, and (3) make any needed changes in parking rules City-wide to prevent similar situations from developing in neighborhoods and elsewhere in town.
- c. Direct City Staff to submit this plan, with an outline of relevant alternatives, to Council at the December 21 City Council meeting.
- d. Make a commitment to prohibiting RVs from moving into an RV Village as described in this Staff Report until the parking concerns described here have been addressed and resolved, with the benefit of the requested plan from City Staff.

Councilmember Rich moved and Vice Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to approve the following:

- a. Make a commitment to clearing Morris Street, and supporting parking rule changes, as needed, to protect Morris Street as well as the neighborhoods from developing overnight parking problems in the future.
- b. Direct City Staff to develop a practical, enforceable, realistic plan to do the following: (1) clear Morris Street, (2) modify and enforce parking rules on Morris Street to prevent future collection of overnight lived-in vehicles on that street, and (3) make any needed changes in parking rules City-wide to prevent similar situations from developing in neighborhoods and elsewhere in town.
- c. Direct City Staff to submit this plan, with an outline of relevant alternatives, to Council at the December 21 City Council meeting.
- d. Make a commitment to prohibiting RVs from moving into an RV Village as described in this Staff Report until the parking concerns described here have been addressed and resolved, with the benefit of the requested plan from City Staff.

Discussion:

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I just wanted to say, I found these recommendations, along with the whole packet of material, really helpful.
- It's good to be clear. It's been good to be that clear about what we're committing to.
- I really appreciated that writing.

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

VOTE:

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

City Council Action: Approved Councilmember Rich moved and Vice Mayor Gurney seconded the motion to approve the following:

- a. Make a commitment to clearing Morris Street, and supporting parking rule changes, as needed, to protect Morris Street as well as the neighborhoods from developing overnight parking problems in the future.
- b. Direct City Staff to develop a practical, enforceable, realistic plan to do the following: (1) clear Morris Street, (2) modify and enforce parking rules on Morris Street to prevent future collection of overnight lived-in vehicles on that street, and (3) make any needed changes in parking rules City-wide to

prevent similar situations from developing in neighborhoods and elsewhere in town.

c. Direct City Staff to submit this plan, with an outline of relevant alternatives, to Council at the December 21 City Council meeting.

d. Make a commitment to prohibiting RVs from moving into an RV Village as described in this Staff Report until the parking concerns described here have been addressed and resolved, with the benefit of the requested plan from City Staff.

Minute Order Number: 2021-299

SAVS discussed the community meeting for Thursday December 9th, 2021.

Due to Council protocols, the Mayor asked if the Council was in agreement to move forward with the meeting. The Council was in consensus to continue the meeting.

2. Discussion of Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Redistricting Map and Consideration to Authorize Mayor to send Letter to Sonoma County Board of Supervisors (Requestor: Mayor Glass)

Mayor Glass presented the agenda item recommending the City Council Discuss the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Redistricting Map and Consideration to Authorize Mayor to send Letter to Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- This item is a It is discussion of Sonoma County Board of Supervisors redistricting map and consideration to authorize mayor to send a letter to Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.
- I think it was the agenda-setting committee asked that this be put on our agenda.
- District 5, Lynda Hopkins; District Director Leo Chyi is here with us to explain what's going on.
- But, first, I will make a very quick explanation.
- So, I would imagine that most of you have read that because of the census, legislative districts are being changed because of census information.
- So the County of Sonoma is looking to redraw the district lines for our supervisorial districts.
- There's five districts in Sonoma County.
- We reside in District 5, which we're forever, as long as I've lived in the county, has basically been West County, with Roseland added on.
- So, now we've got changes in the population, changes in the concentrated population, so now state law requires that our supervisors look at redrawing those lines so that the districts are more or less balanced in population.
- The county hired a demographer to come up with these new maps. And there was a commission appointed to work on those new maps. And there have been various maps proposed.
- I feel we are the capital of West County. We are part of the 5th District. And what happens in the 5th District really affects us.
- And the various maps could significantly change the makeup of the 5th District and put us in with, potentially, other areas that don't have all that much in common with us.
- So the Vice Mayor and I were concerned about this and felt that we would like to have the county, our 5th District supervisor who is being represented by Leo Chyi, to explain the varying maps that are options and then, potentially, direct me to send a letter to the supervisors with our City's opinion about the maps that are in the offing.
- The county has to make a final decision about this by December 15th.

- They just discussed it. And the reason there wasn't more information in our staff report about this was, the actual ending map was still in play yesterday.
- So we weren't able to give a lot of information about what the configuration will look like.
- So Leo Chyi is here to tell us about what the preferred alternative is right now, based on what the supervisors did yesterday.
- At their next meeting, they're going to consider it again, but they have to have the final map approved and passed by December 15th

Leo Chyi, Sonoma County, was in attendance and provided additional information and provided the following information:

- Thanked the Council for being willing to still hear this item.
- Appreciate all the work that you're doing on this.
- So, I think that I have a lot of material that I can present if people have questions or needs, but I'm going to try to condense it as much as I can, but still give you just enough context so that it makes sense
- I'll just walk us through a number of materials that I have.
- Just essentially I want to talk about sort of the rules around redistricting, give you an overview briefly on the timeline and what's happened to get us to where we are, and then we'll look at the maps.
- Every meeting starts with them explaining what the redistricting rules and goals are.
- So, there's federal laws, California law, and then other traditional redistricting principles.
- So, first off, the reason the timeline is so compressed is because census data came out very late from the federal government, so this has been a familiar conversation about not having as much process time as we wish we had.
- But under federal law, there has to be equal population within certain percentage boundaries in each district.
- The law has to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act, and there cannot be racial gerrymandering.
- So, the California rules are that, to the extent practicable, the districts: should be geographically contiguous; there should be undivided neighborhoods and "communities of interest" within the districts; to the extent possible, that cities and census-designated places should be kept together within a district; there should be easily identifiable boundaries, so, ideally, things like freeways or rivers or other clear boundaries that people can identify; and finally, the fifth criterion is for it to be compact.
- And it's not permissible to favor or discriminate against a political party.
- And so then the other principles that are of generally lesser priority, but are still of concern, is: to minimize the voters shifted to different election years, because you could be moving people from essentially voting in one election to another; respecting voters' choices on continuity in office, about looking at who they voted for representation right now, and respecting that that's been the will of the voters in the past, and to sort of minimize that change to as many people as you can manage; you can anticipate future population growth, so that can be a consideration when you're looking at which districts have slightly more or less people, as long as they're within that 10% spread that's allowed; and then, finally, to preserve the core of existing districts.
- So, those are the criteria that the Board of Supervisors, as well as the Redistricting Commission needed to be considering.
- So, the Advisory Redistricting Commission had 19 members appointed by the Board of Supervisor.
- The goal was to have very broad representation.
- They had eight meetings, including they also had engagement ad hocs and equity ad hoc meetings
- They also had a consultant do an additional community outreach and education to targeted communities.
- And so the key priorities that the Redistricting Commission was working to meet at our local level is: to minimize change to boundaries; that the coast should remain unified within one district, aligned within

one district; it is preferable but not necessary for Rohnert Park and Cotati to be aligned within the same district; the Springs area to remain unified; Roseland and Moorland areas to be included in the district representing downtown Santa Rosa, which currently is District 3; Coffey Park, Larkfield, Mark West, Wikiup should be unified in the same district; the Russian River communities, including Forestville, Guerneville, and Monte Rio, should be unified within the same district; ideally, seek to improve Sonoma Valley's voice and representation; and then align the area west of Highway 101, west of Cotati, with Petaluma as they share the same identity and legacy history.

- So, you can see a large range of goals that came forward from the community that are hard to balance, and that the Redistricting Committee worked very hard to try to do their best to move forward.
- He displayed the county's website for redistricting.
- Because I'm rushing through this, I just want people in the public to know that if they would like additional information, you can get almost all of the information from the county site.
- You can Google "Sonoma County 2021 redistricting," and I believe this is the first thing that comes up.
- There's a lot of detail, there's recordings of prior meetings, there's access to the different maps.
- So, the Redistricting Commission, on October 25th, finalized their map options, and they chose to present just one map to the Board of Supervisors.
- On November 2nd, the Board of Supervisors had their first meeting where they looked at redistricting, and they received that one map from the Redistricting Commission.
- On November 16th, they met again and looked at that map, discussed it further, along with other options, and the board chose to focus on the Redistricting Commission's map, but gave guidance for a number of modifications that they wanted to see take place.
- That included, on November 22nd, a small conversation with Rohnert Park community specifically, and then yesterday's meeting, where the Board of Supervisors took the map options and moved them forward.
- So, you can see that it's a very compressed timeline, and that's why the board packet that you were provided didn't have the most up-to-date information.
- I'll just jump to the interactive map and walk you through kind of what different map scenarios are and what we're currently looking at.
- Displayed an interactive map that anyone can link to from the county site.
- Stated what you're seeing here are the current district boundaries.
- Most of the changes and concerns are in the southern part of the 5th District, so I'm going to go ahead and just move the screen and just kind of focus in on that.
- Discussed the map that the Redistricting Commission recommended.
- This is the map that they presented to the board in the beginning of November.
- You can see that this is the map that includes Rohnert Park being added to the 5th District, which is obviously quite controversial and has been in the papers.
- So, the issue is basically that in order to move Roseland and Moorland into the 3rd District, with other parts of Santa Rosa, in order to give them an additional voice, the result is that they've had to move population in their map a lot of different places.
- They were also trying to achieve the goal of keeping Rohnert Park in a single district.
- Previously, Rohnert Park was split between the 2nd and 3rd Districts.
- So they met the letter of what Rohnert Park wanted, which was to put the whole City into a single district.
- The district that they needed to put it in was the 5th District in their proposal.
- So, that's what the board was given, and that's what they were working with for their initial meeting, but gave feedback on changes that they wanted to see.
- So, in the latest meeting, there were three maps presented, and the board chose to move forward this map, which is referred to as RP Split 3 on the screen.

- So, this is a map that divides Rohnert Park back into the district -- partly in District 3 and partly in District 2. But it restores the 5th District to closer to its previous shape.
- So, at the meeting on the 29th, four out of five supervisors were in favor of using a base map that has Rohnert Park with the existing guidelines.
- And then they made changes, live during the meeting, with the demographer to make changes to different areas on the map.
- So, in this map, you can see, Rohnert Park is back in the 3rd District.
- This blue is the 2nd District, and you can see there's a little bit of expansion for the 5th District, taking some of what used to be the 2nd District, in order to do population balancing.
- So, these are areas that are unincorporated. This is Lone Pine Road here. This is Kennedy Road over here. So these streets largely feed into the Sebastopol area.
- So, the thought was that these streets made sense to shift from the 2nd District because they're more oriented toward Sebastopol than Petaluma.
- There's also some additional streets that were added here that are actually relatively close to Cotati.
- The bigger changes that were proposed involve Santa Rosa.
- When we go to the proposed map, this section that is south of 12, that used to be part of the 5th District, moves over to the 3rd District
- The area that is now part of the 5th District has shifted north, so that it's all north of the 12, and most of it is west of the 101, although north of College, right now it's strong, with Mendocino Avenue as the eastern border for Santa Rosa, and then Steele Lane as the north border there.
- The only other change that's worth noting is just Forestville used to be split between the 5th and 4th District, and this map does put just a few parcels back into the 5th District to unify Forestville into a single district.
- So, the controversy is whether the board should continue on this path
- I think that the board went into this meeting not really knowing in advance where they were going to head, and this is the path they chose, with the split Rohnert Park, but with other districts kind of having more of their needs met.
- In my opinion, it meets all of the goals that the Redistricting Commission was trying to move forward, other than unifying Rohnert Park in a single district.
- However, you can see in your packet that the City of Rohnert Park formally voiced a preference for having the existing situation of being split between 2 and 3 as being preferred over shifted as an entire City into the 5th District. That matches the comments and e-mails that we've heard.
- Supervisor Hopkins raised some good points just about how everybody in the 5th District was opposed to adding Rohnert Park by a pretty strong margin.
- The people who were supportive of Rohnert Park going into the 5th District tended to be people who were not living in the 5th District and were not going to be living in the 5th District.
- So it's the sort of collateral effect of trying to achieve what other people are trying to achieve in Santa Rosa and other parts of the country.
- They were guiding the map forward in this direction, and I think that on December 7th, they're going to have to come back and either formally make this the final map, make any last-minute changes that they need to make which need to be finalized on the 7th in order to meet the required December 15th deadline, which is, I think, a federal deadline.
- They have to show a final map on the 7th in order to be able to pass it the following week.
- So, in this upcoming week before the 7th, there's still the ability for community to give feedback, and I think we're anticipating a lot of feedback from the community.
- So if your Council would like to weigh in on sort of either encouraging this direction that the board has moved toward, which is using this split Rohnert Park map in order to have the 5th District look like the

map that's in front of you, versus the map that was recommended by the Redistricting Commission, which has that peninsula into Rohnert Park, I think that letter would certainly be welcome by Supervisor Hopkins and me.

Mayor Glass opened for questions.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- That was really informative and good summary.
- I don't know how you could be so articulate at midnight, but I appreciate it.
- What is Rohnert Park's position regarding the RP Split 3 option that you've showed us, that splits Rohnert Park?
- Are they likely to be supportive of that?

Leo Chyi commented as follows:

- I know that Supervisor Hopkins has talked, been in regular contact with Rohnert Park leadership.
- But I think it's the final pages of this agenda item in your packet is their formal letter that came from the mayor.
- Basically, their order of preference, I believe, was their preference would be the "be unified within the 3rd District." But they would prefer being split between the 3rd and 2nd Districts, like they currently are, over being moved into the 5th District.
- So they don't want to be part of the 5th District.

Mayor Glass opened public comment. There was no public comment.

City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Councilmember Slayter commented as follows:

- I like Rohnert Park just fine.
- I always liked Rohnert Park just fine, but Rohnert Park is not part of West County.
- They have stated that in a letter from their Council, that Rohnert Park is not in West County.
- And the issues of a largely urban Highway 101 corridor-based City are completely different than those of most residents of the current 5th.
- So, honestly, Supervisor Rabbitt's suggestion that maybe with extremely minor tweaking of the current boundaries, in order to achieve parity and equity of population numbers, stick with the current map.
- What's wrong with that? I have to agree with my architect colleague on the board that that makes a lot of sense to me.
- The idea that the proposal where there was the finger that reached out and grabbed Rohnert Park to pull it into the 5th, I mean think about it. What if, say, the 3rd District suddenly had a finger that stuck out Highway 12 towards the west, and Sebastopol was pulled into the 3rd? That doesn't make any sense either.
- So I'm all in favor of sending a letter.
- One final thing, and I hope that you catch my tone on this, but I'm really tired of being the 5th.
- I want to be the 1st.

Vice Mayor Gurney commented as follows:

- I am really appreciating Councilmember Slayter's comments tonight, especially your sense of humor so late.
- I can live with this new map. It's much better than earlier maps.

- I think it's really important for the supervisors to make Rohnert Park happy and Sebastopol happy and realize we don't have a whole lot in common, and we're both just fine with that.
- I think the 5th can live with picking up that area that's just south Sebastopol, Lone Pine, Bloomfield -- that little part of our world.
- I think a lot of those people identify with us.
- Their address is going to be Sebastopol, a great number of them.
- They're kind of maybe split, Sebastopol and Petaluma.
- But that seems really logical to me, just in terms of issues and geography and the continuity.
- Same with picking up that part of Guerneville Road and Santa Rose Creek coming out to the Laguna, I think works for me geographically and culturally and socially and if the numbers help.
- I didn't get all the other little pieces that were changed in there, but I think this could work for us.
- I would encourage us to have our Mayor send a letter in, and follow up on December 7th as all of us might want to do.
- The 5th is looking more like it's staying like the 5th, which I think we are a big driver for Sonoma County -- I just want to add that, too -- for the economy, tourism, culture, all of that.

Councilmember Hinton commented as follows:

- I've been following this, as well, and tuning in to the Board of Supervisors' meetings.
- I just think like, the little finger of Rohnert Park made no sense to me, and kind of felt like it came from out of the blue.
- I agree with Vice Mayor Gurney.
- I know for a fact, out there, Schaeffer Road and Lone Pine, those are Sebastopol addresses, and a lot of times, they didn't even know who their supervisor was.
- They didn't think it was David Rabbitt from Petaluma.
- Then add the arm of Forestville, which really makes sense if the whole of Forestville is in the 5th.
- So this map looks good to me.
- I do think it's an improvement over the last map, with the little things tweaked out without any major, major changes.
- So I'm in favor of sending a letter in support of this latest map.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm definitely in favor.
- I think it checks off all the boxes.
- Agree with my colleagues' observations and appreciate you taking the effort to come and explain this all to us.

Mayor Glass commented as follows:

- I think I'm hearing consensus.
- As some of you may know, I used to actually have Leo's job.
- He knows that a lot of what we do, when you are sitting at that desk in the 5th District, is to answer questions about land use, about septic systems, about wells, about rural roads, about coastal access, about the river, about preserving the river, about the laguna.
- These are not the same concerns as people in Rohnert Park, who we really like.
- I've had discussions with Gerard, the Mayor of Rohnert Park.
- We are buddies. We think they're great, we love their Council but that doesn't mean we want to live together.

- So I'm so glad that this new map was agreed to yesterday at the Board of Supervisors

MOTION:

Councilmember Hinton moved and Councilmember Rich seconded the motion to Mayor to send Letter of support for the new map proposed Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.

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

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved Mayor to send Letter of support for the new map proposed Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.

Minute Order Number: 2021-300

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA: There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING

November 30, 2021 City Council Special Meeting will be adjourned to the City Council Special Meeting – CLOSED SESSION - December 1, 2021 at 9:30 am (ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT).

December 1, 2021 City Council Special Meeting – CLOSED SESSION will be adjourned to the City Council Regular Meeting of December 7, 2021 (ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT).

Mayor Glass adjourned the regular City Council Meeting at 12:16 am.

Respectfully Submitted:



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