



**City Council**

Mayor Jill McLewis  
Vice Mayor Sandra Maurer  
Councilmember Phill Carter  
Councilmember Neysa Hinton  
Councilmember Stephen Zollman

**Interim City Manager**

Mary Gourley  
mgourley@Cityofsebastopol.gov

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**  
**MINUTES FOR MEETING OF February 17, 2026**

As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of March 3, 2026.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor McLewis called the meeting to order 6:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Mayor Jill McLewis  
Vice Mayor Sandra Maurer  
Councilmember Phill Carter  
Councilmember Neysa Hinton  
Councilmember Stephen Zollman

**Absent:** None

**Staff:** Interim City Manager Mary Gourley  
City Attorney Alex Mog  
Administrative Services Director Kwong  
Police Chief McDonagh  
Public Works Operations Supervisor Billing

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG:** Scouting America Troup 27 led the salute to the flag.

**REMOTE PARTICIPATION UNDER AB 2449 (IF NEEDED):** To consider and take action on any request from a Council Member to participate in a meeting remotely due to Just Cause or Emergency Circumstances pursuant to AB 2449 (Government Code Section 549539(f)). Assembly Bill 2302 (2024) (“AB 2302”) revises rules for when members of local legislative bodies may participate in meetings remotely. Specifically, it amends the number of meetings that may be attended remotely for just cause and under emergency circumstances and clarifies the definition of the term “meeting,” for purposes of remote attendance. AB 2302 caps the number of remote meetings a member can attend each year based on the frequency of a legislative body’s meetings: Five meetings per year for those meeting twice a month.

None.

**LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:** The City of Sebastopol acknowledges that we live and work within the unceded ancestral homelands of the Southern Pomo and the Coast Miwok people. We pay our respect to the past, present, and future generations of these peoples, including the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria.

City of Sebastopol History Acknowledgement by Mayor



**PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS/INTRODUCTIONS:**

- CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION – Gold Ridge Fire Department
- CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION – City of Sebastopol Police Department
  - Chief McDonagh
  - Officer Josiah Wotila
  - Officer Jaime Baldovinos
  - Dispatcher Chris Mooney

Reference Order Number: 2026-044

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

There were no stated conflicts of interest.

**PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (FIRST COMMENT PERIOD):**

- Up to Twenty (20) Minute Time Limit (Two Minutes for up to ten speakers).
- Additional public comment will be held at the end of the discussion and action items for up to an additional twenty (20) minutes.
- Mayor has discretion to allow for additional time beyond the 20 minutes allocated for public comment dependent upon the subject matter or number of speakers.
- Process for calling on Speakers: Mayor or designee shall ask for public comment as follows: Speakers to be called on in an alternate manner (One speaker in person to be called on first; then one speaker remote to be called on second with additional speakers to be called on in the same manner) based upon the time limit.

The following member(s) of the public spoke during public comment:

1. Lisa
2. Kate
3. Oliver
4. Jim
5. Craig
6. Carrie
7. Robert
8. Russell
9. Omar
10. Myriah

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- The consent agenda consists of items that are routine in nature and do not require additional discussion by the City Council or have been reviewed by the City Council previously. These items may be approved by one motion without discussion unless a member of the City Council requests that the item be taken off the consent calendar.



- The Mayor will read aloud the title of each consent item (either full agenda title or a simplified version of the agenda title), and ask if a Councilmember wishes to remove one or more items from the consent calendar; and then open public comment to the members of the public in attendance. At this time, a member of the public may speak for up to two (2) minutes on the entire consent calendar and request at that time that an item or items removed for discussion.
- If an item or items are removed from the consent calendar, the item shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor. Council Members may comment on Consent Calendar items or ask for minor clarifications without the need for pulling the item for separate consideration. Items requiring deliberation should be pulled for separate consideration and shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor.

Mayor McLewis read the consent calendar.

Mayor McLewis asked if any Councilmember wanted to remove a consent calendar item. There were no requests.

Mayor McLewis opened for public comment. The following member(s) of the public spoke during public comment:

Lawrence

Mayor McLewis called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Vice Mayor Maurer moved and Councilmember Zollman seconded the motion to approve consent calendar item number(s) 1, 2, 3, and 4.

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

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Zollman, Vice Mayor Maurer and Mayor McLewis  
 Noes: None  
 Absent: None  
 Abstain: None

**1. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes for Meeting of February 3, 2026**

Responsible Department: Interim City Manager

Fiscal Impact: Staff time required to prepare the minutes is covered within existing budgeted salaries. No additional financial impact is anticipated with approval of this item.

City Council Action: Approved City Council Meeting Minutes for Meeting of February 3, 2026  
 Minute Order Number: 2026-045

**2. Approval of Second Reading for Formula Business Ordinance Updates. Updates to the Formula Business Ordinance to Clarify Applicability and Terms.**

Responsible Department: City Attorney/Planning

Fiscal Impact: Staff time required to prepare agenda item report is covered within existing budgeted salaries. No additional financial impact is anticipated with approval of this item.

City Council Action: Approved Second Reading for Formula Business Ordinance Updates. Updates to the Formula Business Ordinance to Clarify Applicability and Terms.



Minute Order Number: 2026-046

Ordinance Number: 1163

3. Sebastopol Kiwanis Club to Conduct their Annual Fireworks Show on July 3, 2026 located on public property of the West Sonoma County Union High School District, Analy High School, 6950 Analy Avenue, Sebastopol and finding this action exempt under CEQA Section 15304(e). At the City of Sebastopol, City Council meeting on July 28, 2021, the Council eliminated the Lottery Policy Application Process and permanently assigned the Annual Fireworks Show to the Sebastopol Kiwanis Club with the following requirements:

By January 15th of each year the Sebastopol Kiwanis Club will provide to the city information as to whether the Kiwanis will conduct or not the Annual Fireworks Show

The Sebastopol Kiwanis Club holds the First Right of Refusal

The Annual Fireworks Show will be scheduled on July 3rd of each year Other non-profits would be invited and included in the event as appropriate

Responsible Department: Gold Ridge Fire Department/Public Works

Fiscal Impact: Staff time required to prepare the minutes is covered within existing budgeted salaries. No additional financial impact is anticipated with approval of this item.

City Council Action: Approved Sebastopol Kiwanis Club to Conduct their Annual Fireworks Show on July 3, 2026 located on public property of the West Sonoma County Union High School District, Analy High School, 6950 Analy Avenue, Sebastopol and finding this action exempt under CEQA Section 15304(e). At the City of Sebastopol, City Council meeting on July 28, 2021, the Council eliminated the Lottery Policy Application Process and permanently assigned the Annual Fireworks Show to the Sebastopol Kiwanis Club with the following requirements:

By January 15th of each year the Sebastopol Kiwanis Club will provide to the city information as to whether the Kiwanis will conduct or not the Annual Fireworks Show

The Sebastopol Kiwanis Club holds the First Right of Refusal

The Annual Fireworks Show will be scheduled on July 3rd of each year Other non-profits would be invited and included in the event as appropriate

Minute Order Number: 2026-047

4. Approval of Process for Transition to Sonoma County Permit Sonoma- Fire Prevention Division CUPA. Item is for authorization for City of Sebastopol to file a formal relinquishment letter with CalEPA under HSC §25404.3(f), requesting that Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) authority for Sebastopol be assigned Sonoma County Permit Sonoma- Fire Prevention Division CUPA and Authorize the City Manager to work with Gold Ridge to execute and submit all required notices, correspondence, and transition documents necessary to effectuate the transfer. If approved by CalEPA, Gold Ridge and City staff will return with remaining action items as listed later in the report.

Responsible Department: City Attorney/Gold Ridge Fire Department/Interim City Manager

Fiscal Impact: Staff time required to prepare agenda item report is covered within existing budgeted salaries. No additional financial impact is anticipated with approval of this item.

City Council Action: Approved Process for Transition to Sonoma County Permit Sonoma- Fire Prevention Division CUPA. Item is for authorization for City of Sebastopol to file a formal relinquishment letter with CalEPA under HSC §25404.3(f), requesting that Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) authority for Sebastopol be assigned Sonoma County Permit Sonoma- Fire Prevention Division CUPA and Authorize the City Manager to work with Gold Ridge to execute and submit all required notices, correspondence, and transition documents necessary to



effectuate the transfer. If approved by CalEPA, Gold Ridge and City staff will return with remaining action items as listed later in the report.

Minute Order Number: 2026-048

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS:** *Informational Items or Presentations are items that are informational only and do not require action by the City Council. Presentations shall be scheduled as necessary for the promotion of an event or service or general information items to the Council and should be limited to ten (10) minutes total in length of item (total length includes questions of Council to presenter and public comment).*

**5. Government Specific Equipment Annual Report Out. Annual report of department’s government specific equipment.**

*Responsible Department: Police*

*Fiscal Impact: The specific equipment in question was purchased prior to 2015. The only cost is the ongoing costs of training and supplies which are currently allocated for in the existing police department budget. The fiscal impact is approximately \$750.00 per year for training and supplies and is a currently budgeted item.*

**THIS ITEM HAS BEEN POSTPONED AND WILL NOT BE HEARD AT THIS MEETING; THIS ITEM WILL BE CONTINUED TO A FUTURE CITY COUNCIL MEETING.**

Reference Order Number: 2026-049

**PUBLIC HEARING(s):**

**6. BOLD Program Participation Discussion & Action. Item includes a presentation on CMFA’s BOLD Program; a Resolution joining the CMFA; and a resolution authorizing participation in the BOLD program for the Canopy Housing Project. All costs can be reimbursed through the BOLD program**

*Responsible Department: Planning Department/Administrative Services/City Attorney*

*Fiscal Impact: Staff time required to prepare agenda item report is covered within existing budgeted salaries. There is no cost or liability for the City to join CMFA as a member. In addition, all of the costs and expenses related to the formation, issuance of bonds and ongoing administration for the CFD formed by the BOLD Program for The Canopy project is the responsibility of City Ventures and/or CMFA and there is no liability or fiscal impact on the City. The City will be reimbursed for any staff time expended on the program.*

City Attorney Mog presented the agenda item and introduced consultants.

Consultants provided a presentation on the BOLD program.

Mayor McLewis opened for questions of staff or consultants. The Council asked various questions of the consultant and City staff.

Mayor McLewis opened the public hearing public comment period. The following member(s) of the public spoke during the public comment period:

Lawrence  
June



Kate

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

City Council Discussion/Deliberations/Comments:

Council continued discussion of the item.

Mayor McLewis called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Hinton moved and Vice Mayor Maurer seconded the motion to approve and adopt a resolution joining CMFA and approve and adopt Resolution authorizing BOLD solely for City Ventures’ The Canopy development project.

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

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Hinton, Zollman, Vice Mayor Maurer and Mayor McLewis

Noes: Councilmember Carter

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved resolution joining CMFA and approve and adopt Resolution authorizing BOLD solely for City Ventures’ The Canopy development project.

Minute Order Number: 2026-050

Resolution Number: 6733-2026

Resolution Number: 6734-2026

**7. Surveillance Ordinance: Public Hearing to consider First Reading and Introduction of Ordinance to amend Chapter 8.80 of the City’s Surveillance Technology and Community Safety Ordinance.**

Responsible Department: City Attorney/Police

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact of this ordinance. The ordinance itself does not authorize the purchase of any equipment, which would be handled through the City’s normal budget and procurement process.

City Attorney Mog presented the agenda item.

Mayor McLewis opened for questions of staff. The Council asked various questions of the City staff.

Mayor McLewis opened the public hearing public comment period. The following member(s) of the public spoke during the public comment period:



Oliver  
 Kate  
 Omar  
 Woody  
 Michael  
 Jim  
 Robert  
 June  
 Una  
 Magnus  
 Jim

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

City Council Discussion/Deliberations/Comments:

Council continued discussion of the item.

Mayor McLewis called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Carter moved and Vice Mayor Maurer seconded the motion the First Reading and Introduction of Ordinance amending Chapter 8.80 of the City’s Surveillance Technology and Community Safety Ordinance as amended:

- Not Make proposed changes to A and B and Maintain Changes to C and D
- Still facilitate use of private cameras
- Not allow to upgrade existing City cameras without Council approval

Language below:

- A. Seeking funds for a surveillance technology, including, but not limited to, applying for a grant or soliciting or accepting State or Federal funds or in-kind or other donations for the purpose of acquiring surveillance technology;
- B. Acquiring or borrowing a new surveillance technology, including, but not limited to, acquiring such technology without the exchange of monies or consideration;
- C. Using a new or existing surveillance technology for a purpose, in a manner or in a location not previously approved by the City Council in accordance with this chapter. This does not apply to traditional security cameras, except for the use of traditional security cameras owned by the City in a new location;  
 or
- D. Entering into an agreement, including a written or oral agreement, with a non-City entity to acquire, share or otherwise use surveillance technology or the information it provides, including data-sharing



agreements. This does not include the City using traditional security cameras for a specific incident or event, as long as such use is not part of an ongoing arrangement with a non-City entity.

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

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Zollman, Vice Mayor Maurer and Mayor McLewis  
 Noes: None  
 Absent: None  
 Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved First Reading and Introduction of Ordinance amending Chapter 8.80 of the City’s Surveillance Technology and Community Safety Ordinance as amended:

- Not Make proposed changes to A and B and Maintain Changes to C and D
- Still facilitate use of private cameras
- Not allow to upgrade existing City cameras without Council approval

Language below;

A. Seeking funds for a surveillance technology, including, but not limited to, applying for a grant or soliciting or accepting State or Federal funds or in-kind or other donations for the purpose of acquiring surveillance technology;

B. Acquiring or borrowing a new surveillance technology, including, but not limited to, acquiring such technology without the exchange of monies or consideration;

C. Using a new or existing surveillance technology for a purpose, in a manner or in a location not previously approved by the City Council in accordance with this chapter. This does not apply to traditional security cameras, except for the use of traditional security cameras owned by the City in a new location; or

D. Entering into an agreement, including a written or oral agreement, with a non-City entity to acquire, share or otherwise use surveillance technology or the information it provides, including data-sharing agreements.

This does not include the City using traditional security cameras for a specific incident or event, as long as such use is not part of an ongoing arrangement with a non-City entity.

Minute Order Number: 2025-051

Ordinance Number: 1164

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

8. Discussion of the Sebastopol Community Cultural Community Center Short- and Long-Term Plan and provide direction to staff. Present the Memorandum prepared by Toni Bertolero regarding short- and long-term plan for the community center and discuss recommendations for Council’s direction.

Responsible Department: Public Works

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact with receipt of this item. The cost for the memo preparation is approved in the CIP budget.

Toni Betolero presented the agenda item.

Mayor McLewis opened for questions of staff. The Council asked various questions of the City staff.



Mayor McLewis opened the public comment period. The following member(s) of the public spoke during the public comment period:

- Kenyon
- Robert
- Craig
- Kate
- Laura
- Oliver

City Council Discussion/Deliberations/Comments:

Council continued discussion of the item.

Mayor McLewis called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Carter moved and Vice Mayor Maurer seconded the motion to:

- Accept the Report and direct staff to include the flood mitigation and repairs in the list prepared by Interactive Resources, in the Fiscal Year 2026-27 Capital Improvement Program for future consideration of approval.
- Direct staff to explore and move forward with implementation for a shared civic space either with the Sebastopol Commons and/or with another non-profit organization.

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

**VOTE:**

- Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Zollman, Vice Mayor Maurer and Mayor McLewis
- Noes: None
- Absent: None
- Abstain: None

**City Council Action:** Approved to Accept the Report and direct staff to include the flood mitigation and repairs in the list prepared by Interactive Resources, in the Fiscal Year 2026-27 Capital Improvement Program for future consideration of approval; and directed staff to explore and move forward with implementation for a shared civic space either with the Sebastopol Commons and/or with another non-profit organization.

Minute Order Number: 2025-052

**9. BAYREN Program – Water \$ave Closure. The Water \$ave Program through BAYREN is closing and BAYREN is proposing options for the City to consider with program closure**

Responsible Department: Administrative Services/City Attorney

Fiscal Impact: BayREN has offered to settle the City’s remaining WUSave obligation for \$13,141.23, a major reduction from the full \$30,020.57 owed. The recommended split is \$7,409.94 from the General Fund and \$5,731.29 from the Water Fund, which would fully close out the program.



Declining the offer means eight more years of repayments and ongoing administrative work to manage a discontinued program.

Accepting the settlement is the most cost-effective option, reduces workload, and cleanly closes the program.

Administrative Services Director Kwong presented the agenda item.

Mayor McLewis opened for questions of staff. The Council asked various questions of City staff.

Mayor McLewis opened the public comment period. The following member(s) of the public spoke during the public comment period:

- Oliver
- Kate
- Steve
- Robert
- Mary
- Mary

City Council Discussion/Deliberations/Comments:

Council continued discussion of the item.

Mayor McLewis called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Vice Mayor Maurer moved and Councilmember Zollman seconded the motion to settle the City’s remaining WUSave obligation for \$13,141.23, a major reduction from the full \$30,020.57 (with General Fund to cover the remaining balance of \$7,409.94)

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

**VOTE:**

- Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Zollman, Vice Mayor Maurer and Mayor McLewis
- Noes: None
- Absent: None
- Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved to settle the City’s remaining WUSave obligation for \$13,141.23, a major reduction from the full \$30,020.57 (with General Fund to cover the remaining balance of \$7,409.94)

Minute Order Number: 2026-053

10. Discussion and Consideration of 2026–2027 City Council Goals and Priorities – Meeting Date, Facilitator, and Process. The item asks the Council to decide on:

- a. Whether to hire an external facilitator for a dedicated goal-setting workshop.
- b. Handle the process internally without a facilitator.



**c. And to set a specific date for the goals/priorities discussion session.**

This is to guide policy, budgeting (especially for FY 2026-27), and operations for the coming period.

Responsible Department: Interim City Manager

Fiscal Impact: Proposals submitted range from \$4400 - \$9125. The FY 25 26 Budget did not allocate or fund a facilitator for the goals and priority setting. If approved, a budget amendment would be required.

Interim City Manager Gourley presented the agenda item.

Mayor McLewis opened for questions of staff. The Council asked various questions of City staff.

Mayor McLewis opened the public comment period. The following member(s) of the public spoke during the public comment period: None

City Council Discussion/Deliberations/Comments:

Council continued discussion of the item.

Mayor McLewis called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Mayor McLewis moved and Vice Mayor Maurer seconded the motion to reject external facilitation and set a date for the Goals and Priorities Setting Meeting, directing staff to prepare a proposed list of actions and priorities using the current six goals.

Date: April 14th 6:00 pm

Youth Annex

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

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Zollman, Vice Mayor Maurer and Mayor McLewis

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

**City Council Action:** Approved motion to reject external facilitation and set a date for the Goals and Priorities Setting Meeting, directing staff to prepare a proposed list of actions and priorities using the current six goals.

Date: April 14th 6:00 pm

Youth Annex

Minute Order Number: 2026-054

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** Two minutes per speaker for up to twenty (20) minutes total for public comments but can be reduced at Mayor’s discretion depending upon the number of speakers or Mayor has discretion to allow for additional time beyond the 20 minutes allocated for public comment dependent upon the subject matter or number of speakers.

None



**COUNCILMEMBER(S) REQUESTS FOR FUTURE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:** None

**CITY COUNCIL/CITY STAFF REPORTS/COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/FUTURE MEETINGS:**

11. City Manager and/or City Clerk Reports: (This will be either verbal reports at the meeting, or written reports provided at or prior to the meeting)

- a. Departmental Reports
- b. Animal Control Inspection Reports -Police

**Reference Order Number:** 2026-055

12. City Council Reports/Committee/Sub-Committee Meeting Reports: (Reports by Mayor/City Councilmembers Regarding Various Agency Meetings/Committee Meetings/Sub-Committee Meeting /Conferences Attended and Possible Direction to its Representatives (If Needed) on Pending issues before such Boards. ((This will be either verbal reports at the meeting, or written reports provided at or prior to the meeting)

13. Council Communications Received (Information/Meetings/Correspondence Received from the General Public to Councilmembers)

**CLOSED SESSION:** NONE

**ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

February 17, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting was adjourned at 10:29 and was adjourned to the next Regular City Council Meeting of Tuesday, March 3, 2026 at 6:00 pm, Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully submitted:

Mary C. Gourley  
Interim City Manager

Attachment: Raw Minutes



City Council Meeting - February 17, 2026

ZACH, ARE WE READY TO START RECORDING THE MEETING? THANK YOU.

NO PROBLEM. SO ARE WE READY? ALL RIGHT, EVERYONE, WOW. WE HAVE A FULL HOUSE. WELCOME, EVERYONE. ALL RIGHT, SO LET'S JUST CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER. IT IS 6:00 P.M., FEBRUARY 17, AND MARY, DO YOU WANT TO --

I'LL CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER. COUNCILMEMBER CARTER?

HERE.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

HERE.

COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN?

YES.

VICE MAYOR MAURER?

HERE.

MAYOR MCLEWIS?

HERE.

PLEASE NOTE, ALL COUNCILMEMBERS ARE IN ATTENDANCE.

ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU. WE HAVE SPECIAL GUESTS HERE TONIGHT, SO WE'RE GOING TO DO A ABSOLUTE TO THE FLAG, BUT SCOUTING AMERICA, TROOP 27 SEBASTOPOL, SOMEONE IS GOING TO COME UP AND HELP US LEAD THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE. ALL RIGHT, SO IF WE WOULD ALL STAND. YOU CAN JUST STAND RIGHT THERE IF YOU WANT TO GO AHEAD AND GET IT STARTED. [ INAUDIBLE ]

PLEASE JOIN ME IN THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG . OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND TO THE REPUBLIC FOR WHICH IT STANDS ONE NATION UNDER GOD INDIVISIBLE WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL.

ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. LET ME GET BACK. SO LET'S SEE. I JUST WANT TO SEE IF WE HAVE EVERYONE HERE. WE ALWAYS DO A LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT, SO I'M GOING TO GO AHEAD AND READ THAT RIGHT NOW. THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL ACKNOWLEDGES THAT WE LIVE AND WORK WITHIN THE UNCEDED



ANCESTRAL HOMELANDS OF THE SOUTHERN POMO AND COAST MIWOK PEOPLE. WE PAY OUR RESPECTS TO THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE GENERATIONS OF THESE PEOPLES, INCLUDING THE FED RATED INDIANS OF GRATON RANCHERIA. AND IN ADDITION EVERY MEETING, I READ JUST A LITTLE BLURB ABOUT REMEMBERING THE HISTORY OF SEBASTOPOL. SO JUST TWO QUICK ONES FOR THIS EVENING. I DO THIS IN CONJUNCTION WITH OUR WEST COUNTY HISTORY MUSEUM. IN 1937, SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS WERE MADE IN SEBASTOPOL. SEBASTOPOL RECEIVED \$19,000 IN FUNDS TO IMPROVE ITS SIDEWALKS AND STREETS. THE PROJECT ACTUALLY EMPLOYED 28 MEN FOR EIGHT MONTHS. THEN IN 1939, A \$30,000 PARK FUND WAS GIVEN TO SEBASTOPOL. SEBASTOPOL WAS ENDOWED WITH THE CASH LEGACY OF \$30,000 OR MORE TO BE USED IN DEVELOPING A CITY PARK AND PLAYGROUND ACCORDING TO TERMS OF THE WILL OF KATHERINE L. IVES TODAY IN SANTA ROSA. THIS IS FROM A PAPER BACK THEN. UNDER THE TERMS OF THE WILL, PRESIDENT OF SEBASTOPOL NATIONAL BANK AND THREE TRUSTEES WERE APPOINTED. HARRY FULLER, A.F. COCHRAN, AND JEANNE BECK. THEY SHALL REQUIRE ATTRACTED LAND TO BE DEDICATED FOR THE PLAYGROUND RECREATIONAL USES TO APPROVE TRACK, AND SHALL BE DESIGNATED AS IVES MEMORIAL PARK. THEREAFTER IT SHALL BE DEEDED TO THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL. MRS. IVES HAD CONSIDERABLE PROPERTY HOLDINGS IN THE CITY, AND SHE WAS A COUSIN OF THE LATE A.B. SWAIN. A PIECE OF INFORMATION. A.B. SWAIN DEVELOPED SWAIN WOODS JUST SOUTH OF HYDE PARK. I ENJOY READING ALL THESE PIECES OF HISTORY, NOT BEING FROM HERE. I'VE LIVED HERE FOR 11 YEARS, SO I LEARNED A LOT. I HOPE OTHERS DO AS WELL. SO LET'S SEE, MOVING ON TO THE NEXT ITEM. WE HAVE PROCLAMATIONS TONIGHT. WE HAVE A PROCLAMATION -- I DON'T KNOW. LET ME PUT MY GLASSES ON HERE TO SEE WHO IS ALL HERE. SO DO WE HAVE GOLD RIDGE PRESENT? OKAY. SO WE HAVE A CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION, AND I'M GOING TO GO AHEAD AND READ THOSE. LET ME JUST PULL THOSE OUT VERY QUICKLY. MY APOLOGIES. SOME OF THESE GOT A LITTLE BIT OUT OF ORDER. SORRY, OKAY. SO I'M GOING TO READ ONE OF THESE, AND THEN I WILL JUST CALL EVERYONE UP. YOU CAN LET ME KNOW -- I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT A GROUP PICTURE AT THE END. YOU CAN LET ME KNOW IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO DO THAT. THIS CERTIFICATE IS PRESENTED TO SHOW OUR SINCERE APPRECIATION FOR YOUR PROMPT PROFESSIONAL AND DEDICATED RESPONSE TO THE HOUSE FIRE. YOUR COMMITMENT TO PUBLIC SAFETY TEAMWORK AND SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY WAS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED THROUGH YOUR ACTIONS. THE CITY SENDS ITS -- RESPONDING TO THIS EMERGENCY IN HELPING PROTECT LIVES AND PROPERTY. ON BEHALF OF THE CITY COUNCIL AND CITIZENS OF SEBASTOPOL, I, MAYOR MCLEWIS, GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGE YOUR DEDICATION TO THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL AND THE CITIZENS OF THIS COMMUNITY. AND THIS IS ON GOLD RIDGE FIRE DISTRICT, IF YOU WANT TO COME UP. WE CAN PRESENT THIS TO YOU.

AND NOW WE'D ALSO LIKE TO PRESENT THE SAME CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION TO OUR POLICE OFFICERS, SO WE HAVE CHIEF MCDONAGH, OFFICER JOSIAH WOTILA, OFFICER JAIME BALDOVINOS, AND DISPATCHER CHRIS MOONEY. IF YOU WOULD ALL LIKE TO COME UP, WE'D LOVE TO PRESENT YOU WITH A CERTIFICATE, AND TRULY A LOT OF GRATITUDE FOR EVERYTHING YOU'VE DONE. WE JUST WANT TO SAY THANK YOU. SEAN, DID YOU WANT A GROUP PICTURE WITH THE FIREFIGHTERS? OKAY. IF WE COULD DO THAT VERY QUICKLY. YOU WANT TO COME UPFRONT AND WE CAN DO IT? THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH. WE APPRECIATE YOU GIVING US LATITUDE TO HONOR THESE GUYS. EVERYONE WHO HAS TAKEN CARE OF OUR COMMUNITY EVERY DAY. ALL RIGHT, SO WE'RE GOING TO GO ONTO STATEMENTS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST. DO WE HAVE ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST? NO? OKAY. ALL RIGHT, NOW WE'RE GOING TO GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA. IT'S UP TO 20 MINUTES, AND I'LL HAND IT OVER TO MARY.



THANK YOU, MAYOR. SO AS YOU JUST STATED, THIS IS THE FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. THERE ARE TWO. THERE'S A SECOND ONE AT THE END OF THE AGENDA. IT IS A 20-MINUTE TIME LIMIT FOR THE FIRST PERIOD. THAT MEANS IT IS TWO MINUTES PER SPEAKER, SO WE'LL HAVE TEN SPEAKERS. I'LL DO CHAMBERS FIRST, THEN I'LL GO OUT TO ZOOM, COME BACK TO CHAMBERS, GO OUT TO ZOOM. ANYONE IN THE CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA? LISA, THEN I'LL GO OUT TO ZOOM AFTER THAT.

HI, EVERYBODY. IS IT ON?

IS THE LIGHT ON?

MY NAME IS LISA PIERS. I WANT TO SAY A FEW THINGS ABOUT A BIG DECISION YOU'LL SOON BE FACING ABOUT OUR STREET SYSTEM. I THINK THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION WE NEED TO ASK OURSELVES IS WHY IN 1985 DID WE SWITCH FROM A TWO-WAY STREET SYSTEM TO A ONE-WAY SYSTEM. AND WE HAVE TO REALLY UNDERSTAND THAT ONE. AND THEN WHY WOULD WE WANT TO SWITCH BACK? AND THEN WHAT ARE ALL THE POTENTIAL DRAWBACKS, RISKS, AND COSTS WITH DOING THIS MAJOR CHANGE OF GOING BACK TO A TWO-WAY SYSTEM? WE CAN SEE HOW PEOPLE VOTED BEFORE, AND WE CAN SEE THE RESULTS OF THE RECENT SURVEY. EVERYTHING I'VE SEEN POINTS TO THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE NOT WANTING TO SWITCH TO TWO-WAY STREETS. I THINK PEOPLE RECOGNIZE GIVEN OUR SITUATION, WE WOULD BE LOOKING AT BIG PROBLEMS IF WE WENT THIS WAY. IF THE COUNCIL IS AT ALL CONSIDERING SWITCHING OUR SYSTEM, I WOULD ASK YOU TO LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE FIRST. I AGREE WITH WHAT HINTON SAID IN A PUBLIC COMMENT IN 2023 WHEN SHE SAID PEOPLE VOTED TO TURN MAIN STREET INTO A ONE-WAY STREET, AND SUPPORTERS OF TWO-WAY STREETS WANT TO CHANGE THAT, THEY COULD TAKE IT TO THE VOTERS. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, LISA, FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL GO OUT TO ZOOM. KATE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

HELLO.

THANK YOU. CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

YES, THANK YOU.

GREAT, GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE.

COUNCIL AND THE CITY IS PROBABLY AWARE JACK TIBBOTT, FORMERLY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL IS NOW RUNNING AS A REPUBLICAN IN THE STATE OF OREGON. HIS REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN MODE MOTTO, COMMON SENSE LEADERSHIP, LESS TAXES, LESS REGULATION. HE MOVED TO OREGON AND SOUGHT POLITICAL OFFICE BECAUSE HE WAS, "DISILLUSIONED BY CALIFORNIA'S CULTURE AND POLITICAL CLIMATE," AND WANTED SOMETHING DIFFERENT FOR HIS CHILDREN. A PLACE WHERE HIS BOYS COULD BE RAISED WITH STRONG VALUES, A SOLID WORK ETHIC, FAITH, SPIRITUALTY, AND A DEEP CONNECTION TO AGRICULTURE. I BRING THIS UP BECAUSE JACK MADE MANY PERSONAL GUARANTEES IN REGARD TO THE CITY'S PARTNERSHIP WITH ST. VINCENT DE PAUL ON A PROJECT THAT IS NOW UNDERWAY. MANY PEOPLE SAID, INCLUDING MYSELF, HE WAS A CARPET GRIFTER AND HAD NO SKIN IN THE GAME WHEN IT CAME TO SEBASTOPOL. HE HAD NO GUILTY



ABOUT PUTTING A HOME KEY SITE, ALLOWING ACTIVE DRUG USE IN THE MIDDLE SEBASTOPOL'S COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR, CLOSE RANGE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL IN A NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT FOR FAMILIES. SO HE HAS MOVED TO OREGON TO RUN AS A REPUBLICAN, AND THE PEOPLE OF SEBASTOPOL ARE STUCK WITH A HORRIBLE AND PERMANENT DEAL. COUNCIL NEEDS TO LEARN AN IMPORTANT LESSON THEY'VE NEVER SEENED TO LEARN, WHICH THE DECISIONS THEY MADE MUST BE FOR THE BETTERMENT OF THEIR RESIDENTS AND SEBASTOPOL BUSINESSES. DO NOT LET OUTSIDE INTEREST, NON-PROFIT, OR COMMERCIAL, INFLUENCE DECISIONS. IS THIS GOOD FOR SEBASTOPOL RESIDENTS? IS THIS GOOD FOR SEBASTOPOL OF BUSINESSES? IF THE ANSWER IS NO ON EITHER ACCOUNT, THE VOTE MUST BE NO. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, KATE FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. IF THERE IS ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT --

HI, STEVE PIERCE FROM SEBASTOPOL. I'M FOLLOWING UP ON MY WIFE, LISA'S COMMENTS ON THE PARKING TRAFFIC OPTIONS. IT'S REALLY THE DOWNTOWN PLAN, PRODUCED. OUR CONSULTANTS. I THINK THEY HAD A PRUDENT RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY. THEY SUGGESTED THE CITY GO WITH THE WALKABLE ONE-WAY OPTION AND THEN DO SOME CURB LINES ON MAIN STREET TO MAKE IT EASIER IF THE CITY DECIDED IN THE FUTURE TO GO WITH A TWO-WAY OPTION. THEY ALSO RECOMMENDED THAT THERE BE A FEASIBILITY TO STUDY AND SEE, CAN WE EVEN FIT TWO LANES OF BICYCLES? TWO LANES OF TRAFFIC ON MCKINLEY. SO AS YOU'RE GOING AROUND THE PLAZA, DOES THAT ALL FIT? CAN WE REALLY PULL IT OFF? THE PLANNING COMMISSION REJECTED THAT IDEA. THEY DECIDED THAT THEY WANTED TO GO WITH THE TOTAL TWO-WAY OPTION WITH SOME MINOR CHANGES. THEY WANTED TO ADD SOME PARKING ON MAIN STREET AND SOME WIDER SIDEWALKS THAT WERE A PART OF THE WALKABLE ONE-WAY OPTION. THIS IS REALLY NOT A HYBRID OPTION. IT'S BASICALLY TWO WAYS. YOU CAN'T BE PARTLY PREGNANT HERE. WHEN THE CONSULTANTS SAID THERE WOULD BE A 5% TO 10% INCREASE IN TRAVEL TIME WITH ANY OF THE OPTIONS, PLEASE REMEMBER THAT THEY DID NOT INCLUDE ANY OF THE BIG WITH IMPACTS FROM LEFT TURNS ON A TWO-WAY SCENARIO. YOU CAN PICTURE YOURSELF DRIVING IN THE TWO WAY. YOU NEED TO MAKE A LEFT INTO A PARKING LOT ONTO ANOTHER STREET, EVEN INTO YOUR OWN DRIVEWAY.

STEVE, YOU HAVE ABOUT 15 SECONDS.

OKAY, AND YOU HAVE TO WAIT FOR THE ONCOMING CARS TO MAKE THAT LEFT. THAT WAS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN THE 5 TO 10% INCREASE IN TRAVEL TIME. WHATEVER WE DO, WE'RE LOOKING AT HAVING TO DO MATCHING. END OF 20% MATCH.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL GO OUT TO ZOOM IF THERE IS ANYONE ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR AN ITEM NOT ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA. PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY? SEEING NONE, I'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS.

HI, I AGREE WITH THE PIERCE FAMILY, AND LISA WROTE A VERY GOOD POST ON SEBASTOPOL TIMES ON THIS TOPIC. SO I WAS TALKING TONIGHT ABOUT THE MICAH'S HUGS THING BECAUSE THE LAST MEETING, WE HAD A WHOLE ROOM OF PEOPLE. NONE OF WHOM LIVED HERE. THEY WERE INSULTING AND ASKING THEM TO EDUCATE THEMSELVES ABOUT NARCAN AND SO ON AND SO FORTH. I THINK THAT WILL COME BACK UP ONTO THE AGENDA THAT WHERE SHE A POLICE FORCE AND A FIRE, AND IF YOU FIND SOMEBODY LYING ON THE



STREETS AND YOU THINK THEY'VE OVERDOSED, THE PROCEDURE IS TO CALL 911. WE'VE SEEN THE POLICE AND THE FIRE SHOW UP, SAVE A WOMAN IN A BURNING HOUSE'S LIFE, VERY QUICKLY. A FEW WEEKS AGO. YOU KNOW, WE'RE IN A VERY DIFFICULT SITUATION, WHERE WE HAVE NARCAN LYING AROUND AND PEOPLE WHO ARE MAYBE DRUNK, TO SEE SOMEBODY LYING IN THE GUTTER, WHO MAY BE DIABETIC OR SOMETHING. IT COULD CAUSE WAY MORE PROBLEMS. WHEN IT COMES BACK UP FOR THE MICAH'S HUGS THING, WE HAVE TO ASK OURSELVES, WHAT ARE WE ACHIEVING HERE? WE ALREADY HAVE A VERY EXPENSIVE POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT WHO -- EMTs ARE WELL EQUIPPED TO DEAL WITH THESE KINDS OF SITUATIONS. SO HAVING OLD NEWSPAPER BOXES WITH NARCAN IS A QUESTIONABLE VALUE IN THIS SITUATION. IT MAY COMPLICATE THINGS FOR THE PERSON WHO HAS COLLAPSED. SO THE NEXT TIME THIS TOPIC COMES UP, IT WILL BE A BUNCH OF PEOPLE SHOUTING WE NEED NARCAN EVERYWHERE. IF YOU CARE ABOUT THIS, YOU SHOULD BE CARRYING NARCAN YOURSELF, AND YOU SHOULD BE TAKING PERSONALITY RESPONSIBILITY, NOT EXPECTING THE CITY TO TAKE THAT RISK, POSSIBLY HAVE A LOT OF LEGAL DOWNSIDE TO THAT, IF SOMEBODY IS INJURED THROUGH SOMEBODY THAT DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO USE NARCAN, SO THAT IS MY COMMENT. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, OLIVER FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL GO OUT TO ZOOM. JIM, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

THERE I GO.

CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

I CAN.

GREAT, GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

WILL SO I'M CALLING ALSO ON THE TOPIC OF THE TWO-WAY, ONE-WAY STREETS. I'M NOT IN FAVOR OF ASKING CALTRANS AND GOING OUT AND TRYING TO FIND A WHOLE BUNCH OF MONEY, WHICH WE DON'T KNOW IF WE COULD DO THE TWO-WAY STREET THING. I'VE BEEN ON THE FENCE ABOUT IT BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW WHAT IS BETTER. I WASN'T HERE IN 1985. I DON'T REALLY KNOW WHAT IT WAS LIKE. BUT I LOVE LISA'S NICE ARTICLE, LOOKING AT THE HISTORY. AND AT THIS POINT, I ALSO DON'T LIKE THE PROCESS OF THE CONSULTANT COMING UP WITH FOUR PLANS THAT WERE HARD TO DECIPHER WHAT HAPPENS. THE DEVIL IS IN THE DETAILS. I WORK ON SOUTH MAIN STREET, AND I RIDE MY BIKE AROUND TOWN. I FEEL COMFORTABLE THE WAY THINGS ARE. SOUTH MAIN STREET, ONE OF THE TWO LANES, HEAD DOWN 116, SOUTH OF TOWN. IT'S TOO FAST AND THERE IS TOO MUCH. BUT THEN ON THE OTHER HAND, THERE'S THESE WIDE TIMES WHERE THE STOPLIGHT HAS STOPPED ALL TRAFFIC, AND YOU CAN GET ACROSS QUITE SAFELY. AND THERE ARE PUSH BUTTONS ON THE LIGHTS YOU COULD USE THAT COULD SLOW THE TRAFFIC DOWN. SO I THINK RUSHING INTO SOMETHING AND ASSUMING THAT OUR TOWN WANTS TWO WAY IS A MISTAKE. AND I WOULD RATHER DO INCREMENTAL CHANGES AND/OR TRY THINGS OUT AND EXPERIMENT. WIDER SIDEWALKS DOWNTOWN WOULD BE GREAT. YOU KNOW, THE BIKE LANE THING. I COULD GET AROUND WITHOUT NEEDING A LOT OF BIKE LANES. BUT I KNOW CALTRANS WILL REQUIRE BIKE LANES AND THAT'S A GOOD THING FOR THE FUTURE. ANY WAY, I'M NOT IN FAVOR OF WHAT CAME OUT OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, AND I WOULD LOVE TO TALK SOME MORE WHEN THE CITY COUNCIL TAKES IT UP. THANK YOU.

AND ALL RIGHT, I COULD MAKE A COMMENT TOO. NEXT TIME.



OKAY, THANK YOU, JIM, AND I'LL COME BACK TO YOU. IS THERE ANYONE IN ZOOM, I'M SORRY, IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR AN ITEM NOT ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA? PLEASE COME UP TO THE PODIUM.

GOOD MORNING, LONG DAY, GOOD EVENING, MY NAME IS CRAIG, AND I'M IN THE CLUB, AND I'M A GRANGER, SEBASTOPOL GRANGE. FIRST OFF, THANK YOU TO THE SCOUTS FOR EVERYTHING YOU DO FOR US, FOR THE THIRD OF JULY. I'M HERE TONIGHT TO TALK ABOUT THE BOX BUILD THAT'S HAPPENING ON SUNDAY, APRIL 12. IT'S FROM 11:00 TO 3:00. LAST YEAR, WE BUILT 37 GARDEN BOXES FOR THE COMMUNITY. WE GAVE THEM AWAY TO FOLKS WHO WANTED TO GROW HABITAT FOR GOOD PLANTS OR SPECIES AND ALSO FOR FOLKS WHO WERE FEELING FOOD INSECURE. SO THAT WAS A COLLABORATION LAST YEAR BETWEEN THE SEBASTOPOL GRANGE 306 AND THE CLUB OF SEBASTOPOL. THIS YEAR WE'RE DOING IT AGAIN, APRIL 12, FROM 11:00 A.M. TO 3:00 P.M. AGAIN AT THE SEBASTOPOL GRANGE, EXCEPT, THE DRUM ROLL, PLEASE. THE LION'S CLUB IS JOINING US AS WELL. SO NOW WE'VE ADDED A THIRD GROUP, AND WE HAVE THREE OF US WORKING TOGETHER, COLLABORATIVELY. I'D LIKE TO INVITE THE CITY TO COME ON OUT IF YOU'D LIKE TO. THE SCOUTS, OF COURSE, AND AGAIN, THANK YOU TO THE SCOUTS FOR ALL THE WORK YOU DO FOR QUANTUS CLUB IN OUR COMMUNITY.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. DID YOU WANT TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT?

YES, PLEASE.

ALL RIGHT, CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER STILL?

YES.

OKAY. GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE.

OKAY, THANKS. I'M GOING TO READ THE COMMENT I PUT IN THE SEBASTOPOL TIMES AFTER LISA'S PIECE. LISA PIERCE'S PIECE. KUDOS AND GRATITUDE TO LISA PIERCE, WHO STUDIED THE HISTORY OF OUR TOWN FOR MANY, MANY YEARS, MADE VIDEOS ABOUT IT, AND CAREFULLY STUDIED MAPS AND PLANS. FOR HER CONSCIENTIOUS CLEAR-HEADED RECOUNTING OF RELEVANT HISTORY. WHY REPEAT MISTAKES THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN MADE? ANY SOLUTION THAT COULD INCREASE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS AND GRIDLOCK MUST BE DEEPLY SCRUTINIZED AND NOT RUSHED THROUGH. CONSULTANTS WHO DON'T LIVE HERE, REMEMBER, THE IVES PARK PROPOSAL TO DO AWAY WITH OUR BELOVED BALL FIELD? EVEN OUR LOCAL PLANNING COMMISSION, NO MATTER HOW WELL INTENTIONED OR VISIONARY ARE NOT THEMSELVES ELECTED OFFICIALS, BUT CAN HAVE AN OUTSIZED INFLUENCE OVER THEM AND OVER THE TOWN WITH LITTLE TO NO ACCOUNTABILITY WHEN THINGS GO WRONG, I MIGHT ADD OR IF AND WHEN. AND EVEN THOUGH WALKING AND BICYCLING TO TOWN ARE IDEAL OPTIONS TO PROMOTE FOR THE NEARBY AND THE ABLE-BODIED, THEY ARE NOT VIABLE FOR COASTAL TOWNS BEYOND PUBLIC TRANSIT OR FOR VISITORS OR PASSER THROUGH FROM FAR AWAY. WE STILL MUST CONSIDER DRIVERS, TRAFFIC FLOWS, AND PARKING ISSUES, AS CARS ARE A CURRENT REALITY IN A RURAL TOWN WITH A COUPLE CITY BLOCKS AND TWO STATE HIGHWAYS PASSING THROUGH. LET'S PLEASE BE KIND TO ALL PARTIES INVOLVED, INCLUDING OUR BELOVED LOCAL BUSINESSES. THANK YOU.



THANK YOU, KERRY FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA? SEEING NONE, I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. ROBERT, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES.

THANK YOU. CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

YEAH.

GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE.

THIS IS QUICK. JUST TO ADD TO OLIVER'S COMMENT ON THE NARCAN BOXES. PARTICULARLY THE INPUT WE GOT FROM A LOT OF PEOPLE THAT APPARENTLY DON'T LIVE IN SEBASTOPOL AND HAVE NO REAL SKIN IN THE GAME. ONE OF THE COMMENTERS, I BELIEVE WAS HEAD OF A GROUP, NON-PROFIT GROUP. SAID THIS IS HAPPENING ALL OVER THE STATE. IN FACT, QUOTED THE SPECIFIC PLACE WHERE THESE BOXES WERE BEING PLACED, YOU KNOW, WE'RE BEHIND THE TIMES, I GUESS. I HAPPEN TO BE IN SAN LUIS OBISPO AND THEY'RE NOT PUTTING BOXES ON THE STREETS. THEY DID PUT SOME SMALL BOXES THAT LOOKED LIKE A FIRST AID KIT THAT HANG ON THE WALL INSIDE PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT A LEVEL THAT WAS SUFFICIENTLY HIGH ENOUGH THAT CHILDREN WOULDN'T BE PLAYING WITH IT, MAKING IT ACCESSIBLE BROADLY IN THE CITY. BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT WAS BEING DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING. I THINK WE WERE BEING MISLED BY PEOPLE WHO GAVE THIS ADVICE TO US. SOMEHOW WE HAVE TO TURN ON OUR SPIDEY SENSES AND SENSE WHEN THINGS DON'T MAKE SENSE. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL COME BACK INTO PUBLIC CHAMBERS. IF THERE IS ANYONE THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT --

HI, MY NAME IS RUSSELL. I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TONIGHT. I AM THE SENIOR PATROL LEADER OF SCOUTING AMERICA SEBASTOPOL TROOP 27, AND I'M PROUD TO BE HERE WITH MY AMAZING TROOP BESIDE ME, AS WELL AS THOSE WHO COULD NOT BE HERE TODAY, SUCH AS MY SCOUT MASTER, MR. GRAVES. WE ARE AN ORGANIZATION THAT VALUES LEADERSHIP AND CIVIC DUTY. AS PART OF THIS, WE'VE BEEN PUTTING UP FLAGS ON MAIN STREET SINCE AT LEAST THE 1990s. WE DO THIS ON MOST STATE AND FEDERAL HOLIDAYS, WHICH IS VERY POPULAR TO THE PEOPLE OF SEBASTOPOL. PEOPLE THANK US AND THEY HAVE ASKED US WHY THE FLAGS AREN'T UP WHEN WE UNFORTUNATELY CANNOT DO IT. HOWEVER, RECENTLY WE'VE RAN INTO AN ISSUE. WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO POST FLAGS RECENTLY AS IT HAS COME TO OUR ATTENTION WE POTENTIALLY NEED A PERMIT FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL INSTANCE OF CARRYING OUT THIS COMMUNITY SERVICE. THIS IS PROVEN TO BE A LENGTHY PROCESS, AND WE OFTEN CANNOT GET A PERMIT IN TIME. SO WE ARE HERE AS A TROOP TO RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THE FOLLOWING. WE ASK THE CITY AMEND ITS ORDINANCE REGARDING PERMITTING POSTING OF FLAGS ON MAIN STREET. WE'RE ASKING THE ORDINANCE EXPLICITLY ALLOW FOR THE POSTING OF U.S. FLAGS ON MAIN STREET. WE ALSO ASK THE SERVICE WILL BE CONDUCTED IN PERPETUITY BY AN ORGANIZATION OF THE CITY'S CHOOSING, AND HUMBLLY ASK THAT TROOP 27 BE RECOGNIZED AS THAT ORGANIZATION. SO YOU MAY BE ASKING WHY SHOULD TROOP 27 BE THE ONES TO PROVIDE THIS IMPORTANT SERVICE? SO I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT THE SCOUTS WHO ARE HERE WITH ME TONIGHT. NONE OF THEM ARE HERE BECAUSE THEY WERE FORCED TO BE. THEY'RE ALL HERE BECAUSE THEY



WANT TO HAVE A PART IN CONTINUING TO PROVIDE SAFE AND CHEERFUL SERVICE TO THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL. WE'VE CARRIED THIS OUT SUCCESSFULLY FOR DECADES AS A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE CITY AND OUR ORGANIZATION, WHICH WE HOPE TO CONTINUE.

YOU HAVE ABOUT TEN SECONDS LEFT.

THANK YOU. WORKING WITH THE CITY IS VERY VALUABLE TO US, AS IT LETS US DEMONSTRATE OUR CIVIC PRIDE AND ENGAGE WITH THE VIBRANT COMMUNITY OF SEBASTOPOL. IF ANYMORE INFORMATION IS NEEDED, I'D BE HAPPY TO PROVIDE FURTHER DETAILS. ON BEHALF OF THE ENTIRETY OF TROOP 27, I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR CONSIDERING OUR REQUEST.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. OMAR, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

GOOD EVENING, MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS, STAFF, AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. I AM SPEAKING OUT IN FULL FAVOR OF THE LAST COMMENT. I THINK THAT THE SCOUTING OF AMERICA PROVIDES AN INCREDIBLE SERVICE TO THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL, WHEN WE HAVE THE FLAGS EACH HOLIDAY, AND I WANT TO THANK HIM FOR THAT. AS SOMEBODY WHO IS PROUD TO LIVE IN SEBASTOPOL, I THINK MY SENSE OF CIVIC PRIDE IS HYPHENED EVERY TIME I SEE THE FLAGS, AND I DIDN'T KNOW WHO PUT THEM UP, BUT I WANT TO THANK ALL OF YOU SCOUTS FOR DOING THAT. YOU'VE DONE REALLY WELL FOR OUR COMMUNITY, AND THANK YOU FOR SPEAKING OUT TODAY AND FOR SHOWING UP, AND FOR YOUR COMMUNITY SERVICE. SO I'M 100% IN FAVOR OF THIS. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, OMAR FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. THIS WOULD BE THE TENTH SPEAKER, SO THIS WOULD BE OUR 20-MINUTE TIME LIMIT, SO I HAVE ONE MR. SPEAKER, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT. PLEASE COME UP TO THE PODIUM. SEEING NONE, I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. MYRIAH, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

I CAN, HI, EVERYBODY, GOOD EVENING. I'M JUST TAKING THIS OPPORTUNITY TO HOP ON REGARDING THE APPLE BLOSSOM FESTIVAL COMING UP, APRIL 25 AND 26. WE'RE DEEP INTO THE PLANNING FOR THE FESTIVAL. EVERYTHING IS GOING REALLY WELL. WE'VE GOT SOME REALLY FUN SURPRISES WITH YOU WITH THE WIZARD OF OZ THEME. I THINK IT WILL BE A GREAT WEEKEND. THAT BEING SAID, MY REASON FOR COMING TONIGHT AMONG OTHER REASONS I WANT TO HEAR ABOUT ALL THE OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU ALL ARE DEALING WITH AT THE MOMENT IS VOLUNTEERS. VOLUNTEERS FOR THE FESTIVAL ARE CRUCIAL TO MAKE A SUCCESSFUL EVENT. WE NEED ABOUT 150 PEOPLE TO HAVE A STRONG VOLUNTEER TEAM OVER THE COURSE OF THE WEEKEND. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE INVOLVED AND VOLUNTEER, YOU CAN GO TO [APPLEBLOSSOMFEST.COM](http://APPLEBLOSSOMFEST.COM). THERE'S A LINK FOR VOLUNTEERING, AND WE APPRECIATE IT. YOU GET FREE TICKETS TO THE EVENT, AND REALLY CUTE TIE DYE T-SHIRT, SO THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. SO MAYOR, THAT IS THE 20-MINUTE TIME LIMIT FOR THE FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

OKAY. THANK YOU.



THANK YOU, EVERYONE FOR YOUR COMMENTS. AND WE ARE GOING TO MOVE ONTO -- OH, I'M SORRY. GO AHEAD.

I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR COMING TONIGHT TO THE BOY SCOUT GROUP, AND TO LET YOU KNOW THAT I WILL BE SURE TO BRING AN AMENDMENT BACK FOR THE FLAG POLICY. SO IF YOU CAN GET YOUR LETTER TO OUR INTERIM CITY MANAGER, I'LL FOLLOW UP, OKAY? THANK YOU.

ANYONE ELSE? OKAY. OH.

I ALSO WANT TO THANK THE SCOUT TROOP FOR DOING THIS SO OFTEN. YOU KNOW, NOT MANY PEOPLE KNOW WHO IT IS, SO IT'S GREAT FOR YOU TO COME UP AND PUT IT OUT THERE. HOPEFULLY WE CAN RECOGNIZE YOU GUYS A LITTLE BIT BETTER. THANK YOU.

OKAY, ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE'RE GOING TO MOVE ON TO OUR CONSENT CALENDAR. LET'S SEE. SO NUMBER ONE, APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 3, 2026. APPROVAL OF SECOND READING FOR THE FORMULA BUSINESS ORDINANCE UPDATES. UPDATES TO THE FORMULA BUSINESS ORDINANCE TO CLARIFY APPLICABILITY AND TERMS. SEBASTOPOL KIWANIS CLUB, NUMBER THREE, TO CONDUCT THEIR ANNUAL FIREWORKS SHOW ON JULY 3, 2026 LOCATED ON PUBLIC PROPERTY OF THE WEST SONOMA COUNTY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, ANALY AVENUE, SEBASTOPOL, AND FINDING THIS ACTION EXEMPT UNDER CEQA SECTION 15304E. NUMBER FOUR. APPROVAL OF PROCESS FOR TRANSITION TO SONOMA COUNTY PERMIT, FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION, ITEM FOR THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL TO FILE A FORMAL RELINQUISHMENT LETTER WITH CAL EPA UNDER HSC 25404.3F, REQUESTING THAT CERTIFIED UNIFIED PROGRAM AGENCY, CUPA, AUTHORITY FOR SEBASTOPOL BE ASSIGNED TO SONOMA COUNTY PERMIT, SONOMA-FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION CUPA, AND AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO WORK WITH GOLD RIDGE TO EXECUTE AND SUBMIT ALL REQUIRED NOTICES, CORRESPONDENCE, AND TRANSITION DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THE TRANSFER. IF APPROVED BY CAL EPA, GOLD RIDGE AND CITY STAFF WILL RETURN WITH REMAINING ACTION ITEMS AS LISTED LATER IN THE REPORT. SO DOES ANYONE WANT TO PULL ANY ITEMS FROM CONSENT CALENDAR? NO? OKAY. THEN WE'LL GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT.

THANK YOU, MAYOR. SO THIS IS PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS JUST READ. IF YOU'D LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THOSE FOUR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS, AGAIN, IT IS A TWO-MINUTE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD, AND I'LL COME INTO CHAMBERS FIRST, THEN GO OUT TO ZOOM. DO YOU HAVE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM?

WELL THANK YOU FOR WELCOMING ME. MAYOR, MADAM MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND WORTHY CLERK AND ATTORNEY AND FINANCIAL CHAIR. I'M A MEMBER OF THE KIWANIS, AND I WANT TO EXPRESS HOW WONDERFUL IT WAS TO USE THE SPACE AROUND THE COMMUNITY CENTER LAST YEAR TO TRANSFORM THE FIREWORKS FROM A BACK-TO-SCHOOL NIGHT AT THE SCHOOL, WHICH WAS A GREAT TRADITION, TO A TOWN PICNIC. I THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING US TO USE THE SPACE AGAIN, AND I REALLY LOOK FORWARD TO PUTTING ON THIS YEAR'S TOWN PICNIC IN CONJUNCTION BY COHORT AT THE KIWANIS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. IF THERE IS ANYONE ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS ONLY, PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY? SEEING NONE, WE'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. IF ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT



WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS ONLY, PLEASE COME UP TO THE PODIUM. SEEING NONE, PUBLIC COMMENT IS CLOSED ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS.

OKAY. SO WE'RE BACK HERE. IF ANYONE HAS ANY COMMENTS OR MOTION?

I MOVE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR.

I'LL SECOND.

THANK YOU, SO MOVED BY VICE MAYOR MAURER AND SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS ONE THROUGH FOUR. COUNCILMEMBER CARTER?

YES.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

AYE.

COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN?

YES.

VICE MAYOR MAURER?

YES.

MAYOR MCLEWIS?

YES.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

PERFECT. WE ARE MOVING RIGHT ALONG. WE ARE AT THE POINT FOR INFORMATION ITEMS AND PRESENTATIONS, NUMBER 5. GOVERNMENT SPECIFIC EQUIPMENT ANNUAL REPORT OUT. ANNUAL REPORT OF DEPARTMENT'S GOVERNMENT SPECIFIC EQUIPMENT. I BELIEVE -- WILL OUR CHIEF BE DOING THIS ITEM?

MAYOR, THERE HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE CALENDAR AND WILL BE POSTPONED. IT'S BEEN NOTICED ON THE AGENDA THAT WAY.

OH, I'M SORRY.

THAT'S OKAY. SO WE'LL GO NEXT TO THE PUBLIC HEARING.

I MADE A NOTE ON THE DIFFERENT AGENDA AND THEN I PRINTED A NEW ONE. ALL RIGHT. WE WILL MOVE TO NUMBER SIX. BOLD PROGRAM PARTICIPATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION. ITEM INCLUDES A PRESENTATION OF CMFA'S BOLD PROGRAM, A RESOLUTION JOINING THE CMFA, AND A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN THE BOLD PROGRAM FOR THE CANOPY HOUSING PROJECT. ALL COSTS CAN BE REIMBURSED THROUGH THE BOLD PROGRAM. AND THIS, I BELIEVE, IS OUR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, PLANNING, A LOT OF DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS THERE.



I'LL KICK US OFF, MAYOR. GOOD EVENING, MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL. SO THIS IS AN ITEM THAT'S BEING BROUGHT TO YOU BY -- ON BEHALF OF THE DEVELOPER OF THE CANOPY PROJECT WITHIN THE CITY. THEY'RE REQUESTING THE CITY AUTHORIZE PARTICIPATION IN THE BOLD PROGRAM, WHICH IS A TOOL, A FINANCING TOOL THAT WILL HELP THEM PAY THE IMPACT FEE THE CITY IMPOSES ON NEW DEVELOPMENT. IT IS AT NO COST TO THE CITY AND NO RISK OR LIABILITY FOR THE CITY, BUT IT DOES NEED THE CITY'S APPROVAL. AND WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER, I THOUGHT I SAW SOME FROM CITY IN THE AUDIENCE, BUT MAYBE THEY'RE JUST ONLINE.

I'M GOING TO ASK JEAN WHO WILL BE PRESENTING CANOPY FOR THE BOLD PROJECT. JEAN, I'M GOING TO MUTE YOU HERE REAL QUICK. JANE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF AND LET US KNOW WHO NEEDS ACCESS FROM THE CANOPY PROJECT IN BOLD TO PROVIDE THE PRESENTATION?

HI, YEAH. I DON'T SEE ANYONE WHOSE NAME I RECOGNIZE ON HERE RIGHT NOW, IF YOU ARE ON HERE, CAN YOU RAISE YOUR HAND?

I BELIEVE RALPH IS HERE TO MAKE THE PRESENTATION AS WELL OR TO ANSWER ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.

YES, THERE WE GO.

GOOD EVENING. I BELIEVE THERE WAS SOMEONE FROM CITY VENTURES WHO WAS GOING TO START THE PRESENTATION, BUT IF NOT, I COULD GO AHEAD AND JUMP INTO IT.

WE JUST STARTED YOUR ITEM. I GAVE A LITTLE INTRODUCTION, BUT IF YOU WANT TO -- YEAH, PERFECT.

DO WE HAVE THE SLIDES AVAILABLE?

GIVE US A SECOND.

GREAT.

PLEASE.

WELL, WHILE WE'RE PULLING UP THE SLIDES, MY NAME IS KELSO. THANK YOU, MAYOR MCLEWIS, MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL. TONIGHT, OUR REQUEST IS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT, BUT THE OVERALL REQUEST IS FOR THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL TO JOIN THE CMFA, WHICH IS THE CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL FINANCE AUTHORITY, WHICH WILL THEN ALLOW OUR COMPANY TO APPLY FOR THE BOLD FINANCING PROJECT, WHICH IS AN 80 TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT BEING CONSTRUCTED IN NORTH SEBASTOPOL, WHICH WAS APPROVED BACK IN 2024. THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVED IT IN APRIL OF 2024 IN THE FINAL MAP THAT WAS APPROVED IN DECEMBER OF 2024. SO THAT'S OUR REQUEST TONIGHT, AND WE HAVE WITH US, RALPH HOLMES WHO SHOULD BE ON ZOOM TO BE ABLE TO -- HE'S A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE BOLD PROGRAM. HE'LL BE ABLE TO GO OVER HOW -- OH, HERE WE ARE.

CAN YOU LET ME KNOW WHEN TO MOVE FORWARD FOR YOUR SLIDE PRESENTATION?

YEAH, WE CAN MOVE FORWARD. SO THIS WAS JUST THE AGENDA, LIKE THE OBJECTIVE THAT I DESCRIBED WHAT THE OBJECTIVE IS AND THE REQUEST IS. IF YOU CAN GO TO THE NEXT. NEXT SLIDE. THIS COMES FROM THE STAFF REPORT. YOU KNOW, THE REQUEST IS TO ALLOW US TO APPLY FOR THE BOLD PROGRAM, AND FOR



THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL TO JOIN THE CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL FINANCE AUTHORITY. THE NEXT SLIDE SORT OF DISCUSSES WHAT THAT AUTHORITY IS. AND RALPH WILL THEN TAKE IT OVER TO DESCRIBE WHAT THE BOLD PROGRAM IS IN DETAIL, AND THEN I'LL BE HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS SPECIFICALLY THAT YOU MAY HAVE AS IT RELATES TO THE CANOPY. SPECIFICALLY THE REQUEST TONIGHT TO ALLOW US TO APPLY TO JOIN THE BOLD PROGRAMS. THE RESOLUTION ONLY SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZES THAT BOLD PROGRAM TO BE ALLOWED FOR THE CANOPY PROJECT, SO WE CAN DISCUSS THAT LATER IN THE PRESENTATION, BUT IT'S NOT A BLANKET APPROVAL THAT ANY PROJECT IN THE FUTURE SPECIFICALLY WOULD ONLY APPLY TO THE 80 HOMES BEING DEVELOPED AT THE CANOPY. SO RALPH CAN TAKE IT FROM HERE.

SURE, GREAT. WHY DON'T WE MOVE FORWARD TO SLIDE NUMBER SIX. SO FIRST OF ALL, MY NAME IS RALPH HOLMES, I WORK FOR PIPER. ONE OF THE BOLD PROGRAMS. THE CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL FINANCE AUTHORITY IS A JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY, WHICH REPRESENTS CITIES, COUNTIES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES IN CALIFORNIA. AND THE SOLE PURPOSE TO ISSUE BONDS, TO FORM COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICTS, TO SUPPORT SOCIAL PROGRAMS. HOWEVER, OTHER CITIES IN THE STATE ARE MEMBERS, AND SOME LOCAL CITIES INCLUDE WINDSOR, SANTA ROSA, NAPA. NEXT SLIDE, PLEASE? SO THE BOLD PROGRAM IS SOMETHING WE CREATED, WORK WITH CMFA TO ALLOW INFRASTRUCTURE, PUBLIC OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE BY CMFA ON BEHALF OF LOCAL JURISDICTIONS. ANY CMFA CAN PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM. IT WILL ALLOW TAX EXEMPT LOW COST FINANCING FOR THOSE PROJECTS. TO FACILITATE THE PROGRAM, WILL BE FORMED AND LATER BONDS WILL BE ISSUED. TYPICALLY WHEN WE POOL THEM, IN ORDER TO ALLOW FOR LOW COST FINANCING FOR PROJECTS. THROUGHOUT THE YEAR, LATER ON, WE'LL DISCUSS A LITTLE BIT ABOUT HOW MANY WE WOULD ISSUE. NEXT SLIDE. SO COMMUNITY FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICTS ARE FINANCING TOOL THAT ARE ALLOWED UNDER STATE LAW TO FUND PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE. INCLUDED IN THAT INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDES GUTTERS, SIDEWALKS, OPEN SPACE, SCHOOL FACILITIES, AND IMPACT FEES. THE BOLD PROGRAM WILL ALLOW FOR THE FUNDING OF THESE, AND ALSO CAN ALLOW FOR THE FUNDING OF SERVICES. NEXT SLIDE. SO IN ORDER TO JOIN THE PROGRAM, LOCAL AGENCY BECOMES A FEBRUARY. IT DOESN'T COST ANYTHING. THE LOCAL AGENCY THAT THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL TO HAVE A CONSULTANT PARTICIPATE, IT IF IT WISHES. AND THAT WOULD BE FUNDED AS A DEPOSIT. WE HAVE RESOLUTIONS IN FRONT OF YOU TO JOIN THE PROGRAM ON THE JOINT CMFA. JONES HALL IS OUR BOND COUNCIL, AND THEY'RE THE FIRM THAT DOES LEGAL WORK ON BEHALF OF CMFA. IN TERMS OF FUNDING THE IMPROVEMENTS AND THE APPLICATION AGREEMENT WILL BE DRAFTED, THAT WILL COVER THE FUNDING OF THOSE IMPROVEMENTS. AT THE TIME, THE BONDS ARE ISSUED WHEN PROCEEDS ARE AVAILABLE. LOCAL AGENCY WILL ACCEPT THE COMPLETED IMPROVEMENTS AND FEES. NEXT SLIDE, PLEASE? SO WHY THE LOCAL AGENCIES? THE BIG REASON IS IT'S AN OUTSOURCING OF THE FORMATION BOND ISSUANCE PROCESS. THERE IS NO COST TO THE PROGRAM. AND CMFA DOES EVERYTHING. ON THE HOMEOWNERS TAX BILL, THERE IS A LINE ITEM THAT IS CMFA, AND IT DOES NOT SAY THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL. THERE IS NO ONGOING ADMINISTRATION REQUIRED BY THE CITY. SIMPLY PUT, ALL YOU NEED TO DO IS ACCEPT TO JOIN THE PROGRAM, THAT YOU WOULD ACCEPT THE IMPROVEMENTS OR THE FEES. NEXT SLIDE. SO MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS. SO WITH SMALL PROJECTS, AND LARGE PROJECTS, BUT REDUCE PROJECTS AS SMALL AS \$500,000. ANY DEVELOPER WILL NEED TO FORM THE DISTRICT. AND WHEN BONDS ARE ISSUED, THERE'S CERTAIN CRITERIA THAT HAVE TO BE MET. ALL DISCRETIONARY IMPROVEMENTS HAVE TO BE PLACED, A LIEN OF 4-1, AND THE PROJECT MUST MEET THE CITY'S GOALS AND POLICIES. NEXT SLIDE. GREAT. THE FORMATION PROCESS IS VERY STRAIGHTFORWARD. ONCE IT'S A MEMBER OF BOLD, THE DEVELOPER WILL



PROVIDE THE APPLICATION TO PARTICIPATE TO THE PROGRAM. WE WOULD REACH OUT TO CITY STAFF, AND WE WOULD CHECK IN TO MAKE SURE WHAT THE DEVELOPER WANTS TO DO IS OKAY WITH STAFF. ONCE THAT'S APPROVED OR THE CITY STAFF SAYS YES, THEN WE GO FORWARD AND WORK ON THE FORMATION OF THE CMFA THAT WILL GO THROUGH THE LEGAL PROCESS OF REFERRING THE CFD. IT TYPICALLY TAKES ABOUT THREE MONTHS. NEXT SLIDE. SO ONCE THEY'RE FORMED, NOW WE'RE IN A POSITION TO ISSUE BONDS ON THE PROJECT. IT'S A SEPARATE PROCESS, BUT, YOU KNOW, YOU HAVE TO FORM BEFORE YOU COULD ISSUE BONDS FOR THAT. AND TYPICALLY POOL FINANCING WILL NOTE THE LARGER FINANCING AGAIN TO SAVE MONEY, YOU KNOW, IN TERMS OF PROCESS. AND WE WOULD LAY IT OUT HERE, THE PROCESS, BUT TYPICALLY IT WOULD TAKE ABOUT FOUR MONTHS. WE WOULD SELL THE BONDS TO INVESTORS. NEXT SLIDE. SO WE STARTED THE PROGRAM IN 2018. SO FOR ABOUT 70 LOCAL AGENCIES HAVE JOINED THE PROGRAM, REFORMED 110 CFDs, ISSUING ABOUT \$675 MILLION IN BONDS FOR 70 DIFFERENT PROJECTS. AND THOSE PROJECTS WILL FUND THE IMPROVEMENTS FOR OVER 12,000 HOUSING UNITS. AND, YOU KNOW, CMFA IS ONE OF THEIR BIG POLICIES TO HELP, YOU KNOW, INCREASE THE SUPPLY HOUSE WITHIN THE STATE. SO, YOU KNOW, IN 2026, WE'VE GOT TEN SAFETIES AND THE FORMATION AS OF NOW. WE WILL PROBABLY FORM BETWEEN 20 AND 30 BEFORE THE YEAR IS DONE. WE'VE GOT SIX FINANCING SCHEDULES SO FAR. SO THINGS ARE MOVING RIGHT ALONG. LET ME GO AHEAD AND TURN IT BACK, I THINK IN TERMS OF THE CANOPY PROJECT. NEXT SLIDE. OH, I'M SORRY. I MISSED ONE. SO THIS IS A LISTING OF JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE FORMED A PROGRAM. AGAIN, WE STARTED THIS PROGRAM IN 2018. IT REALLY DIDN'T GET GOING UNTIL 2020, BUT SINCE THEN, WE'VE PROBABLY ADDED FIVE TO EIGHT AGENCIES PER YEAR. AGAIN, WE'RE FORMING 25 TO 30 DISTRICTS IN HERE. NEXT SLIDE. I THINK I WILL TURN THIS BACK OR WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO TAKE THIS?

I CAN TAKE IT, RALPH.

CAN I INTERRUPT REAL QUICK. WE GENERALLY ALLOW TEN MINUTES FOR PRESENTATION.

OKAY, WE'RE AT THE END. I APPRECIATE THAT, MADAM MAYOR. JUST ON A HIGH LEVEL WHAT THE BOLD PROGRAM WOULD ALLOW US TO DO WOULD PAY ALL OF OUR IMPACT FEES, WHICH ON THE SCREEN SHOWS ALL THE DIFFERENT IMPACT FEES THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL HAS. IT WOULD ALLOW US TO PAY THOSE IMPACT FEES, IF WE WERE ACCEPTED AND APPROVED BY THE BOLD PROGRAM. I BELIEVE IT'S A LITTLE OVER \$2.6 MILLION TO THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL, RIGHT OFF THE BAT. AND INSTEAD OF WHAT THE CURRENT PROCESS IS, WE ARE ALLOWING NEW STATE LAWS TO REFER OUR IMPACT FEES. SO AS WE BUILD EACH PROJECT, WE DON'T HAVE TO PAY THE IMPACT FEES UNTIL THE CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY. SO AS A RESULT, IT WILL TAKE A YEAR OR TWO TO BUILD OUT THE ENTIRE PROJECT. ALL THE IMPACT FEES WOULD COME IN OVER TIME, OVER THE NEXT TWO TO THREE YEARS, WHERE THROUGH THE BOLD PROGRAM, WE WOULD ALLOW, WE WOULD BE ABLE TO PAY ALL THOSE IMPACT FEES THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL, RIGHT OFF THE BAT. AND THE FUTURE HOMEOWNERS OF THE CANOPY PROJECT WOULD SEE AN ASSESSMENT ON THEIR BILL OVER THE NEXT TAX BILL OVER THE NEXT 30 YEARS. SO AT A VERY HIGH LEVEL, THAT'S WHAT THE BOLD PROGRAM IS AND WOULD ALLOW US TO DO.

OKAY, THANK YOU.

AND I'M HERE FOR ANY QUESTIONS AND RALPH IS ALSO AVAILABLE.



YES, WE'RE GOING TO BRING IT BACK TO THE DAIS HERE. I SEE COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN HAS HIS HAND UP.

THANK YOU, MADAM MAYOR. THANK YOU FOR THE HIGH LEVEL BECAUSE THAT WAS A LOT, A LOT ON SLIDES I COULD NOT READ. BUT THE UPSHOT I GOT FROM THE STAFF REPORT IS AGAIN WHAT YOU JUST SAID. IF WE APPROVE THIS, WE'LL GET ALL OF OUR MONEY SOON, LIKE YOU MENTIONED, \$2 MILLION. IF WE APPROVE IT TONIGHT, THEN WHEN WILL WE GET THE CHECK FOR THE \$2 MILLION? I JUST NEED TO BE FRANK WITH THAT THINLY STAFFED CITY HERE. WE DO NOT, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, NEED TO GET A MESH ON THINGS UNLESS THE PAYOFF IS QUICK.

ABSOLUTELY. AND I DO WANT TO NOTE THE BOLD PROGRAM, THERE WOULD BE NO STAFF TIME. THERE WOULD BE VERY LIMITED STAFF TIME. WE WOULD OBVIOUSLY PAY FOR ALL THAT. BUT IF RALPH IS STILL AVAILABLE, I BELIEVE IT IS LATE SUMMER, BUT HE WOULD BE ABLE TO BETTER SPEAK EXACTLY WHEN THAT WOULD OCCUR.

SO WHAT DRIVES THE TIMING IS THE PROJECT ITSELF. MY UNDERSTANDING IS WE'RE THERE IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS. WE ARE PROBABLY LOOKING LATE SUMMER TO EARLY FALL.

OKAY. COUNCILMEMBER? OH, I'M SORRY. DID YOU HAVE YOUR HAND UP?

YOU KNOW, IT IS ONLY A COUPLE OF YEARS UNTIL ALL OF THESE FINISH. DEAR SCOUTS, THIS IS WHY YOU GO TO SCHOOL, SO YOU CAN DO SOME MATH HOMEWORK AND STUFF LIKE THAT. SO I DID SOME CALCULATIONS. AND I TRY TO FIGURE OUT WHAT THE DAMAGE WAS DONE TO THE HOMEOWNERS FOR THIS. SO WHAT YOU'RE DOING IS YOU'RE BASICALLY ASSIGNING A BOND TO THE HOMEOWNER, AND IT IS BEING ATTACHED TO THIS FOR THE NEXT 30 YEARS. THEY'RE NOT ABLE TO OPT OUT OF IT. THEY'RE NOT ABLE TO SELL OUT. YOU KNOW, YOU CAN PAY OFF YOUR MORTGAGE EARLY, BUT YOU CAN'T PAY THIS OFF EARLY. THIS WILL ADD ANOTHER MAYBE \$200 TO \$300 ONTO EVERYBODY'S MORTGAGE, ABOUT \$900,000. SO I CALCULATED. MAYBE YOU WOULD, AND TRUST ME, I LOVE CITY VENTURES AND I'M SO GLAD YOU BUILT HERE, LIKE I WANT TO SUPPORT YOU GUYS. BUT I THINK THIS WOULD ADD ABOUT \$200,000 OR \$300,000 TO YOUR BENEFIT FOR THE PROJECT, WHICH ISN'T SUPER SIGNIFICANT. AND FOR US, LIKE IT MAY NOT SAVE THAT MUCH MONEY. YOU KNOW, IF IT WERE LIKELY YOU WEREN'T GOING TO FINISH THESE, YOU KNOW, THAT WOULD BE A CONCERN. WE WOULD LIKE IT UPFRONT. THAT WOULD BE DIFFERENT. HOWEVER, YOU KNOW, IT APPEARS THAT THE HOMEOWNER MIGHT BE ON THE HOOK FOR LIKE \$190,000 OVER THE TERM OF -- AND THAT'S 62 INDIVIDUALS THAT WOULD HAVE THIS AMOUNT ATTACHED TO THEIR MORTGAGE FOR THAT AMOUNT. SO THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT THE HOMEOWNERS ARE OBLIGATED TO OVER THESE 30 YEARS AND THE BENEFIT TO YOU AND FOR THE CITY. SO I'M KIND OF CONCERNED ABOUT THAT AND WONDERING BECAUSE MAYBE WE SHOULD LEAVE THIS TO THE MARKET AND THEY COULD USE THEIR MORTGAGE FOR THAT SAVINGS OF \$20,000, RATHER THAN THIS DEVICE TO SAVE SOME MONEY TO INCENTIVIZE SOME HOUSE BUILDING BECAUSE IT LOOKS LIKE THERE WOULD BE ABOUT \$60,000 TO \$90,000 OFF THE HOME PRICE GUARANTEED THAT YOU WOULD NEED. IT WOULD WORK OUT FOR THE HOME BUYER. AND BECAUSE HOUSING PRICES CAN VARY. THERE WAS NO GUARANTEE IN YOUR STATEMENT ABOUT EXACTLY HOW MUCH YOU WOULD REDUCE THE PRICE BY.

SO WE PARTICIPATE IN THE BOLD PROGRAM THROUGHOUT THE STATE AND OTHER JURISDICTIONS THAT ARE ALREADY MEMBERS OF CMFA AND PARTICIPATE IN THE BOLD PROGRAM. JOINING THE BOLD PROGRAM



ALLOWS US TO DO, NOT JUST, YOU KNOW, WE'VE DISCUSSED PAYING THE IMPACT FEES RIGHT AWAY. BUT WHAT IT ALSO ALLOWS US TO DO IS REDUCE THE PRICES OF THE HOME OR BUY DOWN MORTGAGES FOR BUYERS, SO THEY COULD HAVE MORE BUYING POWER. SO IT IS NOT FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE. IT'S WIN, WIN. FROM WHAT I UNDERSTAND, TWO THINGS, ONE, THE ASSESSMENT IS FULLY DISCLOSED THROUGH THE PROCESS. IF ANY FUTURE HOMEOWNER HERE WOULD BE FULLY AWARE OF THIS ANNUAL ASSESSMENT, BUT ALSO FROM WHAT I UNDERSTAND THROUGH, YOU KNOW, MARKETING AGENTS AND OTHER COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE PARTICIPATED IN. THE BUYERS ARE -- I UNDERSTAND YOU'RE SORT OF LOOKING OUT FOR THOSE FUTURE HOMEOWNERS. BUT COUNTERINTUITIVELY ALMOST, I DON'T KNOW IF THAT IS THE RIGHT WORD, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROGRAM BECAUSE IT REDUCES -- BECAUSE IT ALLOWS US TO NOT ONLY REDUCE THE PRICE, BUT ALSO CREATE MORE INCENTIVES IN TERMS OF LIKE I SAID, BUYING DOWN THE MORTGAGE.

BUT THAT PRODUCTION ISN'T GUARANTEED. THERE IS NO QUANTITY THAT YOU'RE ABLE TO SAVE SPECIFICALLY, YOU KNOW? THAT IS THE POSSIBILITY FOR IT, BUT IS THAT POSSIBILITY GOING TO HAPPEN?

OH, ABSOLUTELY. I MEAN, WE'VE ALREADY -- OBVIOUSLY IT DEPENDS ON HOW TONIGHT GOES, BUT WE HAVE PLANNED TO -- WE NEED TO JOIN THE BOLD PROGRAM BEFORE WE CAN START ACTUALLY SELLING HOMES, AND THAT'S WHY WE'RE READY TO START SELLING HOMES. BUT I MEAN, WE CAN START SELLING HOMES ONE WAY OR ANOTHER, BUT WE HAVE A MARKETING STRATEGY BASED ON IF WE WERE LUCKY ENOUGH TO BE ABLE TO JOIN THE BOLD PROGRAM THAT WOULD HAVE A WIDE VARIETY OF DIFFERENT INCENTIVES FOR BUYERS, INCLUDING REDUCED HOME PRICES FROM WHAT WE WERE ORIGINALLY PROJECTING, AND ALSO THE AVAILABILITY TO BUY DOWN MORTGAGE RATES BETWEEN 3% TO 4%, WHICH IS CURRENTLY MUCH LOWER THAN WHAT THE MARKET IS. AND IT ALSO ALLOWS US TO BUILD OUT AND DEVELOP THE PROJECT FASTER. FOR EXAMPLE, LIKE TO YOUR POINT EARLIER, IF WE LET THE MARKET DECIDE, THEN THE CURRENT MARKET, IN TERMS OF ABSORPTION AND HOW QUICKLY HOME SALES ARE HAPPENING, THAT COULD TAKE POSSIBLY TWO, THREE, FOUR YEARS WITH THOSE ADDED INCENTIVES. WE ANTICIPATE THAT IT WOULD TAKE. IT WOULD BE A FASTER PROCESS.

VICE MAYOR?

SO I JUST WANT TO VERIFY. YOU SAID TO THE ATTORNEY, THERE IS NO COST, NO RISKS, AND NO LIABILITIES TO THE CITY?

THAT'S RIGHT.

THAT'S CORRECT.

AND THE SECOND QUESTION IS ABOUT STAFF TIME. WE'RE SHORT STAFFED. HOW MUCH STAFF TIME WILL THIS REQUIRE?

LESS THAN FIVE HOURS. VERY MINIMAL STAFFING.

HOW MUCH OVER THE NEXT THREE MONTHS?



CAN I SPEAK TO THAT? SO IN TERMS OF STAFF TIME, WE'LL HAVE, YOU KNOW, SEVERAL CONFERENCE CALLS LESS THAN AN HOUR EACH. ALL THE STAFF TIME WILL BE REIMBURSABLE FROM THE DEPOSIT THAT THE DEVELOPER WILL MAKE.

OKAY.

SO JUST A COUPLE MORE QUESTIONS. WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF THE CMFA PROGRAM FOLDED? WHAT HAPPENS THEN?

THEN ANOTHER, YOU KNOW, ORGANIZATION WOULD HAVE TO TAKE IT OVER. I DON'T KNOW. IT'S A PUBLIC AGENCY.

SO THE TAX WILL ALREADY BE ON THE ASSESSMENT RULES THEN? IT EXISTS AND PUBLIC AGENCIES CAN'T GO AWAY. SO THEY WOULD CONTINUE TO HAVE TO EXIST IN SOME FORM AND THE TAXES HAVE BEEN APPROVED ON THE PROPERTY TAX ROLE.

BUT IT WON'T FALL BACK TO THE CITY?

NO.

OKAY. AND MY LAST QUESTION IS THEN SO DO BUYERS SAVE MONEY OR IS THIS MONEY THAT'S ADDED AS -- IS THERE INTEREST ON THIS MONEY THAT THEY OWE?

DO YOU WANT TO TAKE THAT ROUTE?

I COULD TAKE A RUN AT THAT. SOMETHING TO POINT OUT IS THAT BECAUSE OF YOUR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, WE COULD FUND THESE IMPROVEMENTS WITH TAX DOLLARS. SO THE INTEREST RATE ON THEM ARE SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER THAN THEIR MORTGAGE RATE. SO IF THEY'RE GOING TO PAY FOR THE HOUSE WITH, YOU KNOW, MORTGAGE RATES, THEY'RE GOING TO BE FUNDING IT AT A 6% TO 6.5% RATE. FOR THE COMPONENT WE'RE FUNDING WITH THE BOLD PROCEEDS, THE INTEREST RATE IS CONSIDERABLY LESS. IT IS MORE OF THE FIVE AND QUARTER RANGE.

OKAY, THANK YOU.

AND JUST TO BRIEFLY ADDRESS THAT. THE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT THAT WOULD BE ON THE TAX BILL, THAT WOULD BE THE SAME AMOUNT FOR 30 YEARS. SO THAT WOULDN'T GO UP OR DOWN. IT WOULD BE THE EXACT SAME AMOUNT. IN TERMS OF THE MORTGAGE RATE THAT RALPH JUST EXPLAINED AGAIN. TO BE A PART OF THE PROGRAM WOULD ALLOW US TO HELP SOME FIRST TIME HOME BUYERS, YOUNG FAMILIES PAY DOWN THE MORTGAGES. SO CURRENT MORTGAGE RATES ARE BETWEEN 6% TO 6.5%, BUT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO OFFER INCENTIVES THAT WOULD BE, YOU KNOW, BUY DOWN MORTGAGE RATES, SO THEY'RE CLOSER BETWEEN 3% TO 4.5%.

SO I'M JUST GOING TO ASK A QUICK QUESTION. JUST FOR CLARITY BECAUSE I HEAR ALL THESE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS, AND I'VE READ THIS, BUT YET I STILL FEEL LIKE THERE NEEDS TO BE CLARITY. IF WE HAD A \$900,000 HOME, HOW DOES THIS IMPACT? I MEAN, I TRULY WANT TO HAVE SOME NUMBERS HERE. IF WE'RE SAYING



SOMEONE WAS PURCHASING A HOME FOR \$900,000, EXPLAIN TO ME WHAT THE BENEFITS ARE AND WHAT COST THIS IS TO THEM. I MEAN, JUST MAKE IT VERY SIMPLE FOR ALL OF US TO BETTER UNDERSTAND.

VERY SIMPLE. I'LL SAY TWO THINGS. ONE, ON THAT \$900,000 HOME, THERE'S ROUGHLY ABOUT \$45,000 OF IMPACT FEES, SO THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL WILL GET THAT RIGHT AWAY INSTEAD OF THE NEXT FEW YEARS. AND THAT HOMEOWNER WOULD HAVE AN ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT ON THEIR TAX ROLL OF ROUGHLY \$3,200 A YEAR. SO TWICE IN DECEMBER AND APRIL EVERY YEAR WHEN WE PAY OUR PROPERTY TAXES, THEY WOULD BE PAYING ABOUT \$1,600 IN ADDITION.

IN ADDITION?

THAT WOULD BE FULLY DISCLOSED AND BEFORE THEY ACQUIRE, YOU KNOW, PURCHASE THE HOME. THEY'D BE AWARE OF THAT.

SO THAT WOULD BE A COST ON TOP OF WHATEVER ELSE?

ON TOP OF THE EXISTING PROPERTY TAX ALREADY, IF THERE ARE SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS FOR FIRE OR ANY OTHER SORT OF ASSESSMENT THE AREA HAS ON YOUR TAX BILL.

OKAY.

IT WOULD BE AN ADDITIONAL.

GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN.

THANK YOU. FIRST, HOW DOES THAT HELP THE FAMILIES THEN? THAT DOESN'T SOUND LIKE THAT WOULD BE A WIN FOR A FAMILY, FROM WHAT I JUST HEARD. FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO KNOW, IT DOESN'T SOUND LIKE THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF OTHER MUNICIPALITIES THAT ARE JUMPING ON THIS BANDWAGON. YOU RATTLED OFF A FEW IN THE BEGINNING. WHO LOCALLY HAS JUMPED ON THE BANDWAGON, AT LEAST WITHIN SONOMA COUNTY? SO TWO QUESTIONS.

I'LL TAKE THE FIRST QUESTION, AND THEN I THINK RALPH CAN ADDRESS THE SECOND QUESTION BECAUSE BOLD ALSO HAS A COW SIN, SKIP, WHICH I KNOW A LOT OF LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATE. BUT IN TERMS OF HELPING THE FAMILIES. IF YOU'RE PAYING, YOU KNOW, IF YOUR MONTHLY MORTGAGE IS BASED ON A 4, 4.5% RATE VERSES A 6% RATE, SO THAT WOULD HELP THE FAMILY. AND SO, YOU KNOW, IN SOME WAYS FROM SOME OF THE CALCULATIONS WE'VE DONE, IT ACTUALLY WORKS OUT TO BE, IN TERMS OF YOUR OVERALL ANNUAL HOUSING COST, LESS, INCLUDING THE TAX. OR YOU HAVE A LOWER PROPERTY -- IF WE ARE NOT BUYING DOWN A MORTGAGE, WE ARE JUST OFFERING HOMES FOR A LOWER PRICE. THAT OBVIOUSLY REFLECTS BASED ON A LOWER PROPERTY TAX BASIS, WHICH OVER TIME ALSO HELPS THE HOMEOWNER.

GO AHEAD, VICE MAYOR.

SO HOW MUCH IS EACH PROPERTY GOING TO BE DEFERRING THEN?

I'M SORRY?



HOW MUCH WOULD EACH PROPERTY BE -- HOW MUCH IS GOING TO BE DEFERRED? WAS IT \$30,000? IS THAT WHAT YOU SAID ON IMPACT FEES?

OH, WELL, EACH PROPERTY, THE IMPACT FEES ARE BASED ON THE SQUARE FOOTAGE, SO EACH, YOU KNOW, DEPENDING ON THE PLANNED TYPE, IT WOULD BE DIFFERENT. BUT IT'S ROUGHLY ABOUT, I WOULD SAY BETWEEN \$30,000 TO \$40,000 OF IMPACT FEES. SO I WORK WITH THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT TO PULL OUR BUILDING PERMITS AS WE GO BUILDING BY BUILDING. AND, YOU KNOW, WE HAVE THE ENTIRE, LIKE A BUILDING PERMIT FOR, YOU KNOW, YOUR AVERAGE UNIT IS ROUGHLY BETWEEN \$50,000 TO \$60,000, BUT WE SEND IN A CHECK FOR \$18,000. AND THEN, WE LIST OUT ALL THE IMPACT FEES THAT WE'RE DEFERRING. SO IT IS ROUGHLY ABOUT THAT AMOUNT. THEN IN TERMS OF THE OTHER MUNICIPALITIES, RALPH, I KNOW WE HAD A SLIDE ABOUT THAT. TO YOUR POINT, IT WAS HARD TO READ. IF YOU COULD GO OVER SOME OF THE OTHER MUNICIPALITIES THAT HAVE JOINED BOLD?

SURE. TYPICALLY THIS PROGRAM IS UTILIZED WHERE IN COMMUNITIES THEY'RE BUILDING NEW HOMES. AND SO WHERE WE REALLY SEE IT IS THE VACAVILLE, FAIRFIELD. WE SEE IT IN PITTSBURG, SKIP IS IN BRENTWOOD, THE CONTINUED PROGRAM. WE'RE ALL OVER THE CENTRAL VALLEY, WHERE A LOT OF HOMES ARE BEING CONSTRUCTED. PLACER COUNTY, ROSEVILLE, ROCKLAND, LINCOLN, RANCHO CORDOVA, THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO, AND THEN WE'RE DOWN THE VALLEY AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AS WELL. AS I MENTIONED. 70 DIFFERENT HAVE JOINED THE PROGRAM.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON HAS A QUESTION.

YES. SO JUST KIND OF STUDYING IT. IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU COULD LOWER THE MORTGAGE BECAUSE OF THEIR TAX EXEMPT. THE DIFFERENCE ON A \$900,000 LOAN BETWEEN 4% AND THE MARKET 6.5% ON A QUICK CALCULATION IS ABOUT \$68,000 A YEAR IN INTEREST DIFFERENTIAL. BUT YOU'RE SAYING THEN IT'S DISCLOSED THEIR PROPERTY TAXES GO UP \$1,800 OVERALL. SO THAT SEEMS LIKE A HUGE COST SAVINGS TO THE HOMEOWNER, JUST ON A QUICK MATH. IT WOULD BE GREAT IF YOU HAD SHOWED US THE MATH BECAUSE I THINK POINT OF ENTRY IS REALLY DIFFICULT WITH THE INTEREST RATES.

ABSOLUTELY.

FOR NEW HOME BUYERS, THAT'S THE DIFFICULT PART. THIS SYSTEM HELPS BREAK THAT DOWN. THAT'S WHAT I'M HEARING?

EXACTLY. BECAUSE YOUR ANNUAL ASSESSMENT, AGAIN, THESE ARE AVERAGES, WILL BE ROUGHLY \$3,200. AND SO, YOU KNOW, IT'S ABOUT \$250, \$275 A MONTH ADDITIONAL TAX, BUT TO YOUR POINT, YOU WOULD BE SAVING, DEPENDING WHETHER YOU'RE AT 6%, 6.5%, VERSES 4.5% MORTGAGE, YOU'LL BE SAVING MORE. SO TO THE ORIGINAL QUESTION, WHAT'S IN IT FOR THE BUYER? THAT'S WHAT'S IN IT FOR THE BUYER.

OKAY, WE HAVE TWO PEOPLE HERE. I DON'T KNOW. GO AHEAD.

JUST TO CLARIFY, YOU KEEP SAYING 4%, AND I'M KIND OF CURIOUS ABOUT THE LIKELIHOOD OF THAT OR HOW CAN WE BE SURE THAT THIS IS WHAT'S GOING TO BE PASSED ON TO THE BUYER OR IT COULD BE? THAT MIGHT BE A DIFFICULT THING TO SAY. IT'S A SUPER GREAT MARKETING STORY. OVER TIME IF YOU CAN CUT THE



INTEREST RATE. THAT'S A GREAT THING TO DO. IF YOU CAN ONLY CUT THE PRICE BY MAYBE \$20,000 OFF THE HOUSE, MAKE IT AN \$880,000, INSTEAD OF \$900,000, IT'S NEGLIGENTABLE. IF YOU GO DOWN TO FOUR, THAT'S WILDLY DIFFERENT, BUT I'M NOT REALLY SURE HOW YOU'D BE ABLE TO DO THAT OFF OF THIS AMOUNT, LIKE IT DOESN'T SEEM TO WORK OUT.

WELL, AT OUR CURRENT COMMUNITIES THAT ARE SELLING IN THE BAY AREA, INCLUDING JUST UP THE ROAD IN SANTA ROSA. IF YOU GO TO OUR WEBSITE, WE OFFER THE ABILITY TO, YOU KNOW, BUY DOWN YOUR MORTGAGE, LIKE ON OUR WEBSITE, PROMOTES 4 POINT SOMETHING PERCENT MORTGAGES. AGAIN, JUST THE CURRENT MARKET, WHICH WE'RE ALL AWARE OF. HOME BUILDERS AND DEVELOPERS ARE OFFERING THOSE TYPES OF INCENTIVES BECAUSE ULTIMATELY FOR HOME BUYERS AND CITIES AND DEVELOPERS TO SELL THESE HOMES THAN HAVE THEM SIT. IN THE WAY WE DEVELOPED TOWN HOMES, WE BUILT BUILDING BY BUILDING. WE DIDN'T START UNTIL THE NEXT PREVIOUS BUILDING WAS HALF SOLD AND THE BUILDING BEFORE THAT WAS FULLY SOLD. SO IF THEY'RE NOT MOVING IN THE CURRENT MARKET. IT'S GOING TO TAKE MUCH LONGER TO BUILD UP THE PROJECT. WHAT THIS WILL ALLOW US TO DO IS ULTIMATELY, YOU KNOW, IN OUR VIEW, AND I THINK THE VIEW OF THE BUYERS THAT WE'VE HEARD FROM THESE COMMUNITIES IS A BETTER PROPOSITION FOR THEM AND FOR US AND FOR THE CITY. SO THAT'S WHEN I KEEP SAYING WIN, WIN, I TRULY BELIEVE THE PROGRAM REPRESENTS THAT.

VICE MAYOR?

SO CAN THESE FEES BE PAID OFF EARLY BY THE HOMEOWNER?

YES.

YEP.

OKAY, GREAT, THANK YOU.

AND A QUESTION I HAVE IS, YOU KNOW, THE QUESTION SAYS WILL THE SPECIAL TAX HURT FUTURE HOME BUYERS? HOW DOES THIS IMPACT FUTURE HOME SELLERS AT ALL, IF ANY? YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN? TEN YEARS DOWN THE ROAD?

SO AT TEN YEARS FROM DOWN THE ROAD, LET'S SAY SOMEBODY WHO BOUGHT THE HOUSE WHEN IT WAS BUILT SOLD THE HOUSE. THAT ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WILL CONTINUE WITH THAT HOUSE UNTIL IT'S PAID OFF, UNTIL THE BOND IS PAID OFF UNTIL 30 YEARS. AGAIN, THAT WOULD BE A PART OF THE SALES DISCLOSURE AND EVERYONE WOULD BE FULLY AWARE OF THAT. AFTER 30 YEARS, IT'S ALWAYS 30 BE YEARS, RIGHT, RALPH?

YES.

IT'S VERY SIMILAR TO SCHOOL BONDS OR HOSPITAL BONDS OR FIRE DISTRICTS, YOU KNOW? IT IS VERY SIMILAR TO THE TYPE OF BONDS. A LOT OF US ALREADY SEE ON OUR TAX ROLL AND THEY ARE GENERALLY 30 YEARS.

OKAY. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? OH, GO AHEAD.



I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY THAT THE BUYER WHO IS OBLIGATED TO THIS TAX AND THE TAX STAYS WITH THE HOUSE OR IT STAYS WITH THE MORTGAGE, AND THEY ARE ABLE TO PAY IT OFF EARLY, BUT IT'S THE FULL AMOUNT FOR PAYING IT OFF EARLY?

YEAH. SO IT'S THE FULL AMOUNT FOR PAYING IT OFF EARLY. SO IT IS WITH THE HOUSE.

I'M SORRY.

YOU'RE ASKING IS THERE A BENEFIT TO PAYING IT OFF EARLY?

I WOULD ARGUE NO.

CAN HOMEOWNERS USE THIS AS A TAX WRITE OFF OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT? I'M JUST CURIOUS.

IT'S A GREAT QUESTION. RALPH, CAN HOMEOWNERS -- BECAUSE I KNOW YOU CAN FOR SOME PROPERTY TAXES. CAN YOU USE THIS AS A TAX WRITE OFF?

I BELIEVE THEY DO. I'M NOT A TAX ACCOUNTANT, BUT I BELIEVE HOMEOWNERS DO.

TO THE EXTENT YOU CAN WRITE OFF YOUR PROPERTY TAXES, WHICH I KNOW DEPENDING ON THE ADMINISTRATION EXISTS OR DOESN'T. THIS IS A PART OF YOUR OVERALL PROPERTY TAX. AND SO TO THE EXTENT YOU CAN, ABSOLUTELY.

SO I JUST HAVE ONE LAST QUESTION. IS THIS A PROGRAM YOU JUST NOW THOUGHT? I KNOW WE HAVE BEEN TALKING CANOPY FOR A WHILE, AND IT JUST COMES UP NOW. WAS THIS ALREADY IN THE WORKS LIKE IN YOUR PLAN, YOU KNOW ALONG THE WAY OR HOW DID THIS COME TO FRUITION?

THAT'S A GREAT QUESTION. TO BE CANDID, NO, THIS WAS NEVER IN THE WORKS. WE NEVER CONSIDERED IT. SOME OF OUR, YOU KNOW, AS RALPH F MENTIONED, WE DEVELOPED IN THE BAY AREA. I CONCENTRATE OBVIOUSLY ON SONOMA, NAPA, MARINE COUNTIES. AS RALPH MENTIONED, THERE IS NOT A LOT OF THAT MAJOR HOME BUILDING DEVELOPMENT THAT YOU SEE IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY OR PARTS OF SACRAMENTO OR PARTS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, SO WE WERE UNAWARE OF IT. IN OUR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA OFFICE, THEY HAVE A FEW DEVELOPMENTS DOWN THERE THAT ARE DEVELOPING IN AREAS WHERE THIS KIND OF PROGRAM EXISTS AND ALL THE DEVELOPERS USE IT. THEY WERE TELLING US ABOUT IT. IT SORT OF REMINDED ME ABOUT CONVERSATIONS I HAD WITH STEVE AND TORY AND THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT ABOUT HOW WE'RE ONLY PAYING 20% OF THE BUILDING PERMIT BECAUSE WE'RE DEFERRING SO MANY OF THESE FEES. I LEARNED THERE WAS AN OPPORTUNITY HERE TO, AGAIN, PAY RIGHT OF IT ALL OFF. WE LEARNED ABOUT IT OVER THE LAST FEW MONTHS, AND WE HAD A LOT OF GREAT CONVERSATION WITH CITY STAFF, MARY, ALEX, JANE, JOHN, AND WE STARTED TALKING TO THE CITY ABOUT HOW THIS COULD WORK HERE. AND SO NO, THIS WAS A RECENT -- WE STARTED THINKING ABOUT IT, THEN WE STARTED THINKING ABOUT WAYS WE COULD, YOU KNOW, IN THE CURRENT REAL ESTATE MARKET PROVIDE INCENTIVES AND LOWER THE PRICES FOR THE ABSORPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT. SO THIS CAME ABOUT IN THE LAST THREE TO FOUR MONTHS.

SO I HAVE ONE LAST QUESTION. SO DID I READ IT CORRECTLY? MAYBE I MISSED IT WHERE IT SAID YOU COULDN'T START SELLING HOMES UNTIL WE FIGURE THIS OUT? SO YOU HAVEN'T SOLD ANY HOMES YET?



WE'RE MARKETING THE HOMES, BUT WE CAN'T GO INTO CONTRACT UNTIL -- CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, RALPH, BUT I BELIEVE WE CAN'T GO INTO CONTRACT UNTIL YOU JOIN THE PROGRAM. IF YOU DON'T SUPPORT THE PROGRAM, THEN WE WOULD GO INTO CONTRACT.

RIGHT. BUT THE POINT IS WHETHER OR NOT YOU SOLD SOME OR NOT AND NOW YOU'RE DOING THIS?

NO, NO, NO. WE HAVE ACTUALLY DELAYED FOR THAT VERY REASON. IF YOU CAN ASK MARY, WE GOT BEFORE THE COUNCIL AS QUICKLY AS WE WOULD. WE WANTED TOO HAVE THIS IN JANUARY BECAUSE WE DO WANT TO START. WE HAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE INTERESTED, KNOCK ON WOOD. BUT YEAH, WE WOULD NEED TO KNOW ONE WAY OR ANOTHER BEFORE WE START SELLING.

I SEE, OKAY. THAT'S ALL MY QUESTIONS. IF NO ONE ELSE HAS QUESTIONS, WE CAN GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT.

THANK YOU, MAYOR, SO THIS IS THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE BOLD PROGRAM FOR THE CANOPY PROJECT. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC HEARING, A PUBLIC COMMENT, AGAIN, IT'S TWO MINUTES, TIME LIMIT. DOW CHAMBERS FIRST AND THEN GO OUT TO ZOOM. SO IF THERE IS ANYONE IN THE CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE BOLD PROGRAM FOR THE CANOPY PROJECT, PLEASE COME UP TO THE PODIUM.

I'M GLAD TO BE HERE FOR THE PRESENTATION. LAWRENCE JAFFEY, LOCAL RESIDENT, LOCAL RENTAL PROVIDER. THERE ARE THREE PLACES WHERE I THINK THIS PROGRAM, AND I REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR QUESTIONS, IMPACT THE POTENTIAL BUYER OF THIS PROPERTY. THE FIRST, OUR DEVELOPERS ARE ASSUMING EVERYONE IS GOING TO GET A MORTGAGE. SO NOT EVERYONE OF THE 80 PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BUY WITH A MORTGAGE. PEOPLE ARE GOING TO SELL THEIR HOUSES AND BUY HERE FOR CASH. THOSE PEOPLE WILL NOW BE LOCKED IN TO PAY \$2 FOR EVERY \$1 OF ASSESSMENT IMPACT FEE BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO PAY 30 YEARS. SO FOR EVERY DOLLAR THEY BORROW, THEY'RE GOING TO PAY \$2 BACK. THERE IS ONLY APPARENTLY A FEE FROM PIPER TO DO THIS. I DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH THE FEE IS, BUT WE KNOW THAT'S ADDED ON TO WHAT THESE FOLKS ARE GOING TO PAY ON THEIR TAXES. WHEN WILL IT AFFECT THE NEXT PEOPLE WHEN THEY GO TO SELL THEIR HOUSE? BECAUSE PEOPLE BUY THE HOUSE BY WHAT THEY CAN AFFORD TO PAY. NOW THEIR TAXES ARE HIGHER. SO YOU LOOK AT THE TAXES AND WHATEVER THE INTEREST RATES ARE AT THE DATE OF PURCHASE. THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO BRING THE PRICE HOUSE WITHIN REACH OF WHAT PEOPLE CAN PAY. NOW THEY HAVE THIS HIGHER TAX ASSESSMENT. FOLKS WOULD BE INCENTIVIZED TO PAY THIS OFF. ALSO, THERE ARE ONLY VERY LIMITED CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THIS IS DEDUCTIBLE. REMEMBER, WE HAVE OUR SALT LIMITATIONS. THIS IS NOT NECESSARILY DEDUCTIBLE FOR OUR HOMEOWNERS. YOU HAVE TO BE PRETTY LOW INCOME TO GET THIS DEDUCTION. I UNDERSTAND THE CITY MAY WISH TO RECEIVE AND FIND GREAT BENEFIT OF RECEIVING THE FULL IMPACT FEE, AND THAT'S WHY YOU'RE GIVING A DEEP CONSIDERATION. ALSO, I THINK THIS IS A GREAT BENEFIT FOR OUR DEVELOPER, WHO IS SHIFTING THE RISK OF THESE DOLLARS ONTO FUTURE HOMEOWNERS. AS WE'VE ABSORBED THE LAST 18 MONTHS, HOUSING PRICES HAVE DROPPED. ACTUAL COUNTY IS DROPPING.

LAWRENCE, YOU HAVE ABOUT 15 SECONDS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR DEEP CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUE.



THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL GO OUT TO ZOOM. JUNE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES, HI, GOOD EVENING. YEAH, THIS IS JUNE. AND YEAH, I HAVE SOME OF THE SAME CONCERNS THAT LAWRENCE AND PHILL HAVE RAISED JUST ABOUT THE HOUSING BURDEN ON ONGOING COSTS, YOU KNOW. OTHER PLACES MAY HAVE OPTED IN. FOLKS LIKE A LOWER COST NOW, BUT THEN THERE'S A BURDEN OVER TIME. IT IS GOING TO SHOW UP ON THE PROPERTY TAX. YOU KNOW, PEOPLE START SEEING THEIR PROPERTY TAXES GOING UP, AND THEN THEY HAVE A LESS APPETITE FOR OUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT. IT WOULD BE GREAT IF FOLKS, WHEN THEY WERE BUYING THE HOUSE, COULD OPT IN OR OPT OUT. SO IF THEY HAD THAT \$40,000 AND THEY JUST WANTED TO PAY IT. BUT WITH THIS, IF A WEEK AFTER THEY BUY THE HOUSE THEY SAY THEY WANT TO PAY OFF THE BOND, THEY NEED TO PAY THE WHOLE AMOUNT, WHICH IS DOUBLE THE COST. I WISH WE COULD GET IN WRITING F IT GOES FORWARD, THAT IT WON'T BE AN INTEREST RATE ABOVE 4%. WE'RE HEARING 3% TO 4%, THEN WE HEAR 3.25. COULD IT BE 6%? WHAT GUARANTEE DO WE HAVE ON WHAT THE INTEREST WILL BE ON THE BOND? I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT IN WRITING BEFORE GOING FORWARD. IT WOULD ALSO BE NICE TO SEE SOME GUARANTEE THAT THE HOMEOWNERS WILL, SURE, IT WOULD BE DISCLOSED TO THEM, BUT HOW PROMINENT BE? YOU'LL GET IT THIS AMOUNT OVER THE YEAR WHEN YOU RESELL YOUR HOUSE IF YOU TRY TO PAY IT OFF, YOU'LL PAY X AMOUNT TO PAY OFF THIS BOND. BECAUSE THE MIN YOU BUY, YOU'RE LOCKED IN FOR THAT GREATER AMOUNT. SO IT DOES PUT THE BURDEN ON THE COUNTY TO COLLECT THE PROPERTY TAX. WE HAVE A LOT OF SHARED GOALS WITH THE COUNTY, AND HOW WE FUND OUR PUBLIC SERVICES. SO I DO THINK IT'S THE CASE OF THOSE FINANCIERS, COLLECTING THEIR LOAN MONEY OVER ALL THE YEARS. YOU KNOW, ECONOMY HAS CHANGED AND THE BURDENS ARE OUT TO THE FUTURE.

JANE, THAT'S TWO MINUTES.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. I'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. IF ANYONE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT ON THIS PUBLIC HEARING? SEEING NONE, I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. KATE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU. CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER STILL?

I CAN.

GREAT, GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT NUMBER ONE, IF THE CONSUMERS CAN DECIDE ON THEIR OWN IF THEY WANT TO TAKE ON IT HAD COST OR NOT. CLEARLY THE DEVELOPERS ARE PROBABLY MUCH MORE EXPERIENCED WITH PRICING HOMES AND DEVELOPING THEM AND SELLING THEM THAN MOST OF US PEOPLE IN THE AUDIENCE. IF THEY FEEL LIKE CONSUMERS WANT TO TAKE ON THIS EXTRA EXPENSE, WHICH WOULD ALWAYS BE DISCLOSED TO THEM BECAUSE THAT'S HOW MORTGAGES AND PRICING WORK. THEN I THINK THAT IT SEEMS LIKE WE WOULD LIVE IN A MARKETED ECONOMY FOR NOW. THE MARKET WORKS IN A LOT OF DIFFERENT WAYS. THIS SEEMS TO BE A STRATEGY THAT'S WORKING. THE OTHER POINT I WANT TO SAY IS THAT INFLATION IS ALSO A CONSTANT IN OUR ECONOMY. SO IF WE DELAY GETTING THE MONEY TO THE CITY FOR THE IMPACT FEES, THE



PRICES TO DO THE WORK THAT THE MONEY OF THE IMPACT FEES IS SUPPOSE TO COMPLETE WILL ALSO GO UP. ALL THE IMPACT FEES THEMSELVES WILL REMAIN THE SAME. SO YOU ARE BASICALLY, IF YOU COLLECT THE SAME AMOUNT OF MONEY FIVE YEARS FROM NOW, IT WON'T BUY AS MUCH IN MARKET FIVE YEARS FROM NOW. AND LIKE MORTGAGES THAT ARE 30 YEARS OLD, THIS BOND AMOUNT WILL SEEM MUCH SMALLER IN 10, 15, 20 YEARS BECAUSE AS INFLATION INCREASES OVER TIME, PRICES THAT ARE LOCKED IN A DIFFERENT MOMENT SEEM MUCH CHEAPER, WHICH IS WHY PEOPLE WHO BOUGHT THEIR HOUSES, ONLY PAY \$600,000 A YEAR ON PROPERTY TAXES HAVE EXTREMELY LOW PROPERTY TAXES. SO GIVEN THE FACT WE HAVE INFLATION ON ONE SIDE AND A MARKET ON THE OTHER, I THINK THIS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN A GOOD LIGHT BY THE COUNCIL. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, KATE FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT, I'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. IF THERE IS ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE BOLD PROGRAM? SEEING N I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. IF THERE IS ANYONE ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THIS BOLD PROGRAM. PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE, THE PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED.

ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU. GO AHEAD, VICE MAYOR?

SO I HAD A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS. WILL THE PROGRAM, WILL THE BOLD PROGRAM BE OPTIONAL FOR HOME BUYERS OR IS IT REQUIRED?

IT WOULD NOT BE OPTIONAL. FOR THE 68 -- THE MARKET BASED HOMES, THE INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOMES DO NOT PARTICIPATE. BUT FOR THE 68 MARKET RATE HOMES, IF WE WERE GRANTED THE ABILITY TO APPLY TO THE BOLD PROGRAM, IT WOULD APPLY TO ALL 68 HOMES.

OKAY. WILL THERE BE CLEAR DISCLOSURES?

ABSOLUTELY.

CAN THE INTEREST RATE BE SECURE? HOW CAN WE BE SURE THAT INTEREST RATE IS STABLE?

NOW, I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY BECAUSE I KNOW A PUBLIC COMMENTER BROUGHT THAT UP. ARE WE TALKING ABOUT THE INTEREST RATE ON THE BOND OR THE INTEREST RATE FOR THE HOMEOWNER?

THE RATE THE HOMEOWNER WILL BE PAYING?

SO THE BOND, AND RALPH CAN EXPLAIN MORE ABOUT THIS. BUT THE BOND INTEREST RATE, I BELIEVE IS STABLE OVER 30 YEARS. I'M NOT SURE. RALPH?

IT IS. SO THE BOND RATE IS SET AT THE TIME OF PRICING, AND IT'S FIXED AT THAT POINT. IT'S NOT FIXED UNTIL BONDS ARE SOLD, BUT THEY'RE IN THE CURRENT MARKET, WHERE YOU ARE LOOKING AT LOW 5s.

AND THEN THE MORTGAGE RATE, LIKE IF WE WERE, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, I THOUGHT ONE OF THE PUBLIC COMMENTERS BROUGHT UP A GOOD POINT. IN NO WAY WOULD A DEVELOPER BE PROPOSING THIS PROGRAM THAT WOULD JUST RAISE THE PRICES ON POTENTIAL HOMEOWNERS EVEN MORE THAN THE EXISTING HOME PRICE WITHOUT MAKING ANY CHANGES, ESPECIALLY IN THIS MARKET. MEANING THE INCENTIVES TO BUY DOWN MORTGAGES, THE ACTUAL REALITY OF LOWERING HOME PRICES ARE A PART OF THE WHOLE PROGRAM



BECAUSE NO HOME BUYER WOULD, I THINK YOU UNDERSTAND MY POINT ON THAT. SO IN TERMS OF YOUR QUESTION ABOUT THE MORTGAGE RATE, THAT WOULD --

THE INTEREST RATE ON THE BOLD FEE.

THE INTEREST RATE ON THE BOLD FEE?

THE IMPACT FEE. THAT'S THE ADDITIONAL TAX ON THE PROPERTY TAX BILL. IS THAT GOING TO BE STABLE?

YES. THE BOLD, YES, THE BOND, YES, AS RALPH JUST DESCRIBED, THAT WOULD BE SOLID.

GO AHEAD, COMMISSIONER HINTON?

SO JUST HAVING LISTENED TO THIS. I KNOW IT'S REALLY DIFFICULT TO SELL HOMES RIGHT NOW AND BUILD THEM. I HAVE A GOOD FRIEND, MY BEST FRIEND ACTUALLY WHO WORKS. AND THINGS ARE SLOWING DOWN. SO IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU GUYS ARE PROPOSING THIS TO US BECAUSE YOU THINK THIS IS GOING TO HELP YOU SELL THESE HOMES?

YES.

AND THERE IS NO DOWNSIDE TO THE CITY. AND I'M NOT AN EXPERT IN THIS AREA, BUT I DO BELIEVE PEOPLE BUYING HOMES HAVE TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY'RE COMMITTING TO. I FEEL LIKE OUR STAFF IS COMFORTABLE, THEN I WOULD SUPPORT -- I DON'T THINK YOU'RE GOING TO PUTT ANYTHING IN TO HELP YOU NOT SELL HOMES.

EXACTLY, YES.

ANY WAY, I JUST WANT TODAY ADD THAT COMMENT.

THANK YOU.

SO ACTUALLY BECAUSE OF SOME PUBLIC COMMENTS. SO IF SOMEONE COMES IN AND PAYS CASH, THEN THEY'RE JUST GOING TO -- THEY HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO JUST PAY THIS OFF. BUT I MEAN, OBVIOUSLY --

IN THAT CASE, THEY PROBABLY WOULD PAY CASH FOR A LOWER PRICED HOME. WE CAN'T OFFER A MORTGAGE INCENTIVE. THE HOME PRICE WOULD BE LOWER.

OKAY. GO AHEAD.

I THINK YOU HAVE AN EXCELLENT PRODUCT. I'M EXCITED ABOUT THEM. I THINK THEY'RE GORGEOUS, AND I THINK THEY'RE GOING TO SELL. BUT I DON'T THINK THAT'S A REASON FOR YOU TO NEED THIS TOOL. AND I THINK IT IS COME COME FOR A LOT OF PEOPLE INVOLVED. AGAIN, I SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT A LOT. BECAUSE LIKE THERE IS NO GUARANTEE ON LIKE HOW MUCH YOU'LL REDUCE IT BECAUSE THIS IS A FLUCTUATING THING THAT HAPPENS MONTHLY, YOU KNOW, LIKE THINGS CHANGE. SO YEAH. I REALLY WANT YOU GUYS TO DO GREAT, BUT I DON'T THINK THIS IS THE RIGHT WAY TO HELP HERE.

THANK YOU.



ANYONE ELSE? ANY COMMENTS? OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE A MOTION OR OTHER THOUGHTS?

I'LL GO AHEAD AND MAKE THE MOTION, I GUESS. I WOULD MOVE THAT -- WOULD IT BE WE WOULD -- I WOULD MOVE THAT WE SUPPORT THE RESOLUTION JOINING THE CMFA AND A RESOLUTION APPROVING AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN THE BOLD PROGRAM FOR THE CANOPY HOUSING PROJECT. ALL COSTS TO THE CITY CAN BE REIMBURSED THROUGH THE BOLD PROGRAM. IS THAT WHAT I NEED TO SAY?

I'LL SECOND THAT. ALL RIGHT, MARY?

THANK YOU, SO MOVED BY COUNCILMEMBER HINTON AND SECONDED BY VICE MAYOR MAURER TO APPROVE AND ADOPT THE RESOLUTION JOINING THE CMFA AND APPROVE AND ADOPT A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE BOLD SOLELY FOR THE CITY VENTURES, THE CANOPY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. COUNCILMEMBER CARTER?

NO.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

YES.

COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN?

YES.

VICE MAYOR MAURER?

YES.

MAYOR MCLEWIS?

YES.

MOTION PASSES 4-1 WITH COUNCILMEMBERS HINTON, ZOLLMAN, VICE MAYOR MAURER, AND MAYOR MCLEWIS IN SUPPORT, AND COUNCILMEMBER CARTER IN OPPOSITION.

ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT, SO WE WILL MOVE ON TO, LET'S SEE, ITEM NUMBER 7. THAT IS THE SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE, PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FIRST READING AND INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 8.80 OF THE CITY'S SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ORDINANCE. AND I DON'T KNOW.

I'LL BE PRESENTING THAT, MAYOR. GETTING SCREEN SHARING PRIVILEGES.

MAYBE WE'LL GIVE THEM A MINUTE. THANK YOU. HOW ABOUT WE -- CAN WE TAKE A BIO BREAK FOR FIVE MINUTES? [ MEETING WILL RESUME AFTER A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK ]

ALL RIGHT, WE'RE BACK. ALL RIGHT. SO WE ARE GOING TO PICK UP WITH NUMBER SEVEN, SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE. I THINK OUR CITY ATTORNEY IS GOING TO KICK THAT OFF.



GOOD EVENING, MAYOR, ONCE AGAIN, AND COUNCILMEMBERS. TONIGHT, BEFORE YOU AS A PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 8.80, THE CITY'S MUNICIPAL CODE, THE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNITY ORDINANCE. SO THE COUNCIL FIRST APPROVED THIS ORDINANCE BACK IN 2022. IF YOU LOOK AT THE FINDINGS AND THE PURPOSE THAT'S STATED THERE, THERE'S A LOT OF DISCUSSION ABOUT BIOMETRIC CAMERAS AND SORT OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES. BUT IT'S MUCH BROADER THAN THAT AND THE ACTUAL DEFINITIONS. SO IT DEFINES SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY, ANY SOFTWARE, ELECTRONIC DEVICE OR SIMILAR. PRIMARILY INTENDED TO COLLECT, PERTAIN, SHARE AUDIO, ELECTRONIC, VISUAL, BIOMETRIC. ALL THE FACTORY, SIMILAR INFORMATION, SPECIFICALLY ASSOCIATED WITH ANY INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP. SO VERY BROAD TALKING ABOUT SOME SORT OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES, BUT ALSO VERY SIMPLE TECHNOLOGIES LIKE VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDING. THE DEFINITION PROVIDES EXAMPLES. THIS IS A NON-EXHAUSTIVE LIST OF LICENSE PLATE READERS, TOLL READERS, GUNSHOT DETECTION, HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE MOBILE DNA CAPTURE. CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION CAMERA IS ONE OF THE ITEMS ON THE LIST. THE OTHER EXAMPLES, YOU KNOW, X-RAY VANS, SOFTWARE DESIGN AND MONITOR SOCIAL MEDIA SERVICES. RADIO FREQUENCY I.D. SCANNERS. SO AGAIN, YOU'RE SEEING THE DEFINITION IS, YOU KNOW, HAS A LOT OF EXAMPLES OF VERY ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, BUT ALSO THE CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION CAMERAS. SO CURRENTLY WHAT THE ORDINANCE REQUIRES IS THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN ORDINANCE AS SURVEILLANCE USE POLICY EACH TIME BEFORE THE CITY CAN SEEK FUNDS OR ACCEPT DONATIONS FOR SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY. ACQUIRE OR BORROW NEW SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY. USE NEW SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY. USE EXISTING SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY FOR A PURPOSE IN A MANNER OR IN A LOCATION, NOT PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL. OR BEFORE THE CITY, AN AGREEMENT INCLUDING ORAL AGREEMENT WITH A NON-CITY ENTITY TO ACQUIRE SHARE OR OTHERWISE USE TECHNOLOGY. THAT'S ANY OF THE TYPES OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY THAT WILL FALL UNDER THAT DEFINITION. SO THE BROAD NATURE OF THE ORDINANCE HAS CREATED SOME IMPACTS RECENTLY. ONE OF THEM BEING THE CITY CAN'T UPGRADE SOME OF THEIR OLDER TECHNOLOGY WITHOUT GOING THROUGH THAT SPECIFIED PROCESS IN THE ORDINANCE, WHICH INVOLVES A REPORT ON CONSENT AND THEN, YOU KNOW, 45 DAYS LATER, A PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE ORDINANCE. BUT BEFORE IT UPGRADES THE TECHNOLOGY. SO THIS HAS COME UP WITH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, WHERE THEY HAVE SECURITY CAMERAS AT SOME FACILITIES AROUND THE CITY, EXISTING LONG, BUT THEY DON'T RECORD, THEY ONLY CAPTURE LIVE FEED. SO TO MAKE THEM RECORD, THAT'S A NEW TYPE OF TECHNOLOGY. AND SO IT IS REQUIRED TO GO THROUGH THAT SAME PROCESS. THE SAME THING WOULD BE TRUE FOR OTHER TYPES OF TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES, YOU KNOW, TO BRING THINGS UP TO MODERN STANDARDS. I THINK I USED THE EXAMPLE OF GOING FROM BLACK TO WHITE IN THAT REPORT. THE DEPARTMENT CANNOT USE PRIVATELY OWNED SECURITY CAMERA. IF THERE IS A CRIME, WE HAVEN'T APPROVED USING THE PARTICULAR BUSINESSES SECURITY CAMERAS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSE. SO THEY CAN'T USE THOSE CAMERAS UNLESS WE GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS AND IDENTIFY ALL THE LOCATIONS WHERE IT IS LAID AND THAT PROCESS. AND STAFF DOESN'T BELIEVE THAT WAS THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE. JUST BASED ON ALL THE LANGUAGE AND THE ORDINANCE ABOUT SORT OF FOCUSING ON THESE MORE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY THAT THAT IS REALLY THE INTENT, YOU KNOW, A COUNCILMEMBER BROUGHT UP A FEW MEETINGS AGO THIS IS A POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEM, AND WE LET THEM KNOW THIS IS SOMETHING WE WERE WORKING ON TO BRING TO THE COUNCIL, SO YOU COULD BE BEFORE YOU FOR DISCUSSION AND THE COUNCIL TO DECIDE. SO WHAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT WOULD DO IS THAT COUNCIL APPROVAL WOULDN'T BE REQUIRED FOR THE USE OF



SECURITY CAMERAS WHETHER PUBLICLY PRIVATELY OWNED AS LONG AS THE SECURITY CAMERA ONLY CAPTURES VIDEO AND SOUND, AND DOESN'T HAVE ANY OF THESE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES. DOESN'T COLLECT THERMAL, ANY OTHER TYPE OF TECHNOLOGY OR RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGY. ALL WOULD STILL REQUIRE APPROVAL. BUT THIS KIND OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMERAS, TRADITIONAL CAMERAS, WOULD NOT UNLESS IT'S IN A NEW LOCATION, A CITY-OWNED LOCATION. SO IF WE WERE TO INSTALL NEW CAMERAS AT SOME CITY PROPERTY, WHERE THEY DON'T CURRENTLY EXIST, THAT WOULD REQUIRE APPROVAL FROM THE CITY COUNCIL. BUT USING A PRIVATELY OWNED CAMERA WOULD NOT OR UPGRADING A CITY CAMERA, AS LONG AS THEY STILL ONLY CAPTURE VIDEO AND SOUND WOULD NOT. I'LL NOTE THIS IS REALLY ABOUT ALLOWING RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC INCIDENTS. SO CAMERAS COULD BE USED TO VIEW SPECIFIC INCIDENTS, YOU KNOW, LIKE CRIMES OF, YOU KNOW, I WOULD SAY ROBBERY OR GRAFFITI AT CITY HALL. YOU WANT TO SEE WHO DOES THAT. IT'S NOT ABOUT DATA COLLECTION OR MONITORING. WHILE IT DOES NOT SAY THAT EXPLICITLY IN THE ORDINANCE. BUT BECAUSE THESE CAMERAS ARE, YOU KNOW, THIS BASIC TECHNOLOGY, THERE IS NO -- SOMEONE WOULD HAVE TO LITERALLY MONITOR IT. SO IF YOU WANT TO SEE EVERY PERSON THAT WALKS DOWN THE STREET, SOMEONE WOULD HAVE TO LOOK AT ALL THAT FOOTAGE TO RECORD THAT. WE'RE NOT USING ANY SORT OF HIGH-TECH. SOME OF THESE RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGY THAT COULD DO THAT AUTOMATICALLY. NONE OF THAT IS SORT OF AUTOMATIC WORK WOULD BE DONE. SO IT WOULD REQUIRE, YOU KNOW, DEDICATING A HUGE AMOUNT OF STAFF RESOURCES TO DO THAT KIND OF SURVEILLANCE, AND SO AGAIN, THAT IS WHY THE PURPOSE IS REALLY ABOUT GIVING THE CITY TOOLS TO DEAL WITH SPECIFIC INCIDENTS OR PURPOSES. SO TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS IS THE DEFINITION THAT WOULD BE ADDED IF THE COUNCIL DECIDED THIS WAS THE ORDINANCE THEY WANTED TO APPROVE, MEANS ANY CAMERA THAT IS SOLELY CAPABLE OF CAPTURING VIDEO. CAPTURING AND RECORDING VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO, YOU KNOW, TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS DO NOT INCLUDE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING. SIMILAR INFORMATION, INVOLVING THE USE OF ANY PREDICTED TECHNOLOGY, SCANNING TECHNOLOGY, ARTIFICIAL TECHNOLOGY, OR RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGIES. SO THINGS LIKE AUTOMATED LICENSE PLATE READERS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT WOULD NOT BE COVERED WITHIN THE DEFINITION OF TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS. SO THIS IS THE RELEVANT SECTION IN THE CODE. SAYING WHERE THE CITY COUNCIL HAS TO OBTAIN WHERE APPROVAL IS NECESSARY FOR THE CITY COUNCIL. SO SEEKING FUNDS RIGHT NOW, COUNCILMEMBER APPROVAL IS REQUIRED FOR SEEKING FUNDS FOR SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, YOU KNOW, APPLYING FOR GRANTS OR THOSE THINGS. ADDING THE WORD, EXCEPT FOR TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERA. AND THIS IS ONLY ABOUT FUNDING. ACQUIRING OR BORROWING A NEW SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY, INCLUDING NOT LIMITING THE TECHNOLOGY WITHOUT THE EXCHANGE MONEYS OR CONSIDERATION. AND I'LL JUST NOTE, YOU KNOW, THIS WOULD STILL HAVE TO BE A BUDGETED EXPENDITURE TO THE CITY'S PROCUREMENT POLICIES AND BUDGET POLICIES. OR USING A NEWER OR EXISTING SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY FOR A PURPOSE IN THE MANNER AND THE LOCATION NOT PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL. THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS, EXCEPT FOR THE USE OF TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS OWNED BY THE CITY IN A NEW LOCATION. SO AGAIN, IF THE CITY IS INSTALLING SECURITY CAMERAS SOME PLACE NEW, WE WOULD STILL REQUIRE COUNCIL APPROVAL. BUT THIS FACILITATES THE USE OF PRIVATE SECURITY CAMERAS. AND THE AGREEMENT FOR COUNCIL APPROVAL BEFORE ENTERING INTO AN AGREEMENT TO USE CAMERAS WITH A THIRD PARTY, ADDING THE LANGUAGE. THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE USING TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS FOR A SPECIFIC INCIDENT OR EVENT, AS LONG AS SUCH USE IS NOT PART OF AN ONGOING



ARRANGEMENT WITH A NON-CITY ENTITY. AND AGAIN, THIS LANGUAGE WOULD INTEND TO REFLECT ON WHAT I MENTIONED EARLIER, THIS IS ABOUT USING PRIVATE CAMERAS FOR SPECIFIC EVENTS. IT'S NOT ABOUT ACCESSING SOMEONE, A PRIVATE SECURITY CAMERA, YOU KNOW, AS PART OF A SURVEILLANCE NETWORK ON A PERMANENT BASIS. THAT WOULD, ANY TYPE OF ONGOING ARRANGEMENT WOULD STILL REQUIRE COUNCIL APPROVAL. THIS IS ABOUT RESPONDING TO SPECIFIC EVENTS USING, YOU KNOW, SOMEONE AGREEING TO GIVE THAT VIEW OF THEIR PRIVATE SECURITY FOOTAGE BECAUSE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT WOULD WANT TO LOOK AT SOMETHING FOR A CRIME, NOT A PERMANENT THING. SO IF THE COUNCIL WANTS TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THESE AMENDMENTS, THE RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE TO INTRODUCE AND WAIVE THE FIRST READING OF THE ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 8.80, THE SEBASTOPOL MUNICIPAL CODE. SO WITH THAT, I WILL PAUSE FOR QUESTIONS.

OKAY. I KNOW VICE MAYOR HAD HER HAND UP FIRST.

TWO QUESTIONS. ONE, ISN'T IT TRUE THAT THE POLICE NEED A WARRANT TO ACCESS A PRIVATE CAMERA? THIS DOESN'T GIVE BLANKET ACCESS TO ALL PRIVATE CAMERAS, IS THAT CORRECT?

SO THIS DOES NOT CHANGE ANY OBLIGATIONS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT UNDER THE FOURTH AMENDMENT. SO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT NEED A WARRANT TO UNILATERALLY ACCESS A PRIVATE CAMERA. SOMEONE CAN VOLUNTARILY COME BRING THEIR, YOU KNOW, AND ALLOW THAT TO HAPPEN, BUT THIS DOES NOT CHANGE ANY WARRANT REQUIREMENTS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT.

OKAY. AND THEN WE RECEIVED A COUPLE E-MAILS ON THIS, AND I'M JUST GOING TO READ A COUPLE SENTENCES FROM THIS ONE E-MAIL, AND I'D LIKE YOUR FEEDBACK ON WHAT THEY'RE SAYING. INSTEAD OF MODIFYING THE ORDINANCE TO CREATE A WAY FOR UNACCOUNTABLE NON-TRANSPARENT, WARRANTLESS CITY WIDE DRAGNET SURVEILLANCE TOOLS IN YOUR CITY, YOU SHOULD INSTEAD MODIFY SECTION 8.80.040 TEMPORARY ACQUISITION DURING CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE ORDINANCE. AND I WOULD LIKE YOUR FEEDBACK ON THIS.

I SAW THAT COMMENT. I'M NOT -- THERE ISN'T AN EXCEPTION IN THERE FOR THE EXISTING ORDINANCE WHERE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OR WHOEVER DOESN'T NEED TO -- GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS OF THE COUNCIL APPROVAL FOR CIRCUMSTANCES, WHICH ARE, LET ME PULL UP THE SORT OF -- I'M GOING TO PARAPHRASE WHAT THAT MEANS. BUT IT'S FOR THE LIFE AND SAFETY MEDIA, LIFE AND SAFETY NEEDS. AND THE ISSUE WITH THAT HERE IS THAT, YOU KNOW, LET'S SAY A CRIME HAPPENED FIVE DAYS AGO. THERE'S NO LONGER ANY EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES. THE CRIME IS IN THE PAST. YOU NO LONGER -- THERE'S NO LONGER THE IMMEDIATE RISK TO HEALTH OR SAFETY OR THOSE SORTS OF THINGS, SO IT DOESN'T QUITE MAKE SENSE WE WOULD JUST RELY ON THAT EXEMPTION BECAUSE IT'S NOT GOING TO APPLY IN A LOT OF THESE SITUATIONS. YOU KNOW, IF THERE WAS A LIVE PURSUIT OF, YOU KNOW, GOD FORBID A SHOOTING AND THE POLICE WERE CHASING SOMEONE AND WANT TO ACCESS THAT. THAT MIGHT BE A SITUATION WHERE THAT WOULD APPLY. BUT IF THERE IS A CRIME IN THE PAST THAT IS NO LONGER ONE OF THOSE IMMEDIATE THREATS TO -- TO HEALTH AND SAFETY. I'M JUST PULLING UP THE EXACT LANGUAGE THERE.

SO WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IT WOULDN'T REALLY COVER THE NEEDS THAT ARE BEING EXPRESSED RIGHT NOW BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT?



CORRECT. AND JUST TO READ THIS, WHAT IT SAYS IS, YOU KNOW, OPT TO USE THESE TECHNOLOGIES DURING CIRCUMSTANCES, WHICH FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS CHAPTER IS DEFINED AS AN EMERGENCY INVOLVING IMMINENT DANGER OR DEATH OR SERIOUS PHYSICAL INJURY TO ANY PERSON THAT REQUIRES IMMEDIATE USE OF THE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY. SO THAT IMMINENT DANGER IS REALLY ABOUT THINGS HAPPENING NOW, NOT IN A TYPICAL SITUATION.

OKAY. I'M GOING TO GO TO THE RIGHT HERE AND THEN I'LL COME BACK TO THE LEFT. GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

OKAY, CAN I ASK A SITUATION? A FEW YEARS AGO, MY CAR WAS BROKEN INTO RIGHT HERE ON MORRIS. I WAS AT A BIRTHDAY PARTY AT THE CROOKED GOAT, AND SOMEBODY BUSTED OUT MY WINDOWS AND ALL THE OTHER WINDOWS, AND I HAD LEFT MY WALLET IN MY GLOVE BOX AND LOST A LOT OF CASH AND ALL MY PERSONAL INFORMATION. BECAUSE OF THIS ORDINANCE, WE COULD NOT USE THE CAMERAS THAT WERE SET UP ON THE AUTO BODY SHOPS ACROSS THE STREET FROM MORRIS TO TRY TO FIGURE OUT AND INVESTIGATE THAT CRIME, CORRECT?

CORRECT. IT WOULD REQUIRE UNDER WHAT THE ORDINANCE SAYS, IT WOULD REQUIRE COUNCIL APPROVAL TO USE ANY CAMERA, INCLUDING PRIVATELY OWNED ONES.

AND JUST TO REITERATE, WE DID HEAR ABOUT THIS ISSUE WITH AN E-MAIL FROM DANIELLE AT RETRO GRADE WHO ALSO HAS A CAMERA BEHIND HER SHOP AND HAD A BREAK IN, AND WE COULDN'T INVESTIGATE IT BECAUSE WE COULDN'T USE HER OWN CAMERA FOR HER OWN CRIME TO MAKE AN ARREST, CORRECT?

CORRECT.

THANK YOU.

GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN?

COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, THANK YOU FOR REFERRING TO THAT E-MAIL BECAUSE I ACTUALLY WANT TO FOCUS YOUR ATTENTION ON THE REST OF THE CONTENTS OF THAT E-MAIL. SO TO COVER THE SITUATION WITH DANIELLE AND TO COVER THE SITUATION OF COUNCILMEMBER HINTON JUST IDENTIFIED, THE REST OF THIS E-MAIL STATES THAT SHOULD WE DECIDE TO DO THIS TO ASSIST OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT BY USING TAPES, TAPES FROM OUR EQUIPMENT, FROM PRIVATE CITIZENS, WE COULD ACTUALLY GO THROUGH AND IMPOSE A REQUIREMENT AND THE REST OF THAT IS ACTUALLY IN THIS E-MAIL. THIS PREVISION, WHAT COULD HAPPEN IS IMPLEMENTING A PROVISION FOR A SEVEN-DAY WINDOW FOR THE USE OF THE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY, MEANING THE FACT IF POLICE WANTED TO ACCESS THAT TAPE, THEY WOULD BE ABLE TO HAVE SEVEN DAYS TO DO IT, BUT THEY ALSO MUST LET US KNOW THE COUNCIL AND KEEP A PAPER TRAIL OF EACH TIME THEY'RE TRYING TO ACCESS SOMETHING IN ORDER TO SERVE, AND TO RESOLVE THOSE TYPE OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES. SO IF WE WENT IN THAT DIRECTION AND WE HAVE GOTTEN SEVERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS TO ENCOURAGE US TO NOT JUST RELINQUISH COUNCIL CONTROL, HOW MUCH STAFF TIME WOULD THAT TAKE IN ORDER TO DO WHAT'S IN THE REMAINING PART OF THE E-MAIL THAT YOU STARTED TO READ?



I DON'T KNOW IF WE ARE PREPARED TO ANSWER THAT. I WOULD SAY THAT IS WHAT'S IN THE EXISTING ORDINANCE. IT'S A WORD I HAD TROUBLE SAYING, BUT CIRCUMSTANCES ARE IN THERE ALREADY IN SECTION 8.-

THAT'S NOT WHAT I'M GETTING AT. MY QUESTION IS TO RESOLVE DANIELLE'S SITUATION AND COUNCILMEMBER HINTON'S SITUATION. IF WE WANTED TO ALLOW POLICE TO ACCESS THAT VIDEO TAPE, BUT WE ALSO WANTED THEM TO LET US KNOW ONE MORE REQUEST FOR US TO EVENTUALLY REVIEW THEY REQUESTED THAT AND THEN ONLY HAVE ACCESS TO THE TAPES FOR SEVEN DAYS. HOW MUCH TIME WOULD THAT TAKE YOU TO RETURN BACK TO COUNCIL?

SO I GUESS I WOULD SAY, TO DRAFT IT?

YES.

A COUPLE HOURS. STAFF TIME TO IMPLEMENT THAT, I DON'T KNOW. IT SOUNDS LIKE JUST TO MAKE SURE I'M CLEAR, WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS WHEN THE POLICE WANTED TO USE IT, THEY WOULD MAKE THE REQUEST FOR THE CITY COUNCIL AND THE COUNCIL WOULD APPROVE IT?

NO, THEY COULD GO AHEAD, SHOULD THIS BE THE WILL OF THE COUNCIL TO AUTHORIZE THAT, I'M JUST LOOKING FOR TRANSPARENCY.

OH, SO IT WOULD BE --

IT WOULD BE A NOTIFICATION THEY SOUGHT TO USE THAT PORTION OF THE TAPE, BUT ONLY FOR SEVEN DAYS. THEN IT WOULD BE ERASED, SO WE, AS COUNCILMEMBERS, COULD KEEP A PAPER TRAIL OF HOW MUCH PRIVATE CITIZEN VIDEO IS BEING ACCESSED AND WHERE.

YEAH, I WOULD DEFER THAT TO MARY OR THE CHIEF. I THINK THAT PROBABLY WOULD NOT, THE NOTIFICATION WOULD NOT, YOU KNOW, HAVE EXTENSIVE STAFF TIME. I WOULD SAY SEVEN DAYS. INVESTIGATIONS GO ON SOMETIMES LONGER THAN SEVEN DAYS. IF YOU'RE CRIMINALLY PROSECUTING SOMEONE THAT GOES ON MUCH LONGER. SO JUST OFF THE CUSP, THAT MIGHT BE WHERE THE ISSUE IS. THE NULLIFICATION IS PROBABLY NOT AN EXTENSIVE STAFF TIME, BUT I SEE SOME POTENTIAL.

TO CLARIFY WHAT E-MAIL WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE? IT'S BEEN REFERENCED TWICE, AND THERE'S A LOT OF E-MAILS ON THIS SUBJECT, AND TRYING TO FIND THE ONE THAT IS BEING REFERENCED.

THIS ONE WAS SUBMITTED BY JIM DUFFY TODAY AT 11:30.

THANK YOU.

SO I HAVE MY OWN QUESTION, AND IT IS MY OWN EXPERIENCE. I BELIEVE IT WAS ABOUT FIVE YEARS AGO. I HAD MY GARAGE BROKEN INTO AND MY CAR ATTEMPTED BREAK-IN IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT. BOTH TIMES I HAD VIDEO. I TOOK IT TO THE POLICE. THE CAR CAR ISSUE, THEY FOUND THAT PERSON BECAUSE I PROVIDED THEM THE VIDEO AND THEN THEY FOUND THAT PERSON THAT DAY. SO AT THAT TIME, I MEAN, SO WHAT HAPPENS NOW, RIGHT NOW, IF SOMEONE BROKE INTO MY HOUSE AND I PROVIDED VIDEO? WHAT



HAPPENS? CAN THAT BE UTILIZED? I'M HEARING WITH SOME OF OUR BUSINESSES THEY'RE SAYING THEY'RE NOT, BUT I KNOW FIVE YEARS AGO, I HAD MY OWN EXPERIENCE AND BROUGHT THAT FORTH.

SO THE CURRENT ORDINANCE WAS ADOPTED IN 2022, SO THIS MIGHT HAVE BEEN BEFORE THAT.

I'M JUST TRYING TO COMPARE THAT TO NOW AND WHAT WE'RE DOING FOR THE FUTURE. BECAUSE IF I DIDN'T HAVE THESE VIDEOS, WE WOULDN'T HAVE FOUND \$10,000 WORTH OF STUFF IN MY HOUSE THAT WAS STOLEN IN ADDITION TO MY CAR. SO I'M JUST SAYING. I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THEN, WE COULD UTILIZE THE VIDEOS RIGHT NOW. THEY CANNOT BECAUSE OF WHAT WE HAVE. SO YOU'RE ASKING FOR THE FUTURE FOR A DECISION TONIGHT TO THEN ALLOW THAT AGAIN, RIGHT?

CORRECT. I WOULD DEFER TO THE CHIEF ON HOW OFTEN THIS HAS BEEN THE ISSUE, BUT THERE HAVE BEEN TIMES WHERE THEY HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO USE.

YES, PLEASE.

CAN I ASK WHAT YOUR SPECIFIC QUESTION IS, PLEASE?

I'M JUST TRYING TO UNDERSTAND, YOU KNOW, FIVE YEARS AGO, THE POLICE WERE ABLE TO USE MY VIDEOS IN ORDER TO CATCH THE PEOPLE WHO BROKE INTO MY STUFF. AND NOW, WE CAN'T DO THAT, CORRECT? BUT IF I BROUGHT A VIDEO TO YOU NOW, YOU'RE SAYING IT COULD NOT BE UTILIZED TO HELP FIND THE PERPETRATORS, RIGHT?

THAT'S CORRECT. I MEAN, WE COULD CERTAINLY HAVE IT SHINED TO US, BUT WE CAN'T USE IT FOR ANY FORM OF PROSECUTION OR USE IT IN THE CASE BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN INTO THE ORDINANCE CURRENTLY. AND ALEX CAN CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, BUT THE CITY IS LIABLE FOR COSTS IF SOMEONE WERE TO FILE A DEFENSE AND FIND WE'VE USED FOOTAGE THAT WAS NOT AUTHORIZED AND THE CITY BECOMES LIABLE FOR THE COST OF THE DEFENSE. SO THE FRUIT OF THE POISON TREE IS WHAT WE'RE REFERRING TO.

AND I DON'T KNOW IF THE CITY WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COST, BUT IT MIGHT BE AN ISSUE WHERE THIS, YOU KNOW, EVIDENCE WAS DISMISSED BECAUSE IT VIOLATED OUR ORDINANCE TO COLLECT.

I'M SURE IT SAYS IN THERE THAT THEY WOULD BE LIABLE FOR COST?

THERE IS A SEPARATE PROCESS IN HERE THAT WILL CHALLENGE OUR COLLECTION OF IT AND SEPARATE FROM ANY CRIMINAL PROSECUTION.

OKAY. SO THEN WHAT YOU'RE ASKING TONIGHT, AT LEAST FROM WHAT I UNDERSTAND. FROM ONE PERSPECTIVE IS YOU WANT TO BE ABLE TO UTILIZE THESE TYPES OF VIDEOS LIKE WE COULD IN THE PAST. IS THAT THE SPIRIT OF WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT TONIGHT? I JUST WANT TO CLEARLY UNDERSTAND HOW THIS APPLIES REAL WORLD.

I APPRECIATE THE PUBLIC COMMENT WE'VE HAD AND PEOPLE'S CONCERNS ABOUT CIVIL LIBERTIES. I WOULD ASSERT TO THEM I VALUE THE SAME CIVIL LIBERTIES IN THIS COUNTRY, AND I HAVE ZERO INTENTION OF OUR AGENCY USING THEM IN ANY FASHION THAT'S NOT APPROPRIATE FOR PROSECUTION. WE'VE GOT CASES RIGHT NOW THAT WE'VE GOT PEOPLE ON VIDEO THAT WE CANNOT USE TO FURTHER THAT PROSECUTION AND HOLD



THESE PEOPLE ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR CRIME, OCCURRING IN THE CITY. TO ME, IT SEEMS TO BE CONCERNING THAT YOU HAVE A POLICE DEPARTMENT HERE THAT HAVING THEIR HANDS TIED FOR WHAT ALEX SAID, VERY BASIC TECHNOLOGY THAT SURROUNDS US. EVERYBODY HAS IT. I MEAN, WE HAVE MORE TRACKING CAPABILITIES ON THEIR CELL PHONES. I GATHER ALL OF YOU HAVE, AND WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT BASIC VIDEO CAMERAS. MY SOUL PURPOSE IS TO BE ABLE TO USE THAT FOOTAGE TO PROSECUTE TO THE PEOPLE WHO COMMIT THE CRIME.

OKAY. COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN?

THANK YOU, CHIEF. TO FOLLOW THAT UP THOUGH, I MEAN, IT IS JUST A MINOR CONCERN, GIVEN WHERE WE ARE WITH OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND OUR BROWN BROTHERS AND SISTERS. IT IS A HUGE CONCERN. SO WHAT OPPOSITION WOULD YOU HAVE TO FILING SOMETHING ON A REGULAR BASIS? EVERY TIME YOU REQUESTED TO USE CITY CAMERA FOOTAGE OR PRIVATE CITIZEN FOOTAGE, I'M ASSUMING YOU WOULD BE SOMEWHERE OUT IN THE PUBLIC. SO WHAT HARM WOULD IT BE FOR YOU TO FILE SOMETHING WITH THE CITY SAYING YOU REQUESTED CAMERA FOOTAGE ON THIS DAY, FROM THIS PERIOD FOR THIS PURPOSE? AND FILE IT ON A MONTHLY BASIS TO LET US KNOW WHAT SURVEILLANCE IS ACTUALLY HAPPENING WITHIN OUR CITY?

I'LL ANSWER THAT QUESTION BY SAYING THERE IS A SUBJECTIVE POLICY HERE IN THE CITY THAT REQUIRES WE NOTIFY YOU OF PRETTY MUCH ANYTHING THAT WILL GO ANY WAY. SO I WOULD THINK YOU WOULD BE NOTIFIED AT THE TIME BY ME OR AT LEAST THE LIEUTENANT OF A SITUATION, WHERE WE ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, AND WE HAVE OBTAINED SOME FOOTAGE, AND WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO INCLUDE THAT VERBAGE TO NOTIFY YOU AT THE TIME. BUT CIRCLING BACK TO YOUR PREVIOUS COMMENT ABOUT THE SEVEN-DAY RETENTION PERIOD. THAT WOULD BE DIFFICULT FOR US TO MAINTAIN BECAUSE OF THE LENGTH OF TIME IT TAKES TO BRIDGE A DISPOSITION IN SOME SORT OF PROSECUTION WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND OUR LEGAL SYSTEM. SO THOSE FOOTAGE, SHOULD SOMEONE APPLY THEM TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT ATTACHED TO THE CASE FILE BECAUSE THEY WILL BE FORWARDED TO THE D.A.'S OFFICE AND USED IN PROSECUTION. DEPENDING ON THE TYPE OF CRIME THAT IT RELATES, THERE ARE DIFFERENT RETENTION PERIODS, SO WE WOULD BE GUIDED BY THOSE STATE MANDATES. [ CAPTIONERS TRANSITIONING ]

WE CERTAINLY COULD ADD THAT. YOU KNOW, WE COULD ADD, CHANGE SECTION 1 TO SAY, WHERE IT SAYS RECITALS TO MAKE THAT SAY RECITALS AND PURPOSE, AND ADD A SENTENCE SAYING THE PURPOSE IS, WHATEVER LANGUAGE THE COUNCIL MIGHT WANT, AND ADD THAT IN, IF THAT'S THE DIRECTION OF THE COUNCIL.

I HAVE A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION, BECAUSE IT DEPENDS UPON WHO IS DEFINING WHAT AS A CRIME. WE HAVE I.C.E. IN OUR CITY, AND DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE COMMUNITY BELIEVE THAT OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT WOULD NOT WORK WITH I.C.E., OTHERS BELIEVE THAT THAT IS NOT TRUE. WOULD IT SOLVE COUNCILMEMBER BOWERS QUESTION? WOULD IT BE A CRIME TO SAY THAT AGENCY, LIKE I.C.E., WHAT WOULD YOUR ADVICE BE IN ORDER TO WARRANT ILLICIT USE OF VIDEO CAMERA.

OUR STATE LAW, AND OUR ADOPTED RESOLUTION, DON'T ALLOW COOPERATION WITH I.C.E. FOR CIVIL IMMIGRATION VIOLATIONS. AND SO, THAT'S THE POLICY OF THE CITY, AND STATE LAW. I'M THINKING ABOUT THE SECOND HALF OF YOUR QUESTION. THIS ORDINANCE ALSO ONLY GOVERNS THE CITY, THERE IS NOTHING



PREVENTING I.C.E. FROM GOING TO ACCESS SOMEONE'S CAMERA, GETTING IT VOLUNTARILY, OR THROUGH A WARRANT. THIS IS ONLY ABOUT THE CITY'S USE. EVEN IF NOTHING CHANGED HERE, THAT WOULDN'T IMPACT I.C.E. ABILITY TO GET PRIVATE SECURITY FOOTAGE. THEY'RE NOT SUBJECT TO OUR ORDINANCE.

THEY COULD STILL OBTAIN CITY FOOTAGE REGARDLESS. IT WOULDN'T BE AN OPTION FOR US TO NOT PROVIDE IT TO THEM. AS FAR AS WORKING WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES, SPECIFICALLY I.C.E. , THAT SEEMS TO BE THE HOT TOPIC RIGHT NOW. SB 54 IN CALIFORNIA PREVENTS US FROM WORKING WITH THEM. I LIKEN IT TO US INVITING I.C.E. TO COME INTO TOWN AND INVESTIGATE A DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INCIDENT. THEY HAVE THEIR CHARTER AND WE HAVE OURS, AND WE ARE NOT ON THE SAME PAGE. WITH OUR RESPECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT DUTIES.

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? WE CAN GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT, MARY.

THANK YOU, MAYOR. THANK YOU, CHIEF.

THIS IS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS HEARING WE WILL DO A TWO MINUTE PUBLIC TIME LIMIT. WE WILL DO CHAMBERS FIRST, THEN ZOOM, BACK TO CHAMBERS, THEN ZOOM. OLIVER?

I WAS JUST USING A.I. TO GO THROUGH THE HISTORY OF ALL THIS STUFF WHILE WE WERE TALKING. BASICALLY, THIS IS A 2020 THING, AND THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL IS A COMPLETE OUTLIER, THE SIZE OF OUR CITY, THIS WAS AFTER THE GEORGE BOYD IN 2020, THIS IS AN ACLU ORIGINATING THING, THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL ADOPTED IN 2020. WE ARE NOW IN 2026. EVERYTHING INCLUDING A.I., EVERYTHING MOVES INCREDIBLY FAST. IT'S CUTE TO BE HEARING ABOUT TAPES, I MEAN, WE ARE LIVING IN A DIGITAL WORLD, NOW. INSTEAD OF THE GRANDIOSE STUFF ABOUT WILL I.C.E. BE ABLE TO SEE THE TAPES AND SO ON AND SO FORTH, THE MORE IMPORTANT THING IS THAT THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL HAS AN AWFUL LOT OF DRIVE BY CRIME. WE HAVE A SERIOUS PROPERTY CRIME PROBLEM. AND IF THE POLICE, CAN'T VIEW VIDEO OR TAKE ANY ACTION, IF THEY'VE SEEN ANY VIDEO, GIVEN THAT WE'RE THE ONLY PLACE WHO HAS THIS ORDINANCE IN PLACE, IF I WAS A CRIMINAL, SITTING IN A BAR I THINK, THE OBVIOUS PLACE TO GO TO IS THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL, BECAUSE I'M GOING TO RIP OFF MORE STUFF WITH A MUCH GREATER CHANCE OF GETTING AWAY THAN ANYWHERE ELSE. WHILE WE'RE WORRYING ABOUT THE FEDS AND I.C.E. AND WHATEVER, THE REALITY IS, WE'RE REALLY SHOOTING OURSELVES IN THE FOOT. THE ACLU COST US AN ABSOLUTE FORTUNE AND NOW WE HAVE THE SAME PROBLEM WHERE WE HAVE AN ACLU DRIVEN DIRECTIVE WHICH IS GOING TO COST THE CITY A LOT OF PETTY CRIME, I WOULD ARGUE. IT'S OBVIOUSLY HAVE TO HAVE STRONG CHECKS AND BALANCES. SURVEILLANCE, I'M SUPER PARANOID ABOUT SURVEILLANCE MYSELF. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL, HERE, NOT SOME GRANDIOSE WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM, CONSPIRACY, WHATEVER. I'M IN FAVOR OF AMENDING.

THAT'S TWO MINUTES.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, NEXT GO OUT TO ZOOM, KATE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF?



THANK YOU, MARY. IT IS CLEAR THAT WE SHOULD AMEND THIS ORDINANCE. IT IS COMMON SENSE. SEBASTOPOL HAS AN ONGOING ISSUE WITH THEFT, GRAFFITI ON PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND PROPERTY DAMAGE. WE JUST HEARD THREE STORIES TONIGHT REGARDING THEFT THAT INVOLVED TWO OF OUR COUNCIL PEOPLE. SEBASTOPOL HAS A HIGH RATE OF CRIME RELATIVE TO OUR POPULATION AND OTHER CITIES. SEBASTOPOL HAS A HUGE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC THAT FLOWS THROUGH IT. WE HAVE A MAJOR HIGH SCHOOL, WE HAVE A HOME KEY PROJECT DOWNTOWN WHERE THERE IS ACTIVE DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING, WE NEED TO BE ABLE TO USE CAMERA FOOTAGE TO PROSECUTE CRIME. WHAT IF SOMEONE BREAKS INTO YOUR HOUSE AND THE POLICE CANNOT USE THE FOOTAGE FROM YOUR CAMERA TO FIND THE BURGLAR? WHAT IF THERE'S A THAT TARGETS SEBASTOPOL BECAUSE NO ONE CAN USE THEIR CAMERA FOOTAGE IN ORDER TO PROSECUTE THE PERSON. WE CANNOT HAVE SEBASTOPOL BE A SMALL SECURITY HOLE WITHIN LARGER WEST COUNTY. SEBASTOPOL IS A TINY TWO SQUARE MILE PATCH WITHIN A HUGE AREA. SEBASTOPOL NEEDS TO BE ABLE TO WORK WITH LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY AND BE ABLE TO PROSECUTE CRIMINALS THAT BREAK THE LAW. ONCE AGAIN ASKS THE QUESTION, DOES THIS CHANGE BENEFIT THE CITIZENS OF SEBASTOPOL? THE ANSWER IS CLEARLY YES, IT WOULD HAVE BENEFITED COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, IT WOULD HAVE BENEFITED LOCAL BUSINESS OWNER OF RETRO GROWTH. DOES IT BENEFIT LOCAL BUSINESSES? THE ANSWER IS YES BECAUSE OUR BUSINESSES ARE TARGETED WITH THEFT ALL THE TIME. IT IS CLEAR THAT YOU SHOULD SUPPORT THE CHANGE OF THIS ORDINANCE, SO THAT CRIMINALS CAN BE PROSECUTED. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, NEXT I WILL COME BACK TO CHAMBERS. IS THERE ANYONE IN CHAMBERS AND WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT? SEEING NONE, I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. OMAR, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES, THANK YOU. GOOD EVENING, MAYOR, COUNCIL MEMBERS, AND STAFF. I NAME IS OMAR FIGARO, I AM A PARENT AND BUSINESS OWNER HERE IN SEBASTOPOL. I AM ASKING YOU TO NOT INTRODUCE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ORDINANCE. I WORKED WITH A FORMER POLICE CHIEF RON NELSON FOR OVER A YEAR IN CRAFTING THIS ORDINANCE. NEVER ONCE DID WE THINK THAT THIS ORDINANCE WOULD PROHIBIT THE USE OF PRIVATE SECURITY CAMERA RECORDINGS TO AID IN CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AND APPREHENSION. POLICE CHIEF NELSON WOULD NEVER HAVE APPROVED THIS ORDINANCE IF IT HAD DONE THAT. WHEN THIS ORDINANCE WAS ADOPTED, THE CITY RECOGNIZED THE SIMPLE TRUTH. SURVEILLANCE TOOLS CAN WATCH PEOPLE AS THEY GO ABOUT THEIR DAILY LIVES, AND CAN AFFECT PRIVACY AND LIBERTY. BECAUSE OF THAT, THE COMMUNITY WAS PROMISED NOTICE AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION BEFORE SURVEILLANCE EXPENSE. WE ARE TOLD THIS CHANGE IS NEEDED BECAUSE THE PROCESS TAKES TIME. THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE WAS NEVER SPEED. THE PURPOSE WAS TRUST. THE ORDINANCE ALREADY ALLOWS IMMEDIATE USE OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY IN EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES. SO THE DELAY BEING DISCUSSED ONLY APPLIES, THAT IS HOW PUBLIC TRUST IS PROTECTED. RIGHT NOW THE COUNCIL REVIEWS EXPANSION, THE PROPOSAL REVIEWS A BROAD CATEGORY OF CAMERA USES AND UPGRADES THAT CURRENTLY COME BEFORE YOU. IT SHIPS DECISIONS AWAY FROM PUBLIC DELIBERATION AND TOWARD ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION. ONCE THAT AUTHORITY IS SURRENDERED, IT IS DIFFICULT TO RECLAIM. SMALL CHANGES BECOME BIG CHANGES, A CAMERA USED ONE WAY TODAY CAN BE USED ANOTHER WAY TOMORROW. TECHNOLOGY CONNECTS, GROWS, AND IMPROVES. THE REVIEW PROCESS IS THE MOMENT WHEN THE COMMUNITY CAN ASK



WHETHER THE INCREASING USE OF SECURITY CAMERAS STILL MATCHES OUR SMALL TOWN VALUES. THIS IS NOT ABOUT OPPOSING THE POLICE.

THAT IS TWO MINUTES.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK TO CHAMBERS IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS.

RAISE YOUR HAND.

THANK YOU, OMAR. I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. WOODY, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

I JUST UNMUTED.

I CAN HEAR YOU, CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

I CAN, YES, THANKS.

GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT.

MY NAME IS WOODY HASTINGS, I LIVE IN THE 95473 Z.I.P. CODE. THE WAY THIS WAS PRESENTED TONIGHT MAKES IT SOUND SO INNOCUOUS AND REASONABLE AND PARTS OF IT MAY BE. LIKE THE ABILITY TO USE PRIVATE VIDEOS. WITH PEOPLE BEING SHOT IN THE STREET BY GOVERNMENT FORCES, I'M CONCERNED ABOUT ANY INCREASE IN POLICE SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES. THESE TECHNOLOGIES CAN BE WESTERNIZED, FACILITATE THE DEPORTATIONS, TARGET POLITICAL -- I WANT TO TALK SPECIFICALLY ABOUT ONE OF THE MAIN CONCERNS, WHICH IS SECTION 3B IN THE ORDINANCE. IT'S ABOUT SHARING TRADITIONAL VIDEOS, OLD-SCHOOL VIDEOS WITH OUTSIDE ENTITIES. THIS PROVISION IS UNACCEPTABLE. A NON-CITY ENTITY CAN EASILY BE A MALEVOLENT ENTITY OR BECOME ONE. IT DOESN'T MATTER THAT IT'S FOR NOT AN ONGOING ARRANGEMENT, ACCESS ONCE TO A VIDEO CAN DO DAMAGE IN THE WRONG HANDS. THE PROBLEM IS THE TRADITIONAL VIDEO CAN BE PROCESSED WITH A.I. TO REVEAL INFORMATION THAT IS NOT DISCERNIBLE SIMPLY BY WATCHING THE VIDEO. THIS INCLUDES HUMAN PHYSIOLOGICAL DATA, MAGNIFICATION OF OTHERWISE IMPERCEPTIBLE MOTION, COMBINATION WITH OTHER DATA TO REVEAL BEHAVIOR CHARACTERISTICS AND PATTERNS AND FORENSICALLY REVEAL OTHER SENSITIVE INFORMATION THAT CAN BE USED AGAINST INNOCENT SEBASTOPOL RESIDENTS. PLEASE DON'T ERODE OUR PRIVACY FURTHER THAN IT ALREADY IS. AT THIS TIME, MY REQUEST IS THAT YOU DELAY ANY DECISION-MAKING ABOUT THIS AMENDMENT, THE BEN FRANKLIN QUOTE COMES TO MIND, AND FRANKLIN SAID THOSE WHO WOULD GIVE UP ESSENTIAL LIBERTY TO PURCHASE A LITTLE SAFETY DESERVE NEITHER LIBERTY NOR SAFETY. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I'M GOING TO COME INTO CHAMBERS. IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE, I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, MICHAEL, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

I CAN. CAN YOU HEAR ME?

I CAN, CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?



I CAN.

MY NAME IS MICHAEL, I WANTED TO ADD TO THE LIST, A WEEK AGO THIS LAST WEEK I RODE HOME FROM MY SHOP ON MY BICYCLE, I WAS IN THE HOUSE FOR MAYBE AN HOUR, WENT BACK OUT TO GET ON IT TO WRITE BACK DOWN TO THE SHOP, AND MY BICYCLE HAD BEEN STOLEN OUT OF MY DRIVEWAY. I WAS SURPRISED TO LEARN THAT THE CAMERAS ON THE NEIGHBORS NEXT DOOR, WHICH THEY HAVE PLENTY OF THE DENTIST OFFICE, WOULD BE USELESS, THAT THEY COULDN'T ACTUALLY ACCESS THEM. I WOULD SAY THAT I WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF AMENDING THE ORDINANCE, HERE. A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS THAT I HAD WAS, HOW DOES THAT PERTAIN TO PRIVATE CELL PHONE VIDEOS? THAT THERE IS SOME SORT OF EVENT, SAY YOU WITNESS SOMETHING AND YOU FILM IT, THE OTHER THING IS WHAT ABOUT DASH CAM VIDEO'S? THAT ARE PRIVATELY OWNED, AND THEY WERE WITNESS TO A MAJOR ACCIDENT OF SOME SORT? I THINK THAT MAY BE THE AMENDMENTS COULD BE TWEAKED A LITTLE BIT TO MAKE SURE THAT THOSE APPARATUS AND THOSE VIDEOS THAT ARE RECORDED ARE ALSO AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO THE CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF PLEASE?

MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR, JIM DUFFY, THANK YOU FOR TAKING MY COMMENTS. THE SEBASTOPOL POLICE DEPARTMENT NEEDS TO BE ABLE TO UTILIZE CAMERA FOOTAGE FROM LEGALLY PLACED AND OPERATED PRIVATE SECURITY CAMERAS AND DOORBELL CAMERAS AS PART OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS. THIS IS WHAT I SAID IN THE LETTER THAT SOME OF YOU WERE QUOTING FROM. I'M GOING TO GO TO THE BOTTOM OF THE NEXT PARAGRAPH, THAT'S THE PIECE THAT YOU GUYS WERE MISSING. CURRENTLY YOUR CITY DEFINES EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES AS EMERGENCIES INVOLVING IMMINENT DANGER OF DEATH OR SERIOUS PHYSICAL INJURY TO ANY PERSON THAT REQUIRES THE IMMEDIATE USE OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY OR INFORMATION IT PROVIDES. YOU SHOULD BROADEN THIS DEFINITION. TO INCLUDE THE TYPES OF CRIMES THAT YOUR POLICE DEPARTMENT BELIEVES, I'VE GOT TO SAY BELIEVES BECAUSE I'VE HEARD SOME OTHER LAWYERS WHO SAID THAT THEY CAN USE THESE CAMERAS AS IT'S WRITTEN, BELIEVES THEY WERE FORBIDDEN TO INVESTIGATE DUE TO YOUR CURRENT ORDINANCE. I'M TOTALLY IN SUPPORT OF POLICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY, WE DO NOT WANT TO BLOW A HOLE IN THIS BY ALLOWING DRAGNET SURVEILLANCE WITH CAMERAS ALL OVER THE CITY UNLESS YOU'RE GOING TO PUT A SURVEILLANCE USE ORDINANCE IN PLACE SPECIFICALLY FOR THOSE CAMERAS WHERE YOU DEFINE THE PARTS THAT ARE TALKED ABOUT IN THE ORDINANCE, THE PURPOSE, THE AUTHORIZED USED, DATA COLLECTION, DATA ACCESS, PROTECTION, RETENTION, ET CETERA. THAT ARE CURRENTLY LISTED IN THE ORDINANCE. I WANT TO ADDRESS THE 70 REQUIREMENT, THE SEVEN-DAY REQUIREMENT IS HOW MUCH OF THE PRIVATE CAMERA FOOTAGE YOU CAN REQUEST FOR YOUR INVESTIGATION. YOU CAN ONLY REQUEST THE SEVEN-DAY PERIOD ON THAT PRIVATE CAMERA. POLICE DEPARTMENT CAN HOLD ONTO IT FOREVER IF THEY FEEL LIKE IT, YOU SHOULD HAVE A POLICY THAT MAKES YOU GET RID OF IT EVENTUALLY.

TWO MINUTES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.



THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT, ROBERT, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES.

THANK YOU, CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

I CAN.

GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

WHERE TO START. THIS WAS AN ACLU WRITTEN ORDINANCE AS I RECALL, THERE WAS A LOT OF DISCUSSION AROUND THE PROBLEMS IDENTIFYING PEOPLE FROM VIDEOS, WITH PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS, AND THERE WAS PUBLIC FEEDBACK IN THE DISCUSSION ABOUT THE FACT THAT THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL DOESN'T NEED, WANT, HAVE THE MONEY, OR INTEREST IN ACQUIRING ANY OF THAT TECHNOLOGY. THAT WAS THE WHOLE DISCUSSION. NOBODY DURING THAT DISCUSSION SAID LOOK AT ALL THIS OTHER SECURITY STUFF THAT WE ALL HAVE LIKE RING BELL DOOR CAMERAS. YOU CAN'T USE ANY OF THAT EITHER, THAT DIDN'T COME UP IN THE DISCUSSION BACK THEN. AND I'M REALLY, JUST OFF. THIS THING, THIS ORDINANCE WAS SUPPOSED TO MAKE US INFLUENCE OTHER CITIES, NONE OF THAT HAPPENED. NO OTHER CITIES HAS ANYTHING LIKE THIS. ALL OF THEM ARE USING MORE SOPHISTICATED SURVEILLANCE THAN WHAT WE HAVE HERE, AND IT DOESN'T APPEAR TO BE CAUSING BIG PROBLEMS. WE DID ALL OF THIS FOR AN IDEOLOGY, AND IT COST US, AS INDIVIDUALS IN THIS CITY. IF SOMEBODY BREAKS INTO YOUR HOUSE, DESTROYS YOUR CAR, ATTACKS YOUR FAMILY, AND YOU HAVE A CAMERA OR THERE'S A CAMERA THAT COULD HELP TO IDENTIFY THEM AND CAPTURE THEM, YOU'RE TELLING ME IT CAN'T BE USED, AND EVERYBODY IS OKAY WITH THIS? THIS WHOLE ORDINANCE SHOULD BE THROWN OUT BECAUSE NOBODY UNDERSTANDS, THERE ARE STATE LAWS THAT COVER ALL OF THIS STUFF, WE'RE NOT ANYBODY'S EXAMPLE OF ANYTHING AS IT RELATES TO STUFF LIKE THIS. I'M SORRY. IT'S JUST CRAZY. AND WHAT'S THE SEVEN-DAY THING? WHAT IF SOMETHING BREAKS INTO YOUR HOUSE, WHAT IF YOU DON'T COME BACK FOR TWO OR THREE WEEKS? SEVEN DAYS? CAN'T USE THAT CAMERA TO IDENTIFY WHO STOLE ALL YOUR STUFF. THANK YOU, THAT'S ALL.

THANK YOU, NEXT I WILL STAY OUT ON ZOOM, JUNE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE? CAN YOU GO AHEAD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

SO I'M HEARING THE CONCERNS ABOUT WHERE THIS ORDINANCE HASN'T BEEN USEFUL, THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS, AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS DON'T ACTUALLY MATCH THE CONCERNS. THE CONCERNS ARE ABOUT USING PRIVATE VIDEO FOR CRIME. BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT'S IN THE ORDINANCE, THE ORDINANCE IS AN EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TYPE OF OLD TECHNOLOGY. SO THAT WOULD MEAN, IF YOU HAVE PRIVATE VIDEO THAT WAS HIGH-TECHNOLOGY, MAYBE SOME A.I. FEATURES IN YOUR RING TONE CAMERA, YOU STILL COULDN'T USE IT FOR THE POLICE. SO WE DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT AMENDMENTS HERE. BUT, THIS CURRENT PROPOSAL DOES DO IS IT MAKES ALL SORTS OF EXCEPTIONS FOR ANYTHING WITH THAT OLD TECHNOLOGY. SAYING IT'LL BE HARMLESS IF WE CAN DO WHATEVER WE WANT WITH THAT OLD VIDEO BECAUSE IT DOESN'T HAVE A.I. IN IT, BUT YOU HAND OVER A PHOTOGRAPH OR A BUNCH OF OLD VIDEO TO THE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION, THEY CAN PUT A.I. ON IT. THEY KNOW WHERE IT CAME FROM, AND WE HAVE GOOD FOLK TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT RIGHT NOW, BUT SOMEBODY ELSE COULD DECIDE THEY WANT TO TURN OVER ALL



SORTS OF CITY STAFF, AND WHAT THIS ALLOWS, IT SAYS WE CAN DO NEW AGREEMENTS. WE CAN DO FUNDING AGREEMENTS WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND NOT TELL YOU. WE CAN DO ALL SORTS OF NEW THINGS AND NOT TELL YOU. IF WE WANT TO DO NEW THINGS, COME TO THE COUNCIL AND WE CAN APPROVE THEM. AND LET'S ACTUALLY SOLVE THIS CONCERN ABOUT PRIVATE VIDEO, A LOT OF PEOPLE SO YOU COULD USE PRIVATE VIDEO RIGHT NOW IF THERE NEEDS TO BE CLARIFICATION, COME BACK WITH THAT CLARIFICATION. TO COVER ALL SORTS OF TECHNOLOGY. BUT, DON'T GIVE AWAY OUR PHOTOS TO ANY ENTITY AND NOT TELL US AND ENTER NEW MONITOR AGREEMENTS WITH NEW ENTITIES AND NOT TELL US. THAT THIS PROPOSED ORDINANCE WOULD ALLOW. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE? CAN YOU HEAR US?

YES, I CAN, I'M TRYING TO MAKE MY VIDEO WORK BUT I GUESS YOU'LL JUST HAVE TO SEE MY PICTURE.

CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

I CAN. MY NAME IS EUNA GLASS, I'M THE FORMER MAYOR OF SEBASTOPOL, I'M ONE OF THE AUTHORS OF THIS PARTICULAR ORDINANCE, WHICH IS BEING MALIGNED AT THIS MOMENT. I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT AS FAR AS I CAN SEE, THIS ORDINANCE NEITHER IN WORD NOR IN INTENT WAS MEANT TO PRECLUDE PEOPLE FROM USING THEIR PRIVATE VIDEOS FOR OUR POLICE DEPARTMENT USING PRIVATE VIDEOS FROM PRIVATELY USED SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY, IN OTHER WORDS, PEOPLE'S SECURITY SYSTEMS IN THEIR BUSINESSES AND IN THEIR HOMES, FROM THAT BEING USED TO EITHER SOLVE OR PROSECUTE CRIMES. I DO NOT KNOW WHERE THIS IDEA CAME FROM. IF OUR CITY ATTORNEY SEEMS TO THINK THIS IS TRUE, THEN I THINK THE CITY SHOULD GET AN OUTSIDE COUNCIL TO EVALUATE THE WORDING, IN OUR ORDINANCE, BECAUSE THAT WAS CERTAINLY NOT ITS INTENT. I HAVE NO IDEA WHERE THIS IS COMING FROM. I DO THINK THAT AT THIS TIME, MORE THAN EVER, WHAT WE NEED IS PUBLIC OVERSIGHT OVER SURVEILLANCE. THAT DOES NOT MEAN REMOVING THE CITY COUNCILS OBLIGATION TO REVIEW THE KINDS OF SURVEILLANCE THAT WE ARE PUTTING IN PLACE ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC USING PUBLIC FUNDS. SO, OF ALL TIMES, THIS SEEMS LIKE THE WORST OF TIMES TO BE ASSERTING THAT WE SHOULD BE BACKING OFF OF PUBLIC OVERSIGHT OF THE KIND OF SURVEILLANCE THAT WE'RE USING IN OUR CITY. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS, SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. MAGNESS, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

GOOD EVENING, MAYOR, COUNCIL MEMBERS AND STAFF. MY NAME IS MAGNESS FIGARO A. I'M 15 YEARS OLD, A HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT AND WAS BORN AND RAISED IN SEBASTOPOL. I'M ASKING YOU NOT INTRODUCE THE AMENDMENT TO THE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ORDINANCE. I WANT TO EXPLAIN WHAT THIS FEELS LIKE FROM MY PERSPECTIVE AND THE PERSPECTIVE OF PEOPLE MY AGE. AFTER SCHOOL A LOT OF US GO DOWNTOWN. WE SIT IN THE PLAZA, GET I.C.E. CREAM, TALK AND HANG OUT. MOST OF THE TIME WE'RE NOT DOING ANYTHING WRONG, JUST FIGURING OUT WHO WE ARE. WHEN THERE ARE CAMERAS EVERYWHERE THAT FEELING WOULD CHANGE. YOU DON'T KNOW WHO IS WATCHING, YOU DON'T KNOW HOW LONG VIDEO IS SAVED, YOU DON'T KNOW WHERE IT ENDS UP. SO YOU START ACTING DIFFERENT EVEN IF YOU DID NOTHING WRONG. YOU DON'T SAY AS LONG, YOU DON'T JOKE AROUND AS MUCH, YOU DON'T ACT GOOFY



WITH YOUR FRIENDS. YOU THINK TWICE BEFORE BEING YOURSELF. LIKE YOU'RE ALWAYS BEING RATED IN PUBLIC. TEENAGERS AND PLACES WHERE WE CAN EXIST WITHOUT FEELING RECORDED ALL THE TIME. IT'S PART OF GROWING UP. YOU LEARN CONFIDENCE BY MAKING SMALL MISTAKES IN HARMLESS SITUATIONS. IF EVERY NORMAL MOMENT FEELS WATCHED, PEOPLE STOPPED TRYING THINGS, STOP TALKING FREELY AND JUST GO HOME. I UNDERSTAND THAT CAMERAS CAN BE HELPFUL SOMETIMES. I'M NOT AGAINST SAFETY, BUT WITH THE CURRENT ORDINANCE AT LEAST MAKES THE POLICE STOP AND TALK WITH THE PUBLIC BEFORE SURVEILLANCE GROWS. THAT MATTERS. IT MEANS THE COMMUNITY GETS TO DECIDE WHAT KIND OF TOWN THIS IS. FROM MY POINT OF VIEW A SAFE TOWN IS NOT ONLY A PLACE WITH LESS CRIME, IT'S A PLACE WHERE YOUNG PEOPLE CAN FEEL COMFORTABLE ABOUT BEING OUTSIDE AND BEING THEMSELVES. PLEASE DON'T MAKE IT EASIER TO ADD MORE SURVEILLANCE WITHOUT THAT CONVERSATION. THANK YOU FOR LISTENING.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I'M JUST TUNING INTO THIS ISSUE, I LOOKED AT THE SLIDES AND I HAVE TO SAY, THE SLIDES DIDN'T SEEM TO REFLECT AT ALL WHAT MOST PEOPLE SEEM TO BE CONFUSED ABOUT. I HAVE A HARD TIME BELIEVING THAT THE ORDINANCE WOULD PREVENT A PRIVATE CITIZEN FROM HANDING OVER EVIDENCE OF A CRIME AND THE POLICE NOT BEING ABLE TO USE THAT IF IT HAS THE PERMISSION OF THE OWNER. YOU HAVE TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THAT IS REALLY TRUE OR NOT, AND I DON'T WANT TO JUST BELIEVE THE WORD OF THE POLICE OR BELIEVE THE WORD OF THE AUTHOR OF THE ORDINANCE, I WANT LEGAL HELP IN DETERMINING THAT. YOU DON'T WANT TO MAKE CHANGES LIKE THIS IN A PUBLIC FORUM FOR COMPLICATED TECHNOLOGICAL ISSUES WITHOUT A DEEP DIVE AND UNDERSTANDING WHAT'S GOING ON. IT MAY SOUND LIKE AN EASY THING, WE WANT TO UPGRADE OUR CAMERAS WITHOUT LETTING THE CITY COUNCIL NO. BUT WAITING A WHILE AND SAYING WE'RE UPDATING OUR CAMERAS AND WE'RE DOING THIS AND WE'RE DOING THAT AND IT TAKES A MONTH OR TWO TO DO, DOESN'T SEEM LIKE A BAD PROBLEM, TO ME. THE BIG PROBLEM IS SOLVING CRIMES AND BEING ABLE TO USE THE EVIDENCE IN CRIME WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CAMERA OWNERS. THAT REALLY HAS TO BE ESTABLISHED IN FACT, WHETHER THAT'S TRUE OR NOT. I HAVE A HARD TIME BELIEVING THAT WE CAN'T DO THAT. WE ALSO COULD IMAGINE, THIS IS DYSTOPIAN, BUT IF A SHOP OWNER WANTS TO GIVE CONTINUOUS COVERAGE TO THE POLICE AND THEY REQUEST WE WANT YOUR COVERAGE, AND THE SHOP OWNER SAYS FINE, YOU CAN HAVE A 24/7, I DON'T THINK THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO THAT WITHOUT US KNOWING THAT THAT'S GOING ON. ONCE YOU START RECORDING THINGS AND SAVING THEM THERE'S ABUSES THAT CAN HAPPEN. I RECOMMEND NOT DOING ANYTHING WITH THIS ORDINANCE UNTIL YOU REALLY GET SOME BASIC FACTS TARGET THEM ON WHAT THE PROBLEM IS THAT WE CAN ALL AGREE ON, AND MAKE A MINOR CHANGE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. IF THERE'S ANYONE ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THIS SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE, PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE, THE PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED ON THIS ITEM.

THANK YOU, MARY. WE'RE BACK AT THE DAY IS HERE, AND NOW I'M JUST INTERESTED IN SEEING IF ANYONE HAS ANY COMMENTS THEY'D LIKE TO MAKE. VICE MAYOR.



I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY SOMETHING. SO, THESE EDITS, DO THEY ALLOW THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TO ADD, OR THE CITY TO ADD NEW CAMERAS IN NEW LOCATIONS, OR ARE WE TALKING JUST ABOUT UPDATING THE CURRENT CAMERAS?

THEY DO NOT. THIS DOES NOT APPLY IN SECTION C, ADDING LANGUAGE TO SAY THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS EXCEPT FOR THE USE OF SECURITY CAMERAS OWNED BY THE CITY IN A NEW LOCATION.

SO RIGHT NOW, YOU NEED THE COUNCIL'S APPROVAL FOR THE USE, USING A NEW OR EXISTING SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY. IT DOESN'T SAY OWNED BY THE CITY. IT JUST SAYS USING A NEW OR EXISTING SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY REGARDLESS OF ITS OWNERSHIP. FOR A PURPOSE IN A MANNER AND LOCATION NOT PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL IN A LOCATION WITH THIS CHAPTER. WITH THEIR CURRENT ORDINANCE, ANY NEW LOCATION PUBLICLY OR PRIVATELY OWNED NEEDS COUNCIL APPROVAL. THE ADDITION WOULD SAY THIS DOESN'T APPLY TO TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS. EXCEPT FOR THE USE OF TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS OWNED BY THE CITY IN A NEW LOCATION. YOU WOULD CONTINUE TO NEED COUNCIL APPROVAL TO INSTALL CITY-OWNED CAMERAS IN A NEW LOCATION.

THIS DOESN'T ADD A BUNCH OF CAMERAS. AT THE DISCRETION OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OR THE DISCRETION OF THE CITY.

CORRECT. THANK YOU.

COUNCILMEMBER CARTER?

JUST, ALSO L.A. SOME FEARS, I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS PER USE AND BY WARRANT ONLY TO ACCESS THESE. THIS DOESN'T HAVE ANY KIND OF LOOPHOLE OR OPENNESS FOR ONGOING SURVEILLANCE WERE ANY KIND OF UNWANTED EXPOSURE.

I WOULD, A WARRANT IS STILL REQUIRED FOR THE CITY IN THE SAME CIRCUMSTANCES A WARRANT WOULD BE REQUIRED NOW. THIS DOES NOT CHANGE ANY OF THAT. AND COUNCIL AUTHORIZATION WOULD STILL NEED TO BE REQUIRED FOR ANY ONGOING ARRANGEMENT TO ACCESS PRIVATE PROPERTY. 24/7 ACCESS TO A PRIVATE SECURITY CAMERA WOULD STILL REQUIRE COUNCIL APPROVAL. THAT'S AN ONGOING ARRANGEMENT. ONE THING I WOULD, IN I HEARD SOMEONE MAKE A COMMENT ABOUT SHARING THIS OUTWARD, NOT JUST SHARING IT INWARD. WE COULD ADD, NOT THE INTENT OF SECTION E TO ALLOW THE CITY TO SHARE FORWARD WITH THIRD PARTIES, WE COULD ADD HERE THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE THE CITY USING TRADITIONAL SECURITY CAMERAS FOR SPECIFIC INSTANCE OR EVENT TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE INTENT IS NOT TO ALLOW THE CITY TO SHARE OUTWARD. TO SHARE WITH THE CITY.

IS THAT DEFINED AS OTHER POLICE DEPARTMENTS? BECAUSE, THERE'S ALL THAT MUTUAL HELP?

THIRD PARTY WOULD BE ANYONE BESIDES THE CITY. COULDN'T THAT HINDER THE PROCESS?

I DON'T WANT TO SAY IT NEVER WOULD, BUT, WE COULD MAKE A LIST OF PEOPLE THINGS COULD BE SHARED WITH, BUT, NO ONE BESIDES THE CITY.



IF THE SHERIFF, IF OUR POLICE DEPARTMENT WAS WORKING WITH THE SHERIFF, BECAUSE WE'RE SURROUNDED BY COUNTY, THEN THEY COULDN'T SHARE ANYTHING?

THE CITY COULDN'T, THEY, THE SHERIFF COULD GET THE CAMERA FOOTAGE IF IT WAS PRIVATE CAMERA FOOTAGE DIRECTLY FROM THE PRIVATE PARTY, THEY'RE NOT SUBJECT TO OUR ORDINANCE.

BUT IF A CITIZEN VOLUNTARILY SHARES THAT INFORMATION, COULD THEY THEN, COULD THE POLICE DEPARTMENT THEN SHARE IT? OR THEY WOULD BE PERMITTED FROM SHARING IT AT THAT POINT?

THEY WOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM SHARING IT. THE SHERIFF COULD GET IT DIRECTLY FROM THE INDIVIDUAL. GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN.

I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS PUBLIC HEARING BUT I WANT TO MAKE CLEAR THAT I OPPOSE THE INTRODUCTION OF THIS AMENDED ORDINANCE. FOR THE PRIVACY REASONS AND FOR THE FACT THAT FROM MY PERSPECTIVE IT DOES STRIP THE CITY COUNCIL OF APPROVING ANY SURVEILLANCE AND IN THIS DAY AND AGE WITH OUR CURRENT FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AND THE TERROR THAT THEY'RE ASSERTING, I DEFINITELY OPPOSE ANY TYPE OF INTRODUCTION TO CONSIDER THIS TYPE OF SURVEILLANCE.

I HAVE A QUESTION, TOO.

THE REASON FOR THIS WAS FOR THE REASON THAT SOME OF THESE OTHER COUNCILMEMBERS SAID, SO THAT THE POLICE COULD USE THE PRIVATE, THE THINGS. IT DOESN'T EXTEND ANY OTHER CAPABILITY, THIS PRETTY MUCH JUST ALLOWS POLICE TO DO THEIR JOB AND BE ABLE TO ACCESS, WARRANT THESE.

THERE IS THE SECOND PART WHERE THE CITY COULD UPGRADE ITS CAMERA SYSTEMS, WITH, AS LONG AS THEY CONTINUE TO ONLY CAPTURE AUDIO AND VISUAL. SO CITY COULD REPLACE AT CITY HALL, WE HAVE SECURITY CAMERAS, THOSE COULD BE REPLACED AS LONG AS THE NEW SECURITY CAMERAS ONLY CAPTURE AUDIO AND VIDEO AND NOT ANY OF THESE OTHER HEIGHTENED TECHNOLOGIES. THERE IS A SECOND ASPECT NOT RELATED TO PRIVATE SECURITY CAMERAS.

GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

TO FOLLOW UP ON THAT QUESTION, IT WAS INDICATED THAT WE ONLY HAVE LIVE CAMERAS RIGHT NOW. SO, WE WOULD WITHIN THIS ORDINANCE BE ABLE TO REPLACE THOSE WITH A RECORDING CAMERA.

CORRECT. AND TO CLARIFY, THERE ARE SOME AREAS WHERE WE HAVE RECORDING CAMERAS BUT SOME AREAS WHERE WE ONLY HAVE LIVE CAMERAS. THOSE LIVE CAMERAS COULD BE UPDATED TO RECORDING CAMERAS, AFTER THESE CHANGES WITHOUT HAVING TO GO THROUGH THE OTHER PROCESS.

BUT RIGHT NOW, WE CAN'T UPDATE THOSE CAMERAS THAT ARE LIVE ONLY TO BE RECORDING CAMERAS?

WE CAN, THERE'S A PROCESS IN THE ORDINANCE WHERE IT'S MULTI STEP PROCESS, TO HAVE TO COME TO THE COUNCIL, FOR THAT TO HAPPEN.

SO THIS WOULD MAKE US AUTOMATIC THAT COULD HAPPEN? WITH DISCRETION BY STAFF? A SPEAKER BROUGHT UP FILMING ON OUR CELL PHONES. WHICH, DOES THIS COVER ANY OF THAT, OR SHOULDN'T IT?



TRADITIONAL CAMERAS ARE DEFINED AS ANYTHING THAT CAPTURES VIDEO AND AUDIO ONLY. SO A DASH CAM CAMERA THAT ONLY CAPTURED THAT, A CELL PHONE CAPTURE AND AUDIO, IF I'M SURE IN THE FUTURE CELL PHONES MIGHT HAVE SOME OTHER THINGS, THE CITY WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO USE ANY OF THAT TYPE OF VIDEO FOOTAGE. AT THE NORMAL CELL PHONE VIDEO, YES.

I HAVE A QUESTION I WANT TO ASK. WE ALREADY HAVE IN OUR ORDINANCE, WHICH PROHIBITS CERTAIN SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES, IT SHOULD BE UNLAWFUL TO RETAIN ACCESS USED TO BIOMETRICS, PREDICTIVE POLICING, THAT STILL STANDS. WE'RE HEARING A LOT OF DIFFERENT HEIGHTENED CONCERNS, BUT, THIS STILL STANDS, IT'S IN OUR ORDINANCE. I TOOK A SCREENSHOT OF IT. ANY INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM BIOMETRIC SURVEILLANCE, IT LISTS THESE THINGS WE CAN'T DO, WE'RE NOT CHANGING ANY OF THAT.

AND THE DEFINITION OF TRADITIONAL CAMERA, I TRIED TO BE VERY SPECIFIC BUT IT IS NOT INCLUDE CAMERAS THAT DO ANY OF THAT.

SO, YOU'RE STATING BASICALLY THAT WE ARE JUST CHANGING THIS, BECAUSE WE'VE HEARD A FEW PEOPLE WHO ARE AUTHORS OF THIS SAYING, IT WAS THEIR UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS DIDN'T COVER THESE CAMERAS. BUT THINGS EVOLVE, I FIND DIFFERENT ATTORNEYS HAVE DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS. I'VE FOUND SINCE I'VE SAT HERE FOR FOUR YEARS THAT WE FOUND OTHER THINGS THAT WEREN'T EXACTLY WHAT WE THOUGHT THEY WOULD BE. THIS IS NO DIFFERENT. WE'RE TRYING TO TIGHTEN THINGS UP AND MAKE IT RELEVANT TO THE CITY AND MAKING IT POSSIBLE TO PROTECT OUR RESIDENTS WITH THEIR OWN VIDEOS. THAT'S ALL WE'RE LOOKING TO DO WITH THESE PRIVATE CAMERAS. I MEAN, I'M TRYING TO REITERATE. IN MY MIND I'M LISTENING TO THESE STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE ARE MAKING.

THAT IS WHAT OUR INTENT IS PLUS THE UPDATING OF THE CITY-OWNED CAMERAS. WE TRY TO ANTICIPATE SOME OF THESE CONCERNS, THAT'S WHY WE TRIED TO DEFINE TRADITIONAL CAMERA CLOSELY TO SPECIFY NEW CITY CAMERAS AND NEW LOCATIONS REQUIRES THAT. ONGOING ARRANGEMENTS WITH A PRIVATE PARTY REQUIRE COUNCIL APPROVAL. TRY TO ADDRESS AND ANTICIPATE AS MANY OF THESE CONCERNS AS POSSIBLE TO EMPHASIZE THIS HAD A NARROW PURPOSE.

GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER CARTER.

I WAS WONDERING IF WE COULD SPLIT THIS, TO ENABLE THE POLICE TO USE RECORDED VIDEO OF PRIVATE CITIZENS. AND RIVIERA RATE, THAT WASN'T POSSIBLE BEFORE, WE'VE TRIED TO GO THROUGH THIS AND THIS LANGUAGE MAKES THAT MORE CAPABLE. BUT TO SPLIT THIS BETWEEN THAT AND THE UPGRADING OF THE CAMERAS, BECAUSE THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT I'M INTERESTED IN. OFFERING, A HYBRID.

CERTAINLY IF THAT'S THE DIRECTION FROM THE COUNCIL.

VICE MAYOR?

YES, COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHERE EXACTLY IN THIS ORDINANCE, WHERE IS THE WORDING THAT RESTRICTS THE POLICE FROM ACCESSING PRIVATE CAMERAS?

RIGHT NOW, IN SECTION C, CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL IS REQUIRED BEFORE THE CITY FOR USING A NEW OR EXISTING SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY.



I'M SORRY. SECTION --

IN SECTION SO, 8.80

PAGE FIVE OF SIX.

OUR EXISTING ORDINANCE SAYS THE CITY DEPARTMENT MUST OBTAIN CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL PRIOR TO ENGAGING IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING. C IS USING A NEW OR EXISTING SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY. IT DOESN'T SAY OWNED BY THE CITY. IT JUST SAYS USING A NEW OR EXISTING SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY.

SO, IF WE WERE TO DO A MINIMUM, COULD WE JUST MAKE THAT CHANGE AND NOT DO THE CHANGE? WOULD THAT FIX THE PROBLEM?

SO, WE COULD TAKE IT OUT FROM A, AND B, THAT WOULD STILL REQUIRE COUNCIL APPROVAL, IF WE TOOK IT OUT OF CAPITAL A AND B, THAT WOULD ELIMINATE THE CHANGE TO UPGRADING CITY CAMERAS. ANY TYPE OF UPGRADING CITY CAMERAS WOULD STILL HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE EXISTING PROCESS AND COME TO THE CITY COUNCIL. IF WE TOOK THIS OUT OF D, WHEN SOMEONE GIVES YOU THE SECURITY FOOTAGE, DEPENDING ON SITUATIONS, AN ORAL AGREEMENT THAT YOU'RE GIVING SOMEONE. SO, WE PUT IN HERE, NOT PART OF ANY ONGOING CITY ENTITY. IF YOU WANTED TO GET RID OF THE PORTION THAT ALLOWED THE UPGRADING OF THE CITY CAMERAS, YOU COULD ELIMINATE THE CHANGES TO A AND B AND KEEP THE CHANGES TO C AND D.

I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THAT MOTION. THAT DOES THAT. THAT ALLOWS THE POLICE TO USE EXISTING THINGS. I'M SORRY? I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION THAT IS THAT HYBRID. THAT ENABLES THE POLICE TO USE PRIVATE CAMERAS TO BE ABLE TO SOLVE THINGS. BUT, NOT, BUT STILL REQUIRE, LEAVE OFF THE PARTS OF THE COUNCIL INDEPENDENTLY REVIEWS WHETHER WE UPGRADE THOSE OTHER CAMERAS OR NOT. SO WE CAN MORE CAREFULLY THINK ABOUT IT.

CAN SOMEONE HELP ME UNDERSTAND? I'M NOT FOLLOWING WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, I'M SORRY.

I BELIEVE WHAT COUNCILMEMBER CARTER WAS SAYING IS, THERE'S PROPOSED CHANGES IN SECTION 8.8 0.030 PROPOSED CHANGES TO SUBSECTIONS A, B, C, AND D. IS PROPOSING TO NOT MAKE THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO CAPITAL A AND B WHICH WOULD STILL FACILITATE THE USE OF THE PRIVATE CAMERAS, BUT WOULD NOT ALLOW THE CITY TO UPGRADE WITHOUT GIVING COUNCIL APPROVAL.

CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHY WE WOULD NEED D, WHY DO WE NEED THAT?

SO, SOMEONE, PRIVATE ENTITY SHARING THEIR CAMERA WITH YOU, IT SAYS ENTERING INTO AN AGREEMENT INCLUDING EITHER A WRITTEN OR ORAL AGREEMENT WITH A NON-CITY ENTITY TO OTHERWISE USE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY. SO, ORAL AGREEMENT IS PRETTY BROAD, IF SOMEONE GIVES.

I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT'S BEING PROPOSED IS THAT WE DON'T WANT TO GIVE THE AUTHORITY TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TO JUST CHANGE OUT CAMERAS THAT MIGHT NEED TO BE CHANGED OUT? WE'RE AFRAID OF THAT? I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND.

I BELIEVE THAT IS THE RECOMMENDATION.



OKAY. REMOVING IT FROM A AND B, WOULD BE THAT, BUT, THEN THAT FOR SURE WOULD ALLOW. OKAY.

HOW MANY CAMERAS ARE THE OLD SCHOOL THAT PROBABLY, IF WE APPROVE IT THE WAY IT'S BEING DISCUSSED RIGHT NOW, POLICE DEPARTMENT WOULD COME BACK, I WOULD ASSUME WITH THE REQUEST TO CHANGE OUT CAMERAS? HOW MANY ARE OLD VERSUS HOW MANY RECORD? DO WE KNOW? CHIEF,

LET ME KNOW IF I'M CORRECT OR WRONG, PLEASE LET ME KNOW. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THE POLICE DEPARTMENT IS JUST A LIVE FEED, THERE IS NO RECORDING. CITY HALL DOES RECORD, I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S AUDIO. IS IT AUDIO OR JUST VISUAL? CITY HALL IS JUST RECORDING VISUAL, NO AUDIO. PUBLIC WORKS IS VISUAL. AS WELL.

AND WE HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE, WE HAVEN'T PROSECUTED GRAFFITI ON CITY HALL, FOR EXAMPLE. EVEN WITH THE RECORDING, BECAUSE, OF THIS ORDINANCE, FROM LEGAL COUNCIL. WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO DO THAT. OKAY. BUT WITH THIS NEW ORDINANCE, THE POLICE DEPARTMENT WOULD COME BACK TO US IF THEY WANTED TO CHANGE OTHER CAMERAS. THE WAY WE'RE BEING PROPOSED NOW. I WANT TO BE CLEAR ON WHAT WE'RE AGREEING TO.

THE WAY OF BEING PROPOSED NOW, POLICE DEPARTMENT WOULD NOT NEED TO COME BACK TO THE CHANGE OTHER CAMERAS.

I MEANT ON THE FLOOR.

CORRECT.

UNOFFICIAL REQUEST. OKAY.

THAT'S CORRECT. SORRY FOR MY CONFUSION.

THE POLICE CHIEF COULD COME BACK WITH US WITH ANOTHER AGENDA ITEM AND SAY, NOW WE WANT THEM LIVE INSTEAD OF, RECORDED INSTEAD OF LIVE. OKAY. UNDERSTOOD.

MY THOUGHT IS, WE'VE INFORMED EVERYONE OUT THERE HOW ALL OF OUR SECURITY SURVEILLANCE WORKS. OKAY. OKAY. I DON'T KNOW. WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. I DON'T KNOW, IS THERE A SECOND? OKAY.

I'LL SECOND THAT EMOTION.

COULD SOMEBODY RESTATE THE MOTION? THEY ARE NOT CLEAR.

SO, THE MOTION IS TO INTRODUCE IN THE FIRST READING OF THE ORDINANCE, TO MEND SEBASTOPOL MUNICIPAL CODE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ORDINANCE OF SEBASTOPOL MUNICIPAL CODE, EXCLUDING TWO CHANGES 8.8 0.03 0A AND B.

THAT'S WHAT IT IS.

GO AHEAD. FURTHER DISCUSSION?

I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY THAT I WON'T SUPPORT IT THAT WAY. I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THE ADVICE OF OUR ATTORNEY. HE'S TOLD US OVER AND OVER AGAIN DESPITE MANY PEOPLE WHO DON'T EVEN LIVE IN OUR CITY



AND EVERYWHERE ELSE TELLING US THAT WE SHOULDN'T BE DOING THIS. BUT I PERSONALLY DON'T SEE A PROBLEM WITH THE CHANGES THAT ARE MADE. I'M IN SUPPORT OF WHAT IS RECOMMENDED BY THE STAFF. I WON'T BE SUPPORTING THE MOTION. I JUST WANT TO BE ABLE TO SAY WHY.

I'M SORRY? SHE CAN DO THE VOTE COUNT. I JUST WANTED TO BE ABLE TO SAY WHY I'M VOTING THE WAY I'M VOTING.

OKAY. I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS FAIR BUT I'M TRYING TO GET TO A YES SO, I HOPE THAT THIS DOES COME BACK BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE TO UPGRADE THE CAMERAS, TOO. THIS DOESN'T PRECLUDE THAT, THIS AT LEAST GET SOMETHING ACCOMPLISHED AS FAR AS BEING ABLE

I'M IN SUPPORT OF DOING IT ALL. AND, I SURE PEOPLE'S CONCERNS ABOUT WHAT'S HAPPENING IN OUR COUNTRY, BUT, I BELIEVE WHAT OUR ATTORNEY IS SAYING, AND I PERSONALLY AM SUPPORTIVE OF DOING THIS. HAVING BEEN VICTIM TO CRIMES HERE MORE THAN ANYWHERE ELSE IN 23 STATES THAT I'VE LIVED IN, THAT'S WHY I'M SUPPORTIVE OF IT. AT ANY RATE. IF YOU WANT TO GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

WELL, I JUST WANTED TO SAY ALTHOUGH I STATED A CRIME THAT HAPPENED TO ME, THAT I THINK THE WAY I UNDERSTAND THE ORDINANCE AND WAS PROPOSED ON THE TABLE, THIS WOULD HAVE SOLVED MY SITUATION. WHICH IS THAT I COULD HAVE GOT THE CAMERA FROM THE AUTO BODY SHOP ACROSS THE WAY AND THE POLICE COULD HAVE SEEN IF THERE WAS INFORMATION THAT THEY COULD HAVE PROSECUTED, CORRECT? THE ONLY THING WITH THE CHANGE THAT COUNCILMEMBER CARTER HAS PROPOSED IS THAT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT WILL HAVE TO COME BACK TO US ON ANOTHER AGENDA ITEM, AND ASK FOR ANY UPDATES SPECIFIC TO CAMERAS, AND WE CAN GO THROUGH ALL OF THAT WHERE THEY'RE LOCATED, ET CETERA ET CETERA. CORRECT?

THAT'S CORRECT.

THAT'S ALL WE'RE DOING HERE. WE'RE STILL ON A COMPROMISE SOLVING SOME OF THE ISSUES I WAS CONCERNED ABOUT. I WILL BE SUPPORTING THE CHANGE TONIGHT.

I GUESS I JUST NEED TO ASK, WHAT YOU ARE PROPOSING IS JUST TO ALLOW POLICE TO USE VIDEO. IF SOMEBODY OFFERS VIDEO TO SOLVE CRIMES, RIGHT? AND NOTHING ELSE, IF THE POLICE WANT TO BRING ANYTHING BACK OUT FOR ADDITIONAL CAMERAS OR DIFFERENT TECHNOLOGY OR WHATEVER, THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO COME BACK WITH A JUSTIFY POLICY. IS THAT WAS ON THE TABLE?

CORRECT.

OKAY, THANK YOU.

CAN I ASK A QUESTION FROM THE POLICE CHIEF? CHIEF, HOW MANY CAMERAS DO YOU BELIEVE ARE GOING TO NEED TO BE REPLACED ANYTIME SOON, I'M JUST TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THIS ISSUE. IT SEEMS LIKE A SMALL ISSUE AND FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, I'M WONDERING IF PEOPLE CAN HEAR YOU ONLINE. PEOPLE CAN HEAR YOU ONLINE IF YOU'RE NOT AT THE MIC.



PERHAPS MARY COULD BETTER ADVISE. WE ALREADY BOUGHT A STAFF REPORT FORWARD ON UPGRADING THE CAMERA SYSTEM WITHIN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT SO THAT IT MET THE SAFETY REQUIREMENTS OF ACTUALLY RECORDING AND CAPTURING AUDIO AND VISUAL. I DON'T RECALL WHAT MONTH THAT WAS, I DON'T HAVE THAT INFORMATION WITH ME.

THE PROCESS LAID OUT IN THE ORDINANCE IS A MULTI STEP PROCESS. THERE'S AN INITIAL REPORT ON CONSENT, THEN A PUBLIC HEARING 45 DAYS LATER WITH THE REPORT, THAT'S THE FIRST READING OF THE ORDINANCE, SO, FOR THE CAMERAS AT THE POLICE STATION, THE FIRST STEP WAS ALREADY DONE. SO WE COULD PICK UP WITH THE SECOND STEP AND DO THOSE SECOND STEPS FOR THOSE PARTICULAR SPECIFIC CAMERAS.

WE DID AN IMPACT REPORT AS WELL. I'M SORRY.

GO AHEAD.

I'M NOT SURE, THE PUBLIC HEARING HAS NOT HAPPENED. THE FIRST STEP, I CAN'T REMEMBER IF THERE'S A DRAFT.

WE DID A STAFF REPORT, WITH THE IMPACT REPORT. THAT'S ROLLED INTO WHERE WE ARE WITH THIS, I THINK. SOMEHOW THERE'S MORE.

I DON'T THINK THE IMPACT REPORT WAS EVER BROUGHT TO THE COUNCIL. THERE WAS A PIVOTED DOING IT THIS WAY TO ADDRESS THIS, CONCERNED STAFF TIME AND IN A COUPLE YEARS, WHEN CAMERAS IN CITY HALL NEED TO BE REPLACED, NOT HAVE TO SPEND ALL THAT TIME THAT'S A CONCERN SOMETIMES FROM THE COUNCIL. TRYING TO STRIKE A BALANCE BY BEING EFFICIENT WITH STAFF TIME, BUT TAKE DIRECTION FROM THE COUNCIL HOWEVER YOU WANT TO HANDLE.

.IT. MY QUESTION WAS, THIS IS IN PROCESS WITH THE POLICE, IT FEELS LIKE

I DON'T BELIEVE THERE'S ANYWHERE ELSE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT IS THE ONLY AREA THAT NEEDS A NEW CAMERA SYSTEM AT THIS POINT IN TIME. JUST BECAUSE AS I UNDERSTAND IT THE BEST PART OF 30 YEARS OLD. IT'S JUST TIME.

OKAY. ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

BASED ON THIS NEW INFORMATION THAT CAMERAS HAVE BEEN BOUGHT, IF WE PASS THIS TONIGHT, THE NEXT STEP WOULD BE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS TO COME BACK TO THE FULL COUNCIL AND ASK IF THEY CAN USE THAT?

THEY HAVEN'T BEEN BOUGHT YET. IT'S JUST, WE DID THE FIRST STEP IN THE PROCESS TO AUTHORIZE. CORRECT.

AND, WE HAVE IT ON MARCH 3rd. I BELIEVE IF THIS ORDINANCE WAS APPROVED TONIGHT, MOVING FORWARD TO THE SECOND READING, WE HAVE AN ITEM ON THE NEXT AGENDA DISCUSSING THE PURCHASE OF THE CAMERAS BASED ON THE APPROVAL OF THE ORDINANCE.



THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS IF WE PASS IT THE WAY WE GOT A MOTION ON THE FLOOR THAT WE CAN STILL HAVE THAT MARCH MEETING, BUT THAT'S A SEPARATE DECISION. BY THE COUNCIL TO UPGRADE THE POLICE BUILDING CAMERAS. CORRECT?

TO MEET THE PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENT. OKAY. I UNDERSTAND, THANK YOU.

TO CLARIFY, THE IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PUBLIC SEARING HAS TO BE POSTED ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE 30 DAYS BEFORE THE PUBLIC HEARING, THAT WILL NOT BE COMING MARCH 3rd TO YOU. BUT IT CAN BE COMING IN THE FUTURE.

IN ESSENCE WE'RE CREATING RED TAPE FOR THIS SOMETHING WE ALREADY HAD IN PLACE AND MOVING ALONG? BECAUSE NOW YOU'RE SAYING IT'LL HAVE TO BE RELAYED THAT --

THIS CHANGE IS NOT CREATING ANY ADDITIONAL RED TAPE. IT'S LEAVING THE STEPS IN PLACE THAT ALREADY EXIST INSTEAD OF ELIMINATING SOME OF THOSE STEPS.

OKAY. ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, CHIEF. SO, NO FURTHER DISCUSSION AND I CAN CALL FOR THE VOTE? THANK YOU. SO MOVED BY COUNCILMEMBER CARTER AND SECONDED BY VICE MAYOR MAURER. TWO APPROVED THE RECOMMENDATION IN ADOPTION OF THE FIRST READING INTRODUCTION OF THE ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 8.80 OF THE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY COMMUNITY SAFETY ORDINANCE, NOT RECOMMENDING ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROPOSES TO CHANGES A AND B BUT MAINTAINING THE CHANGES TO C AND D, THIS FACILITATES THE USE OF PRIVATE CAMERAS BUT IT WOULD NOT ALLOWED TO UPGRADING CITY CAMERAS WITHOUT COUNCIL APPROVAL. COUNCILMEMBER CARTER?

YES.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

AYE.

COUNCILMEMBERS ALLMAN?

YES.

VICE MAYOR MAURER?

YES.

MOTION PASSES 5-0. ALL RIGHT. LET'S SEE, IS EVERYONE OKAY? NO ONE NEEDS A BIO BREAK GIVEN THE HOUR? OKAY. WE ARE MOVING ON TO REGULAR CALENDAR DISCUSSION AND ACTION. NUMBER EIGHT, DISCUSSION OF THE SEBASTOPOL COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER SHORT LONG-TERM PLAN AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF, PRESENTLY MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY TONY REGARDING SHORT AND LONG-TERM PLAN FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER AND DISCUSS RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCIL DIRECTION. I BELIEVE PUBLIC WORKS?

TONY IS ON ZOOM AND SHE WILL BE PROVIDING THE INFORMATION FOR THE REPORT.

SORRY, TONY, I HAD MY GLASSES ON. OKAY, GO AHEAD, TONY.



GOOD EVENING, MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS, PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEER, AND I WILL BE PRESENTING AGENDA ITEM NUMBER EIGHT ON THE KENNEDY CENTER SHORT AND LONG-TERM PLAN. JUST A BRIEF BACKGROUND ON THE MEMO INCLUDED IN YOUR AGENDA PACKET, DATED JANUARY 27, 2026, AND A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS THAT LED TO THE MEMO. FIRST, THE CITY RECEIVED \$1.5 MILLION IN FLOOD RELIEF FUNDS FOR THE 2019 FLOOD EVENT FOR FLOOD REPAIR AND MITIGATION PROJECTS IN THE CITY. THE CITY HAS USED SOME OF THIS FUNDING FOR MAKING FLOOD REPAIRS TO THE COMMITTEE CENTER SUCH AS REPAIRS TO THE MAIN HALL, THE ROOF, RESTROOM FACILITIES, THE KITCHEN, AND REPLACING THE DAMAGED WALLS WITH FIRE RATED WALLS THAT ARE ALSO MOISTURE RESISTANT. IN 2021 THE CITY STAFF IDENTIFIED BLOOD REPAIRS AN INITIAL LIST OF REPAIRS WAS PREPARED AT THAT TIME. ALSO IN 2021 PUBLIC WORKS ACQUIRED THE SERVICES OF AN ENGINEER TO IDENTIFY AND EVALUATE LONG-TERM FLOOD APPROVING ALTERNATIVES. THE REPORT IS INCLUDED IN YOUR AGENDA PACKET. FOUR ALTERNATIVES WERE EVALUATED, RANGING IN COST FROM 650,000 TO \$3.8 MILLION AND THE RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE WAS A REMOVABLE PERIMETER BARRIER AT \$650,000. IN 2023 CITY STAFF INITIATED WORK WITH AN ARCHITECT TO REVISIT THE LIST OF REPAIRS THAT WAS INITIALLY PREPARED BACK IN 2021. AND CAME UP WITH WHAT WERE YOU REFERRED TO AS A MASTER LIST OF REPAIRS. THE MASTER LIST OF REPAIRS IS INCLUDED IN YOUR AGENDA PACKET. I SHOULD NOTE, HOWEVER, THAT THE LIST WAS NOT UPDATED TO NOTE THAT CERTAIN AFFAIRS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED, NOTABLY THE REPAIRS TO THE KITCHEN HOOD, AND THE NEW FIRE RATED WALLS. IN ADDITION, COMMUNITY CENTER STAFF HAS ALSO PERFORMED SOME TEMPORARY CEILING AT THE BOTTOM OF THE WALLS WHERE THERE IS A ONE INCH GAP FOR BUGS AND CRITTERS TO GET THROUGH, AND THE MORE PERMANENT REPAIRS WOULD BE MADE WITH THE PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT. THE MASTER LIST WILL BE UPDATED TO INCLUDE THE REPAIRS THAT I HAVE MENTIONED, THEY WERE INADVERTENTLY LEFT OUT, AND WILL BE ATTACHED TO THE UPDATED MEMO. THE ARCHITECTS PREPARED PLANS IN A PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE OF THE MASTER LIST OF REPAIRS, AND THAT COST ESTIMATE IS \$380,000 FOR THE REPAIRS, BECAUSE OF THE COST OF THE REPAIRS BEING HIGHER THAN \$200,000, BY LAW THE CITY WOULD ALSO HAVE TO COMMIT AN ADDITIONAL 20% OF THE CONSTRUCTION TO MAKING A.D.A. ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS TO THE BUILDING WHICH WOULD INCREASE THE TOTAL COST FOR CONSTRUCTION TO \$456,000. FOR THE SHORT TERM PLAN, STAFF RECOMMENDS MOVING FORWARD WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MASTER LIST OF IMPROVEMENTS, FINALIZING THE PLANS AND COST ESTIMATE THAT HAVE BEEN PREPARED BY THE ARCHITECT AND THAT COUNCIL APPROVED LIMITATION OF THE LIST OF REPAIRS IN 26-27 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. WHERE IN THE BUDGETING PROCESS RIGHT NOW FOR THAT PLAN. THEREFORE THE NEXT STEPS FOR THE SHORT TERM IMPLEMENTATION PLAN WOULD BE, INCLUDE THE SHORT REPAIRS IN THE 26-47 STAFF AS PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED, STAFF WOULD HAVE TO INCLUDE IN THE CIP BUDGET THE FINAL DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION I MENTIONED TO YOU, THE TOTAL CONSTRUCTION WOULD BE 456,000, YOU'D HAVE TO ADD A LITTLE BIT MORE TO THAT FOR FINAL DESIGN. AND IF APPROVED, THE FINAL DESIGN WOULD BEGIN IN JULY WITH PROJECT BIDDING AND AWARD WOULD START IN THE FALL. AND WORK COMPLETED IN 2027. FOR THE LONG-TERM PLAN, PUBLIC WORKS STAFF DID NOT BELIEVE THAT THE REMOVABLE BARRIER THAT WAS RECOMMENDED IN THE REPORT WOULD BE FEASIBLE DUE TO THE NUMBER OF PUBLIC WORKS STAFF THAT WOULD NEED TO BE DEPLOYED TO PERFORM THE WORK. THERE WAS CONCERN OF HOW TO STORE THE BARRIER. THERE WAS A SUGGESTION RECENTLY OF WORKING WITH OTHER AGENCIES SUCH AS GOLD RIDGE FIRE DISTRICT, AND STAFF CAN LOOK INTO THE FEASIBILITY OF THAT AS WELL AS FURTHER AT WHERE TO STORE THE PORTABLE BARRIER



SYSTEM. AS WE CONTINUE TO EXPLORE THE FEASIBILITY OF THE PERIMETER SYSTEM, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT STAFF BE DIRECTED TO EXPLORE AND MOVE FORWARD WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF A SHARED CIVIC SPACE EITHER WITH THE SEBASTOPOL COMMENTS OR WITH ANOTHER NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION. THIS WAS NOT AN EASY PROJECT TO GO THROUGH BECAUSE THE COMMUNITY CENTER IS A VERY IMPORTANT CENTER FOR THE COMMUNITY, AND SO, WE DO BELIEVE THAT SOMETHING HAS TO BE DONE IN TERMS OF THE SHORT TERM IMPROVEMENTS. IN THE LONG TERM, WE'RE GOING TO CONTINUE TO EXPLORE THAT, BUT WHILE WE DO THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO MOVE FORWARD WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SHARED CIVIC SPACE WITH THE SEBASTOPOL COMMENTS AND BEGIN THE DISCUSSION. AND THAT CONCLUDES MY ORAL PRESENTATION, AND WITH ME HERE TO HELP ANSWER QUESTIONS IS ERIC BILLING, PUBLIC WORKS SUPERVISOR.

ERIC?

I'M JUST HERE FOR QUESTIONS IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSAL. THE RECOMMENDATIONS OR STAFF TIME, ON WHY WE DON'T THINK THE REMOVABLE BARRIER IS THE BEST OPTION, I'M HERE TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS.

ANY QUESTIONS FROM ANYONE? NO? OKAY. I HAVE A QUESTION FOR THE FOLKS FROM THE COMMUNITY CENTER, THE BOARD. SOMEONE WHO WANTS TO.

THANK YOU. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE, AS MANY PEOPLE KNOW I SERVED ON THE COMMITTEE CENTER BOARD FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS. I FEEL INTIMATELY AWARE AND SAT ON THE FLOOD MITIGATION COMMITTEE FOR A LONG TIME, BUT I WANTED TO VERIFY WITH YOU ALL. WE ARE MANAGERS OF THE BUILDING. AND THE COMMUNITY CENTER IS RUN BY ITS OWN NONPROFIT. WHEN WE SAY THAT WE WANT THE CITY TO DIRECT THE COMMUNITY CENTER TO WORK WITH THESE OTHER ENTITIES OR WHATEVER TO FIND SHARED SPACES, WHAT I'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM YOU IS, IN MY OPINION IT'S NOT OUR PRAYER PLACE TO TELL A NONPROFIT, WE OWN THE BUILDING, WE LEASE IT TO YOU. THERE'S A DISTINCT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT WE CAN DIRECT AND WHAT YOUR BOARD DIRECTS. I WANT TO KNOW FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE, ARE YOU SUPPORTIVE OF THAT? IT SAYS RIGHT HERE, DIRECT STAFF TO EXPLORE AND MOVE FORWARD WITH IMPLEMENTATION FOR SHARED CIVIC SPACE, EITHER WITH THE COMMENTS OR WHATEVER. I'M ASKING YOU IS THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD, IS THE BOARD SUPPORTIVE OF THAT DIRECTIVE?

YES. WE RECOGNIZE THE ISSUES WITH THE BUILDING. IN THE SHORT-TERM AND THE LONG-TERM, AND THERE'S BEEN A VARIETY OF EXPLORATIONS OF NEW FACILITIES RELOCATED, REBUILT, OVER THE DECADES.

DOESN'T IT FEEL LIKE GROUNDHOG DAY?

WE ARE OPEN TO PARTICIPATING IN THE COMMONS PROCESS AND OPEN TO DISCUSSIONS WITH OTHER ENTITIES FOR THE LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS.

I WANTED TO CLARIFY THAT BECAUSE I ALWAYS WANT TO RECOGNIZE THAT THESE ARE NONPROFITS RUNNING WITH THEIR OWN DIRECTIVES, THEIR OWN BYLAWS AND INITIATIVES, AND IT'S THE DECISION OF THE NONPROFIT WHAT DIRECTION THEY WANT TO GO WITH WHATEVER THEY'RE DOING.

WE APPRECIATE THE THOUGHT ABOUT THAT, YES.



THANK YOU, THAT'S THE ONLY QUESTION I HAD, BUT I DIDN'T KNOW IF ANYBODY ELSE HAS ANY. GO AHEAD, VICE MAYOR.

WHAT'S THE IDEA OF RAISING THE BUILDING UP DISCUSSED AND WHAT WOULD THE COST BE FOR RAISING THE BUILDING UP?

I'M NOT AWARE OF THAT DISCUSSION. THAT WAS A PREVIOUS DIRECTOR HAD TALKED ABOUT THAT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE FEASIBILITY OF THAT IS, THE STRUCTURE ITSELF HAS MAJOR CHALLENGES. TO TAKE THAT COMPROMISED STRUCTURE AND RAISE IT UP WOULD BE A PRETTY ASTRONOMICAL FEET, ALMOST BETTER TO STIR -- TEAR IT DOWN AND START FROM NOON, I THINK. BUT WE CAN LOOK INTO THE COST OF TRYING TO RAISE IT UP. TRYING TO RAISE IT UP. BECAUSE THE OTHER ISSUE WITH THAT IS, A.D.A. COMPLIANCE. NOW WE HAVE TO PUT AN A.D.A. ELEVATOR TO GET ACCESS TO THE MAIN FLOOR AND THE UPPER FLOOR.

IN ORDER, IF WE WANTED TO LOOK INTO THAT FURTHER, WE WOULD HAVE TO ACQUIRE THE SERVICES OF A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER AS WELL AS AN ARCHITECT. AND I HAVEN'T RIGHT NOW EXPLORE THE COST OF DOING THAT. BUT WE CAN FIND OUT.

THE YOUTH ANNEX IS ABOVE THE FLOOD LEVEL, RIGHT? WE DON'T HAVE AN ELEVATOR HERE. WHY WOULD THAT REQUIRE AN ELEVATOR AT THE COMMUNITY CENTER?

THE YOUTH ANNEX WAS BUILT THIS WAY, IT HAS A RAMP THAT ACTS AS AN A.D.A. ACCESS THAT WE DON'T HAVE CURRENTLY FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER. AND WE'RE TALKING ABOUT RAISING IT OUT OF THE FRONT PLANE WHICH WOULD BE RAISING IT SIGNIFICANTLY. WE WOULD HAVE TO RAISE IT SIX FEET, SIX TO EIGHT FEET, WHICH IS PRETTY SIGNIFICANT.

GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

READING THIS, I JUST WANTED TO VERIFY, IS THIS EXPENSE THAT IS THE SHORT-TERM OPTION, \$456,000, IS THAT'S WHAT'S LEFT FROM THE ORIGINAL FLOOD MITIGATION MONEY THAT WE GOT IN 2019 OF THE 1.5? IS THAT STILL SITTING THERE BEING PROPOSED TO USE ON THIS PROJECT? IS THAT COMING OUT OF OUR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT, AND SEPARATE FROM THE 1.5?

IT'S PROPOSED TO BE COMING OUT OF THE FLOOD MITIGATION MONIES. THERE SUFFICIENT FUNDING IN THE BALANCE OF THAT ACCOUNT TO BE ABLE TO PAY FOR THAT PROJECT.

WHAT IS THE BALANCE OF THAT ACCOUNT?

700,000. I BELIEVE IT'S IN YOUR REPORT AS WELL. 700,000.

I BELIEVE, I COULD LOOK THAT UP. GO AHEAD WITH YOUR OTHER QUESTIONS WELL I LOOK THAT UP.

I HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION. I KNOW I MENTIONED EARLIER OVER THE LAST DECADE, AND IT'S BASED ON A FEW YEARS AGO, I HAVEN'T BEEN IN ALL THESE MEETINGS, HAS THERE BEEN ANOTHER SPACE IDENTIFIED? I KNOW ALL THE CHALLENGES THAT WITH THE NOISE AND THE SIZE, WITH COMMERCIAL KITCHEN, WE HAVE A LIMITED AMOUNT OF BUILDINGS IN THE CITY HAS ANOTHER SPACE. APPEARED, THAT ACTUALLY WOULD, IT'S A VERY SPECIFIC SIZE AND NEEDS.



THERE HASN'T BEEN A SEARCH BY CITY STAFF OR CONSULTANTS, OR BY THE COMMUNITY CENTER, AND THERE'S TALK OF VARIOUS DIFFERENT SITES, PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT THAT. THERE ARE SOME POTENTIALS OUT THERE, THEY WOULD NEED TO BE LOOKED AT SERIOUSLY.

AND WHAT WOULD YOU IDENTIFY AS THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY CENTER NEEDS IN ORDER TO, THE MAJORITY OF THE FUNDS, THE FUNDS THAT YOU HOST EVENTS BASICALLY, THOSE EVENTS ARE, I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S STILL THE CASE THAT THE LION'S SHARE OF THE FUNDING THAT COMES IN, IT'S BEEN A NUMBER OF YEARS AS I'VE BEEN ON THE BOARD. IT USED TO BE THAT, SO IS THAT STILL THE CASE, WHAT KIND OF SPACE WOULD YOU NEED? TO BE ABLE TO CONTINUE DOING WHAT YOU DO.

REVENUE SOURCES INCLUDE CLASSES, GRANTS, CONCERT REVENUE WHEN THEY MAKE MONEY, WHICH THEY DON'T ALWAYS. AND ALSO ROOM RENTALS. WE DO ALL OF THOSE THINGS, AND ALL THAT BRINGS IN REVENUE THAT MAKES UP OUR BUDGET. SECOND PART OF YOUR QUESTION.

I'VE HAD PEOPLE ASKING ME QUESTIONS AND I'M SO CLOSE TO THIS AND HAVE BEEN INVOLVED FOR SO LONG. SOMETIMES I FORGET THE PEOPLE DON'T UNDERSTAND OR KNOW ALL THESE THINGS. I WAS SAYING TO SOMEONE YESTERDAY, THE COMMUNITY CENTER, YOU DO THE ALL THE DIFFERENT THINGS, SO YOU HAVE VERY SPECIFIC NEEDS THAT YOU WOULD NEED IN ANY NEW SPACE THAT YOU HAD, WHICH WOULD BE SPACE TO HOLD FOR THE EVENT, PLUS THE COMMERCIAL KITCHEN. I WAS TRYING TO TAKE OFF THE THINGS THAT WE NEEDED FOR YOUR SPACE. I THINK IT'S GOOD FOR PEOPLE TO UNDERSTAND THE CHALLENGES. I HEAR YOU SHOULD JUST MOVE IT, AND EVERYBODY HAS TALKED ABOUT THAT. IT'S NOT AS SIMPLE AS THAT.

ONCE WE ENGAGED IN A PROCESS, WE WOULD EVALUATE OUR EXISTING SPACE, THE BUILDING WASN'T DESIGNED TO BE A COMMUNITY CENTER, IT'S NOT IDEAL IN SEVERAL RESPECTS, LIKE NOT HAVING A BACKSTAGE. NOT HAVING A BATHROOM FOR THE GREENROOM.

THAT'S WHY I'M ASKING.

IN THE IDEAL WE WOULD LOOK AT THE FULL PROGRAM THE EXISTING SPACE, AND THEN, START FIGURING OUT IF THERE ARE EXISTING SITES OR EXISTING BUILDINGS, WORKING WITH THE CITY, OF COURSE.

THAT DOESN'T ANSWER MY QUESTION, BUT OKAY. THANK YOU.

I DID CHECK.

GO AHEAD, TONY.

I DO WANT TO ANSWER THE QUESTION ABOUT THE FUND BALANCE ON THE FLOOD MITIGATION FUND. I CHECKED THE BUDGET AND THE ESTIMATED FUND BALANCE IS \$862,000.

FIRST, I THINK IT'S FAIRLY REASONABLE TO DO THE \$456,000 WORTH OF REPAIRS, BECAUSE IT'S A VALUABLE BUILDING AND IT SHOULDN'T BE COMPLETELY MANDATED. I DON'T KNOW WHAT I'M ALLOWED TO SAY OR WHAT I'M NOT ALLOWED TO SAY ABOUT THE CREATIVE COMMENTS EFFORT. WE HAVE PUT IN SIGNIFICANT EFFORT --

WE ARE IN QUESTIONS RIGHT NOW.



I'M NOT ALLOWED TO SAY THAT STUFF.

GO AHEAD, VICE MAYOR.

TWO QUESTIONS. WHAT WAS THE BUILDING ORIGINALLY DESIGNED FOR? THAT WAS MY FIRST QUESTION, HE SAID IT WASN'T DESIGNED AS COMMUNITY CENTER, I HAVE ONE MORE QUESTION.

I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS TRUE, IT'S BEFORE MY TIME. I UNDERSTOOD THAT IT WAS BUILT FOR BOXING PURPOSES. BOXING CLUB OR WHATEVER.

AND WAS IT CITY PROPERTY?

I CAN CONFIRM THAT IS CORRECT.

THIS IS AN EXTRA QUESTION, WAS IT CITY PROPERTY ORIGINALLY? DID THE CITY BUY THE PROPERTY?

I DO NOT KNOW THAT. I'M NOT SURE, I THINK IT WAS A YMCA BOYS GYMNASIUM, I'M NOT SURE HOW THE CITY ACQUIRED THE PROPERTY. THAT'S WHAT THE ORIGINAL INTENT WAS, IT WAS A BARN WITH FIGHTING RINGS IN IT.

IT COULD BE A NEW ARTICLE FOR YOU. MY SECOND QUESTION IS, WHAT IS THE POSITION OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE YOU SPEND A EURO OR SO ON THIS, DID YOU COME INDIVIDUALLY TO CONCLUSION ABOUT WHAT YOU THINK IS BEST FOR THIS BUILDING? I'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM BOTH OF YOU.

SURE, I DEFINITELY AGREED WITH THE CONTENTS OF THE REPORT THAT WE PRESENTED AS FAR AS THE SHORT-TERM AND THE LONG-TERM GOALS. AS FAR AS, WE LEFT IT BROAD. AND THE SHORT-TERM GOAL OF PAYING THE 456,000 WAS SOMETHING THAT WE AGREED TO, AND AS FAR AS THE LONG-TERM ARE WORKING WITH THE SEBASTOPOL COMMENTS WERE ANOTHER NONPROFIT.

WE BOTH AGREED WITH THAT. I HAVE THESE QUESTIONS BECAUSE I'VE BEEN ASKED THESE QUESTIONS AND BEING SO CLOSE TO IT FOR SO LONG I ASSUMED PEOPLE UNDERSTOOD THE CHALLENGES. THAT PEOPLE FACE. WE BOTH AGREED WITH IT, BECAUSE EXPLORING THE DIFFERENT OPTIONS, I MEAN, AT THIS POINT IN TIME, THIS IS WHAT MAKES THE MOST SENSE.

MAY I RESPOND TO COUNCILMEMBER MAURER. AS A MEMBER OF CREATING THE COMMONS, THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE'RE PROUD OF. WE DEFINITELY EXPLORED MOST OF THE AVAILABLE RESOURCES IN THE CITY. WE'RE PUTTING GOOD FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OVER THEM. WE THINK THERE ARE A COUPLE OF GOOD PROSPECTS FOR SOMETHING IN THE MID TO LONG-TERM RANGE, WE CAN'T SAY ANYTHING SPECIFIC BECAUSE WE'RE GOING OVER THIS STUFF, BUT YOU CAN WATCH PAST VIDEOS TO SEE WHAT WE THOUGHT. I THINK THERE'S A REASONABLE CHANCE TO CREATE SOME SYNERGY WITH OTHER NEEDS THAT THE CITY HAS IN A WAY THAT I THINK BENEFITS THE CULTURAL CENTER IN A GREAT WAY. BUT THESE ARE ALL TO BE DEVELOPED.

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS BEFORE WE GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT? GO AHEAD, MARY.

THANK YOU, MAYOR, THIS IS PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE SEBASTOPOL CULTURAL COMMUNITY CENTER FACILITIES ASSESSMENT REPORT. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT IT IS TWO MINUTES IN



CHAMBERS AND THEN OUT TO ZOOM. IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT.

KENYON WEBSTER, PRESIDENT OF THE COMMUNITY CENTER BOARD OF DIRECTORS. WE SUPPORT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THIS MATTER. AS FAR AS THE SHORT-TERM, ISSUES, DEFINITELY WE SUPPORT THE IDEA OF FOLDING THIS INTO YOUR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS. AND PLAN. ONE OF THE PAGES OF THE STAFF REPORT IT TALKS ABOUT NOTED ISSUES INCLUDE NUMEROUS LEAKS IN THE INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, ROTTED WOOD IN CONTACT WITH THE CONCRETE, MOISTURE IN THE INTERIOR BUILDING EVIDENT THROUGHOUT. EXTENSIVE CORROSION THROUGH STRUCTURAL STEEL MEMBERS OF THE BUILDING. THERE ARE SOME NOTEWORTHY ISSUES WITH THE BUILDING AS IT IS, AND AT SOME POINT IF REPAIRS ARE NOT MADE, IT COULD ENDANGER THE OPERATION OF THE BUILDING ALTOGETHER. WE THINK IT'S VERY APPROPRIATE THAT THIS BE FOLDED INTO THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS, AND YOU CAN CONSIDER AND GET UPDATED INFORMATION IN THAT PROCESS. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, NEXT I GO OUT TO ZOOM, ROBERT, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE? CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER? GREAT, GO AHEAD.

IT SEEMS LIKE YOU GOT A SEPARATE, WHAT IS THE EMOTIONAL ISSUE OF THE COMMUNITY CENTER AND ALL THE ISSUES SURROUNDING THAT AND WHERE DOES IT GO, HOW DOES IT WORK, WHAT DOES IT NEED? THAT'S A SEPARATE ISSUE, AND YOUR ISSUE AS A CITY COUNCIL IS YOU OWN A BUILDING, IT'S PRETTY VALUABLE, AT LEAST YOU'VE SUNK A LOT OF TAXPAYER MONEY INTO IT IN THE LAST FOUR OR FIVE YEARS, IT NEEDS TO BE FIXED, STILL, AND YOU HAVE MONEY TO FIX IT, AND I THINK THAT MONEY IS RESTRICTED, PROBABLY TO ONLY FIXING THIS BUILDING. YOU EITHER USE IT OR SEND IT BACK TO THE GOVERNMENT. I'M NOT SURE ABOUT THAT, THAT'S A QUESTION YOU COULD ASK. IF YOU'RE GOING TO PUT \$400,000 INTO THE BUILDING, YOU PROBABLY OUGHT TO PROTECT IT FROM FLOODS. IT'S BEEN FOUR, FIVE YEARS, NOW THAT WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT THIS. IT'S RAINING RIGHT NOW, YOU'RE FOUR FEET FROM FLOOD ACTION STAGE, AND IS GOING TO RAIN FOR THE NEXT 10 DAYS. THIS MIGHT BE THE MOMENT WHERE WE GET ANOTHER FLOOD. IF NOT, IT'S COMING. SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE TO PROTECT THAT INVESTMENT. IT SEEMS LIKE THE TEMPORARY BARRIER COULD BE DONE PRETTY COST-EFFECTIVELY, IT'S THE ONLY COST-EFFECTIVE CHOICE. THE ISSUE IS WHO'S GOING TO PUT IT UP. SOMEBODY POINTED OUT AT PUBLIC COMMENT, MAYBE THE FIREFIGHTERS WOULD HELP US, AND THEY MIGHT. BOY SCOUTS, THERE WERE A LOT OF HEALTHY YOUNG MEN THEY ARE LOOKING FOR SOMETHING TO DO. YOU CAN ENLIST SOMEBODY LIKE THE BOY SCOUTS OR OTHER VOLUNTEERS FROM THE COMMUNITY TO DO THAT, MAYBE THAT WOULDN'T BE THE MAJOR BARRIER. STORAGE, THE CORPORATE YARD IS ACROSS THE STREET, IT SEEMS LIKE STORAGE ISN'T THE BIGGEST PROBLEM. I DON'T KNOW THE ISSUES THAT HASN'T BEEN RAISED PUBLICLY. MY THOUGHT IS, YOU GOT TO FOCUS ON THE BUILDING AND NOT ON THE COMMITTEE CENTER. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. SORRY.

I'M NOT VOLUNTEERING.

I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT.



I'LL SAY GOOD EVENING. SO, THE SEBASTOPOL COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER, I KNOW I'M PREACHING TO THE CHOIR HERE, WHAT AN INCREDIBLE ASSET FOR THE WORK THEY DO. WE'RE IN THIS BUILDING RIGHT NOW. THE CITY HALL, THE CHAMBERS, WE'RE WORKING TOGETHER. I REALLY LOVE SEEING THAT, IT SEEMS LIKE READY TO INVEST THESE FUNDS INTO THE COMMUNITY CENTER. I WOULD PAUSE, I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE SPECIFICITY WITH WHICH KENYON WEBSTER SAID WITH THE OTHER PIECES, IS A FORMER BOARD MEMBER BUT OUR FORMER PLANNING DIRECTOR, IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER THOSE COMMENTS. AND IT REALLY WARMED MY HEART TO HEAR HIM SAY, HOW KENYON SAID ABOUT WORKING TOGETHER FOR A COMMON AREA, HOW OPEN THE COMMUNITY CENTER IS TO THAT. AND I'M REALLY EXCITED ABOUT WHAT THE CITY HAS BEEN DOING, BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER. I STARTED FOLLOWING THIS PROCESS AND THIS HAS BEEN TALKED ABOUT FOR A VERY LONG TIME. BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER, ORGANIZATIONS AND COOPERATING ESPECIALLY IN CIVIC NEEDS POSSIBLY WITH STAFF AND GRANT WRITING, OTHER EFFORTS IS SUCH A SHIFT IN HOW THINGS HAVE BEEN DONE. IN SUCH A MOVE TOWARD A COOPERATIVE SPIRIT. IT'S EXCITING TO THINK ABOUT. I APPRECIATE THAT YOU'RE LOOKING AT NOT JUST PRESERVING THE SHORT-TERM NEED, THE ASSET, THE IMMEDIATE USE, BUT ALSO LOOKING AT THE LONG-TERM OPPORTUNITY TO BRING PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY TOGETHER IN A DEEPER WAY. THANK YOU. FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, NEXT I'LL GO OUT TO ZOOM, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

THANK YOU.

CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

I WANT TO SUPPORT WHAT THE COMMENTOR ROBERT SAID, WHICH IS, I THINK IT'S GREAT TO INVEST IN THE BUILDING OF THE COMMUNITY CENTER, IT'S A WONDERFUL ORGANIZATION, BUT IF WE'RE GOING TO INVEST THE MONEY IN IT, WE SHOULD LOOK AT DOING THE TEMPORARY BARRIER AND I THINK WE HAVE LOTS AND LOTS OF DIFFERENT SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES WHERE YOU COULD TRAIN A GROUP OF PEOPLE AND HAVE THEM EITHER THE VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS, OR OTHER FIRST RESPONDERS OR EVEN SOME OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS, OR PEOPLE WHO ARE ASSOCIATED AND LOVE THE COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER AND DON'T WANT TO SEE IT GET FLOODED, BUT, I THINK THAT THERE SHOULD BE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRAIN A GROUP OF PEOPLE AND HAVE THEM AVAILABLE IF NEEDED TO ERECT THE TEMPORARY FLOOD BARRIER, WE TYPICALLY HAVE A TWO DAY WARNING PERIOD, AND SO THAT WOULD GIVE VOLUNTEERS ENOUGH TIME TO GET IT UP AND GOING. I AGREE WITH PUBLIC WORKS THAT THEY ARE OVERBURDENED DURING FLOOD TIMES BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO DEAL WITH OUR SYSTEM, BUT I THINK IF YOU MAKE THE INVESTMENT TO FIX THE BUILDING THAT THERE SHOULD BE A PLAN TO PROTECT IT FROM FLOODS, AND IF A TEMPORARY BARRIER IS A LOW-COST WAY TO DO IT, I DO THINK THAT THERE ARE THE PERSONAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO ERECT THE BARRIER. I ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT ELEMENT LENO HIGH SCHOOL HAS A BRAND-NEW PERFORMANCE SPACE THAT HAS A 289 SEAT PERFORMING ARTS CENTER THAT INCLUDES A 2000 FOOT STAGE, A SECOND-FLOOR TECHNICAL EDGE, A LOBBY AND BACKSTAGE AREA, SO PERHAPS THAT COULD BE A SPACE THAT IS USED BY THE COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER. THANK YOU.



THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS.

I WANTED TO GET AN IDEA OF WHAT IT WOULD TAKE, ERIC MAY HAVE THE ANSWER TO THIS. TO ACTUALLY ERECT THE BARRIER, WHETHER YOU NEED HEAVY EQUIPMENT, HOW MUCH IT WOULD WAY IF IT WAS FULL OF WATER. I DON'T KNOW HOW HIGH IT WOULD BE, BUT, WE MAY BE UNDERESTIMATING WITH HER BOY SCOUTS AND MADE SUCH A HUGE ENTITY, AND TAKE IT DOWN AGAIN. I READ THE INFORMATION ABOUT IT BUT I'M NOT CLEAR ON WHAT THAT WOULD ENTAIL AND WHETHER IT WOULD BE PRACTICAL OR NOT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENTS. NEXT I WILL GO OUT TO ZOOM, IF THERE'S ANYONE ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE COMMUNITY CENTER FACILITIES ESTIMATE REPORT, PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE IF THERE WAS ANYONE ELSE IN CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE, PUBLIC COMMENT IS CLOSED.

THANK YOU. BACK HERE AT THE DAIS FOR ANY COMMENTS. IF ANYONE HAS ANY COMMENTS. GO AHEAD.

SO, I'VE BEEN LISTENING TO THIS FOR A LONG TIME. SINCE WE GOT THE MONEY. THE FLOOD BARRIER, I HAD HIGH HOPES AT THE BEGINNING THAT THE FLOOD BARRIER WAS GOING TO BE THE LATEST AND GREATEST, WE STUDIED IT BACK THEN, WE KNOW THAT IT'S BIG, IT'S HEAVY, WATER FILLS AND WHAT HAPPENS TO THAT WATER WHEN IT GOES OUT? IT'S RUBBER, SO WITH THE BARLOW FLOOD THE RUBBER THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO GO INTO THE LOCKED THINGS TO PREVENT THE FLOOD DIDN'T HOLD UP OVER TIME. SO, HAVE WE BOUGHT THAT IN 2019 AND WE HAVEN'T HAD A FLOOD, WHAT WOULD BE LIKE IF WE DID NEED TO BLOW IT UP IN 2026. FOR MANY, MANY REASONS, I DON'T THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA ANY LONGER. AND WE GOT THIS MONEY AS A WINDFALL, REALLY, FOR THIS PURPOSE. I HAVE NO PROBLEM SPENDING IT ON THE COMMUNITY CENTER, AND WE STILL HAVE ADDITIONAL MONIES LEFT ON OUR FLOOD ACCOUNT THAT WE HAVEN'T USED. I SUPPORT THIS PLAN TONIGHT, AND THANK THE COMMUNITY CENTER FOR EVERYTHING THEY DO FOR OUR COMMUNITY. WE HAVEN'T HAD A FLOOD SINCE 2019 AND HOPEFULLY THAT WILL HOLD.

AND I'M JUST GOING TO SAY, OBVIOUSLY I SUPPORT THIS AND HAVING SAT ON THAT COMMITTEE WITH THE BARRIERS AND ALL OF THAT, THERE ARE MANY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RUNOFF OF THE WATER, THE FISH AND WILDLIFE NEED TO BE INVOLVED TO FIGURE OUT WHAT HAPPENS WITH THAT RUNOFF. QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT IF THAT SITS SINCE 2019, WHAT IF THAT SITS FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, IT HAS AN END OF LIFE, AND THEN WE SPEND MONEY ON SOMETHING, THERE'S A SIMILAR DIFFERENT CHALLENGES. WE LOOKED AT PUTTING WALLS UP AND THE DISCUSSION BECAME, THERE'S A GREASE TRAP IN THE PARKING LOT AND THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE MOVED, TREES WOULD HAVE TO BE CUT DOWN. I COULD GO ON AND ON AND ON AND TELL YOU ABOUT THE DIFFERENT DISCUSSIONS AND MEANINGS OF MY LIFE THAT I HAVE SPENT ASSESSING THIS. ALL THAT TO SAY IS I'M SUPPORTIVE OF FIXING WHAT WE HAVE RIGHT NOW AND CONTINUING TO ALLOW THE GROUP TO FIGURE OUT IF THIS IS AN ALTERNATE SOLUTION IN THE FUTURE. BUT WE DO NEED TO BE GOOD LANDLORDS, AND TAKE CARE OF THESE MOISTURE ISSUES IN THAT BUILDING, I FEEL ADAMANT ABOUT THAT. THE HOLES IN THE WALLS AND THE CEILINGS. THOSE HAVE TO BE TAKEN CARE OF. I WANT TO SAY THAT PUBLICLY, IT NEEDS TO BE TAKEN CARE OF. I CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHY THAT'S NOT DONE YET. I WANT TO SAY THAT PUBLICLY AND I'M HOPING THAT THAT IS BEING HEARD, BECAUSE IT'S NOT RIGHT AND WE NEED TO BE GOOD LANDLORDS.



I WANT TO MAKE A MOTION TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT 400 SOMETHING DOLLARS WORTH OF CHANGES. AND THE LONGER-TERM VISION TO WORK WITH ANOTHER GROUP TO FIND A SOLUTION. WHICH I THINK IS THE RECOMMENDATION.

I'LL SECOND THAT.

ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? SEEING NONE, SO MOVED BY COUNCILMEMBER CARTER, SECONDED BY VICE MAYOR MAURER, TO ACCEPT THE REPORT AND DIRECT STAFF TO INCLUDE THE FLOOD MITIGATION REPAIRS BY INTERACTIVE RESOURCES IN THE 26-27 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND DIRECTING STAFF TO EXPLORE AND MOVE FORWARD WITH IMPLEMENTATION FOR THE SHARED CIVIC SPACE WITH THE SEBASTOPOL COMMENTS OR ANOTHER NONPROFIT FOR THE LONG-TERM VISION. COUNCIL MEMBER CARTER?

YEAH.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

AYE.

VICE MAYOR MAURER?

YES.

MAYOR McLEWIS?

YES.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.

SO WE ARE GOING TO MOVE ON, THANK YOU FOR STAYING FOR SO LONG. REALLY. WE HAVE NUMBER NINE, THE BAY RUN PROGRAM. BEFORE I DO THIS ARE WE ALL OKAY? I KNOW IT'S BEEN SEVERAL HOURS. OKAY. THE BAYREN PROGRAM, THE WATER \$AVE PROGRAM IS CLOSING AND BAYREN IS PROPOSING OPTIONS FOR THE CITY TO CONSIDER WITH PROGRAM CLOSURE. I BELIEVE IS IT ALEX IS DOING THIS? TAKE IT AWAY.

THANK YOU, MADAME MAYOR. I'LL KEEP THIS BRIEF BUT I DON'T THINK I CAN TOP THE BOXING. SO, THIS ITEM WAS REVIEWED BY THE BUDGET COMMITTEE, AND THE ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. AND THE COMMENT HAD BEEN RECORDED IN THE STAFF REPORT. THAT WAS ALSO INCORPORATED THEIR FEEDBACK. SO THE CITY JOINED THIS PROGRAM IN 2022, AND FAST FORWARD TO TODAY. THIS PROGRAM IS ENDING, SO, BAYREN HAS APPROACHED THE CITY TO SETTLE THE REMAINING CAPITAL INVESTMENT BALANCE OF \$30,020.57. FOR A REDUCED AMOUNT OF \$13,141.23. STAFF IS PRESENTING TO THE CITY COUNCIL TWO OPTIONS. THE FIRST OPTION IS TO APPROVE THE BAYREN PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND RESOLVE THE CITY OUTSTANDING CAPITAL OBLIGATION OF \$13,141.23. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID ENTIRELY FROM THE WATERFRONT, AND ULTIMATELY THE COUNCIL MAY CHOOSE TO PAY \$7409.94 FROM THE GENERAL FUND, AND THE BALANCE FROM THE WATERFRONT HOLDING ACCOUNT. OPTION TWO IS TO MAINTAIN THE EXISTING CHARGES TO PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS, PAY A FULL OUTSTANDING BALANCE OF 30,000, CONTINUE



COLLECTING THE CHARGE TO REIMBURSE THE CITY AND ASSUME ONGOING RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY FUTURE REPAIRS. WITH THAT SUMMARIZED STAFF REPORT, I WILL PAUSE NOW FOR QUESTIONS. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

I HAVE A QUESTION, ON THE BOTTOM OF PAGE TWO, I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW NINE ACCOUNTS WERE NOT CHARGED TOTALING \$4663.38 IN UNBILLED COSTS. I GET AN EXPLANATION OF HOW THE CITY HAS A PROGRAM AND WE DID NOT BILL NINE CUSTOMERS THAT SIGN UP FOR IT.

SO THERE'S AN OVERSIGHT. NOT EVERYBODY COME ON BOARD AT ONCE, AND CITY STAFF WAS HAVING THE CHANGE OUT, SO THERE'S A LOT OF PROJECTS HAPPENED, AND IT, THOSE NINE ACCOUNT WAS NOT BILLED.

I DON'T SUPPOSE DUE TO THE CONTRACT THEY SIGNED THAT WE COULD DO A QUICK BILL NOW BEFORE WE SETTLE THIS THING. THEY GOT FREE TOILETS AND UPGRADES IN THEIR HOME AND THEY HAVEN'T PAID A DIME. I'VE GOT TO SAY PUBLICLY, I AM SO DISAPPOINTED THAT THIS IS WHAT HAS HAPPENED. I WISH I HAD SIGNED UP FOR THAT PROGRAM SO I COULD USE SOME UPGRADED TOILETS FOR FREE.

CAN I ASK A QUESTION? WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT? THE UNBILLED?

THE ACCOUNT --

FROM CITY STAFF, WHAT DEPARTMENT, WHO DOES THAT BUILDING?

THAT WOULD BE THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

OKAY. ANYONE ELSE HAVE QUESTIONS? I HAVE A LOT OF COMMENTS, BUT GO AHEAD.

I WANT TO MAKE A BRIEF COMMENT THAT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE LOOKED AT THIS.

CAN'T HEAR YOU. THAT'S A COMMENT, DO YOU HAVE A QUESTION?

YOU HAVE TO WAIT TILL WE'RE, WE'RE IN QUESTION.

I'D JUST LIKE TO VERIFY THIS WITH THE ATTORNEY. THAT, WE HAD DIRECTED, WE ASKED YOU TO LOOK INTO THIS ISSUE REGARDING THE CITY'S LIABILITY. SO, COULD YOU SAY A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THAT? I THINK THAT'S A KEY ISSUE, HERE, IS IF WE DON'T TAKE THIS BUYOUT FROM BAYREN, THEN WE WOULD BE LIABLE FOR ANY REPAIRS, ET CETERA.

SO, WE'RE NOT LIABLE FOR REPAIRS, BUT IN OUR AGREEMENT, UNDER THE AGREEMENTS, THE PROPERTY OWNERS SIGNED, IF SOMETHING HAPPENS WITH THE TOILET OR SINK OR WHATEVER, AND WE DON'T FIX IT, THEN WE CAN NO LONGER CHARGE THEM, THEY STOP HAVING TO MAKE THEIR REPAYMENTS.

I THOUGHT THAT THE CITY WOULD THEN GO ON TO PRIVATE PROPERTY AND DEAL WITH THIS. ARE YOU SAYING WE DON'T HAVE TO DO THAT?

WE HAVE TO MAKE THAT CORRECTION IF WE WANT TO CONTINUE CHARGING THEM.

IT'S LIKE AN ONGOING POTENTIAL PROBLEM. THAT'S THE PROBLEM.



CORRECT. IF WE WANT TO KEEP CHARGING THEM, ASSUMING SOMETHING HAPPENS. IT MAY NOT HAPPEN, SIX YEARS DOWN THE ROAD. THERE MAY BE A PROBLEM AND WE MIGHT SAY, WE'RE NOT FIXING IT. WE'RE GOING TO START CHARGING YOU NOW.

GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

SO WE USED CONTRACTORS, CONTRACTORS USED FOR THIS WORK. SO WHERE'S THE CONTRACTOR IN THAT? THE CONTRACTOR INSTALLED THE WORK. IS THE CONTRACTOR HAVE NO OBLIGATION TO GO BACK IF THERE WERE A PROBLEM TO MAKE THE WORK RIGHT? OR THE CITY, WE DON'T INSTALL TOILETS.

I DON'T HAVE COPIES OF THOSE AGREEMENTS. OF WHAT WE MIGHT SAY, AND THESE ARE TEMPLATE AGREEMENTS FROM THE BAYREN PROGRAM. THAT PROVIDED HOW THAT REPAYMENT WOULD WORK.

SO THEY PROVIDED THE CONTRACTORS THROUGH BAYREN, THE CITY WAS OUT AT THAT POINT? BUT IF WE WANTED TO CONTINUE CHARGING, THE CUSTOMERS, IF WE WANTED TO NOT DO THIS PROGRAM, NOT CLOSE IT OUT. AND LET'S SAY A TOILET HAD A MALFUNCTION OR SOMETHING, IF WE WANTED TO KEEP REPAIRING THAT WE WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR GOING IN OR HIRING A CONTRACTOR TO GO IN AND DO THAT. WE CAN GET CLARIFICATION BECAUSE MARY IS ON THE LINE RIGHT NOW, WE CAN ASK HER FOR CLARIFICATION. BUT THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING.

IF SHE'S ON THE LINE.

I'M GOING TO UNMUTE YOU IF YOU CAN PROVIDE SOME CLARITY ON THIS. CAN YOU UNMUTE? THERE YOU GO. JANE HAS ALSO BEEN ON THE MEETINGS WITH US AS WELL. JANE, CAN YOU HEAR IS OKAY?

CAN YOU HEAR ME?

WE CAN HEAR YOU.

OKAY, THANK YOU. GOOD EVENING, COUNCILMEMBERS. I'M THE PORTFOLIO ADMINISTRATOR, AND TO ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, WITH THE PROGRAM, BAYREN RUNNING THE WATER UPGRADES SAVE PROGRAM, WE HIGHER AN IMPLEMENTOR WHICH THEN SUPPLIED THE CONTRACTORS THAT DID THE INSTALLATIONS FOR THE VARIOUS IMPROVEMENTS, THE WATER AND ENERGY IMPROVEMENTS. WITH THAT, THE RESIDENTS SIGNED A PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT THAT DETAILED OUT ALL OF THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS AND WHAT HAVE YOU. THE CONTRACTOR WAS PROVIDED THROUGH BAYREN. I THINK THAT ANSWERS THE QUESTION.

THE CONTRACTOR WOULD HAVE NO OBLIGATION IF SOMETHING WENT WRONG TO GO BACK AND REPAIR IT?

AT THAT POINT IN TIME BECAUSE WE HAVE TERMINATED THE PROGRAM, WE HAVE SINCE TERMINATED THE AGREEMENT WITH THE IMPLEMENTOR SINCE WE ARE NO LONGER PROVIDING THE SERVICES ANY LONGER. UP UNTIL, UP UNTIL THE PROGRAM WAS CLOSED. YES, IF THERE HAD BEEN SOME KIND OF MALFUNCTION OR REPAIR NEEDED ASIDE FROM TYPICAL MAINTENANCE, THAT'S TOTALLY SEPARATE. IF SOMETHING HAD MALFUNCTIONED THEN WE WOULD SEND THE CONTRACTOR BACK IN TO ASSESS THAT, AND MAKE GOOD OF WHAT WAS NEEDED IF NECESSARY.

THANK YOU.



I'VE READ THIS A COUPLE TIMES. CAN YOU HELP ME TO UNDERSTAND THIS? WE HAVE THAT AMOUNT THAT WAS UNBILLED, BUT THESE OTHER AMOUNTS, I'M TRYING TO LOOK AT ALL THE DIFFERENT AMOUNTS, HERE. HOW IS IT THAT WE'VE NOT BEEN ABLE, CAN SOMEONE EXPLAIN TO ME THESE DIFFERENT AMOUNTS, AND WHY IT IS THAT, I THINK IT'S OUTRAGEOUS THAT WE WOULD MISS BILLING. IT'S A TOTAL DISREGARD FOR ALL THE PEOPLE HERE WHO PAY THIS MONEY EVERY DAY. YET NOW WE WANT TO ABSORB THIS. THE QUESTION I HAVE, IT'S JUST ABOUT THE DIFFERENT AMOUNTS HERE. WE HAVE UNBILLED REVENUE, AND THE OTHER AMOUNTS BEING ASKED TO BASICALLY WAIVE, WHERE DID THOSE COME FROM? WHY CAN'T WE GET THAT MONEY BACK? I DON'T KNOW WHO CAN ANSWER THAT.

CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, BUT MY UNDERSTANDING RIGHT NOW, I DON'T HAVE THE REPORT IN FRONT OF ME, WE HAVE THAT \$30,000 IN OUTSTANDING. BAYREN CONTRACTED US, AND WE NEGOTIATED, PRETTY MUCH IT'S A SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATION, THEY ARE REDUCING THEIR REQUEST TO, I THINK IT'S 13,000. 5000, WE STILL HAVE IN A SAVINGS ACCOUNT BECAUSE WE HAVE NOT SENT THAT MONEY YET TO BAYREN. WE HAVE 5000 STILL SITTING OUT THERE. SO THERE'S 7000 AND I DON'T HAVE THE EXACT AMOUNT IN FRONT OF ME BUT 7000 THAT IS OUTSTANDING THAT WE NEED TO EITHER PAY FROM THE ENTERPRISE FUND OR THE GENERAL FUND, SO, BAYREN IS WILLING TO SETTLE THAT 30,000 FOR REDUCED RATE OF 13,000. BUT WE CAN NO LONGER BILL THOSE RESIDENTS BY DOING THIS. WE ARE CLOSING OUT THAT ACCOUNT, AND CAN NO LONGER BILL.

I UNDERSTAND, I'M WONDERING, WHAT'S TO PREVENT US FROM BUILDING THESE PEOPLE?

WE COULD CONTINUE TO BILL THEM. AND WE COULD PAY BAYREN THE \$30,000 NOW. AND CONTINUE RATHER THAN THE 13 AND CONTINUE TO BUILD THOSE PEOPLE AND COLLECT THAT 30,000 TO REIMBURSE OURSELVES OVER THE NEXT SEVEN YEARS.

WHAT IS THE LIKELIHOOD THAT YOU FEEL LIKE YOU'D GET IT BACK?

IF THEY'RE GOING OUT OF BUSINESS, WHY WOULD WE HAVE \$30,000 DUE TO THEM?

THAT'S WHAT THE AGREEMENT SAYS. THE OUTSTANDING AMOUNT IS WHAT'S NOT BEEN BILLED. NOT PAID BY CUSTOMERS, IS THAT CORRECT? I'M TRYING TO MAKE SURE I FULLY UNDERSTAND THAT, AND IT ALL SEEMS OUTRAGEOUS TO ME. I HAVE A LOT OF COMMENTS LATER. I'M VERY ANGRY ABOUT THIS.

OKAY. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? ALL RIGHT, PUBLIC COMMENT?

THANK YOU, THIS IS PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE CLOSEOUT OF THE BAYREN AND RECOMMENDATIONS MOVING FORWARD, IF YOU'D LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT, IN CHAMBERS FIRST, ALL OF THERE.

THE ENTERPRISE WITH CARTER DISCUSSED THIS AT THE LAST MEETING, WE AGREED THAT ALL THE MEMBERS AGREED THAT THEY SHOULD BE PAID OFF 13,000, AND PUT THIS BEHIND US. IT'S TOO EXPENSIVE TO TRY AND COLLECT THE MONEY. HOW WE GOT INTO THIS IN 2021 I DON'T REMEMBER THE MEETING, BUT IT SEEMS ABSOLUTELY NUTS TO ME THAT WE DID THIS. PRESUMABLY A FEW OF THE PEOPLE WHO GOT THE FREE TOILETS AND THE SUBSIDIZED ONES THAT MOVED OUT, AND STOPPED PAYING. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE PEOPLE WHO TOOK ADVANTAGE OF THIS IN JANUARY 2021 UNTIL NOW, STILL ACTUALLY LIVE IN THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL? HUGE MISTAKE BY THE COUNCIL BACK THEN TO EMBARK ON THIS, IT'S INCREDIBLE HOW



QUICKLY, IT'S A LESSON HOW QUICKLY THESE ENTITIES, YOU ENTER AN AGREEMENT AND THEN THEY DISAPPEAR. THEY GO BANKRUPT, LEAVING THE CITY HOLDING THE BAG. MY POINT IS THE ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE SAID EVERYBODY AGREES JUST PAY IT OFF AND MOVE ON, THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

I'M UNMUTED.

GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT.

I WANT TO FOLLOW UP WITH, AS TO WHAT OLIVER SAID. I'M ON THE ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE, WE AGREED THAT IT SHOULD BE PAID IN FULL AND BY THE GENERAL FUND. I WILL GO ON WITH MY PUBLIC COMMENT. THEY RUN IS A PROGRAM THAT ALLOWED INDIVIDUAL HOMEOWNERS TO UPGRADE THEIR TOILETS AND OTHER FIXTURES WITH SPREAD PAYMENT PLAN THAT WAS ADMINISTERED BY THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL VIA THE WATER AND SEWER BILL. THE COUNCIL DECIDED TO OFFER THIS TO RESIDENTS, 54 HOMEOWNERS PARTICIPATED. THE CITY'S FINANCE PROGRAM FAILED TO BILL NINE PEOPLE. NOW, BAYREN IS CLOSING AND THE CITY IS LEFT WITH A BALANCE TO PAY. AS A PERSON WHO PAYS HIGH WATER BILLS, I DO NOT WANT TO SUBSIDIZE A NEW TOILET OR SHOWER HEAD FOR ANOTHER HOMEOWNER. MY WATER BILL SHOULD BE GOING TOWARD EARTHQUAKE PROOFING OUR WATER TANKS WHICH ARE CURRENTLY NOT SECURE, MY SEWER BILL SHOULD GO TOWARD REPLACING CLAY PIPES, WHICH TAKE ON RAINWATER AND CAUSE HUGE INCREASES IN PROCESSING EXPENSES, THE CITY SHOULD FIRST TRY TO COLLECT THE BALANCES, REDUCED OR OTHERWISE FROM THE EXISTING 54 CUSTOMERS. THE HOMEOWNERS SHOULD BE HAPPY TO PAY A REDUCED BILL AS THEY GOT NEW FIXTURES AND GOT TO PAY THEM OFF OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS AND COULD NOW BE OFFERED A REDUCED BILL. SHOULDN'T THE PEOPLE WHO RECEIVE THE BENEFITS PAY THE BILL? IF THEY DON'T WANT TO PAY THEM COUNCIL NEEDS TO PAY THE BALANCE FROM THE GENERAL FUND. WATER AND SEWER RATEPAYERS HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS DECISION. THE MONEY WENT TOWARD PRIVATE RESIDENCES. AS THE PROJECT BENEFITED LESS THAN 2% OF RATEPAYERS, THERE'S NO REASON WHATSOEVER THAT I OR A SMALL BUSINESS OR THE SENIOR CENTER OR SUNRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OR ANY OTHER RATEPAYER SHOULD BE CHARGED WITH THE EXPENSE OF SOMEONE'S NEW TOILET. WHEN YOU DISCUSS WATER AND SEWER FINANCES, YOU ARE DISCUSSING THE FINANCES OF EVERY SINGLE RESIDENT, BUSINESS, AND INSTITUTION IN SEBASTOPOL.

THAT'S TWO MINUTES.

THANK YOU.

NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS, IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS. SEEING NOT I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. STEVE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES, THANK YOU.

GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT.

IT'S REALLY A SHAME, LOOKING BACK ON THIS, I THINK HINTON WAS THE ONLY COUNCIL MEMBER TO VOTE AGAINST THIS IDEA AT THE TIME, AND IT SHOULD BE A LESSON THAT WE REALLY NEED TO TRY TO KEEP THINGS SIMPLE. THIS PROGRAM WAS NOT SIMPLE. IT DIDN'T HAVE THE UPTAKE THAT WE HOPED IT WOULD. AT THE



SAME TIME, EVERY OTHER CITY IN SONOMA COUNTY HAS INCENTIVES TO LOWER YOUR WATER CONSUMPTION. ALL THE CITIES HAVE INCENTIVES FOR HIGH EFFICIENCY CLOSE WASHERS. THE CITY OF SONOMA GIVES AWAY FREE SHOWERHEADS, FREE SINK AERATORS. AND MANY OF THE OTHER CITIES HAVE SIMILAR PROGRAMS. I'M SURE MANY OF THE COUNCILMEMBERS ARE EVEN AWARE THAT THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL HAS HAD A SEPARATE PROGRAM OF INCENTIVES FOR HIGH EFFICIENCY TOILETS UP TO \$150. IT'S VERY OBSCURE, THE LIST OF APPROVED TOILETS ENDS UP IN A DEAD LINK. I THINK WE DO HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO HELP REDUCE OUR WATER CONSUMPTION. WE END UP WITH LESS IMPACT ON OUR SEWERS, AND OUR RATEPAYERS CAN END UP HAVING LOWER BILLS. WE DON'T NEED A COMPLICATED PROGRAM LIKE THIS WAS. WE CAN HAVE SOMETHING CHEAP, LIKE FREE SHOWERHEADS AVAILABLE AT CITY HALL, LIKE THE CITY OF SONOMA DOES. I WANT THE COUNCILMEMBERS, WE NEED TO REFLECT ON THE MISTAKE THAT WAS MADE, WE WENT FOR A COMPLEX PROGRAM, BUT LET'S SEE WHAT WE CAN DO ON A SIMPLE LEVEL AND STILL IMPROVE OUR WATER EFFICIENCY. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL GO TO ROBERT, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES.

CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

I CAN.

GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

SEVERAL PEOPLE HAVE ALREADY MADE THE MOST IMPORTANT POINTS IN TERMS OF THE COMMENT AROUND THE LESSONS LEARNED. ONE OF THE THINGS WE SHOULD PROBABLY LEARN IS THAT ANY TIME SOMEBODY COMES TO US WITH A GREAT IDEA AND WE'RE THE FIRST CITY TO TRY TO ADOPT IT, WE SHOULD RUN LIKE CRAZY. TESLA IS A LEADER, THEY GET OUT IN FRONT OF STUFF. IF YOU FOLLOW TESLA STOCK IT GOES UP AND DOWN LIKE CRAZY, THEY LOSE MONEY LIKE CRAZY BUT THEY HAVE DEEP POCKETS, GENERAL MOTORS IS A SLOW ADOPTER, OR EARLY FOLLOWER, SO, THEY LOOK FOR THE THINGS THAT WORK AND THAT'S WHAT THEY ADOPT. APPLE DOES THE SAME THING, IS WHAT MAKES THEM SUCCESSFUL, THEY DON'T TAKE UNNECESSARY RISKS. SEBASTOPOL DOESN'T HAVE DEEP POCKETS. YOU'RE GOING TO BE IN DEFICIT AND OUT OF MONEY IN FIVE YEARS. BANKRUPT IN FIVE YEARS BASED ON THE CURRENT BUDGET FORECAST. YOU CAN'T TAKE THESE KINDS OF RISK. SEBASTOPOL WAS THE FIRST CITY IN THE BAY AREA TO GET INTO THIS PROGRAM. HOW WE GOT THERE I HAVE NO IDEA. THE IDEA OF SAVING MONEY, SAVING MONEY IS GREAT BUT WE SIT ON AN AQUIFER THAT DOESN'T EVER GO DOWN, WE DON'T HAVE A WATER SHORTAGE PROBLEM IN SEBASTOPOL. BUT THE IDEA THAT THE LAST COMMENTOR SAID THAT PEOPLE SAVE MONEY IF THEY USE LESS WATER, THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN HERE. 90% OF THE COST OF WHAT YOU PAY IS FIXED COST. IF THE WATER USAGE GOES DOWN, THE RATES HAVE TO KEEP GOING UP TO COVER THOSE FIXED COSTS. THOSE ARE MY COMMENTS, HOPEFULLY WE LEARN, THANKS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. I WILL COME INTO CHAMBERS IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT, SEEING THAT I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. MARY, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?



MY NAME IS MARY MY HOUSE, I AM PART OF THE ENTERPRISE FUND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. I WANT TO PARALLEL WHAT KATE AND OLIVER HAVE BEEN SAYING, WE HAVE ALL AGREED THAT THESE FUNDS THAT, TO PAY BAYREN, WHICH, WE ALL ALSO AGREE, WE NEED TO MOVE FORWARD FROM IT, TO PAY FROM FUNDS WITHIN THE GENERAL FUND, I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THE SEPARATION OF THE DECISION TO PAY BAYREN FOR THE FUNDS TO BE NOT TAKEN FROM THE WATER, SEWAGE FUNDS, BUT FROM THE GENERAL, THAT'S REALLY IMPORTANT TO HIGHLIGHT. AND I THINK THIS IS JUST A HUGE MESS, THAT HAS A LOT OF LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS THAT ARE JUST NOT FEASIBLE. AND TO PAY THE AMOUNT THROUGH THE GENERAL FUNDS AND MOVE ON. AND HAVE THIS BE A LESSON LEARNED AND I HOPE THAT THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT IS LEARNING A LOT OF LESSONS HERE, TOO AND THANKFULLY THIS IS, ON A RELATIVELY SMALL SCALE COMPARED TO WHAT IT COULD BE. I THINK THE LAST THING I WANT TO SAY IS THAT THE LARGER CONVERSATION HERE IS NOT ONLY IS THIS A MESSY PROGRAM BUT, THE WATER AND SEWAGE FUNDS AND THE USAGE WITHIN THE CITY, AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE, THAT IS THE BIGGEST CONVERSATION TO HIGHLIGHT, I WOULD SAY. AND THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO SAY. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF? CAN YOU SEE THE TIMER?

I NEVER TAKE LONG. EARLIER IN THIS, I THINK MESA SAID SOMETHING ABOUT IT, WE ALMOST GOT TO WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS. AND I'D LIKE TO KNOW, WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE UNBILLED? IS THAT ANNA? ANNA, IF IT IS, HOW ABOUT YOU COP TO IT? TELL US YOU'RE SORRY AND WE GO ON. THAT'S MY PUBLIC COMMENT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE. I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, IF THERE'S ANYONE ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE, PUBLIC COMMENT IS CLOSED. THANK YOU, WE'RE BACK TO THE DAIS FOR COMMENTS. GO AHEAD. VICE MAYOR.

SO ORIGINALLY, IT WAS WRITTEN IN THE STAFF REPORT I SAID I THOUGHT IT SHOULD COME OUT OF THE WATER ENTERPRISE FUND. BUT I DID SUPPORT CLOSING OF THE PROGRAM BECAUSE THE LIABILITY ISSUES, I'M NOT ATTACHED TO THAT. IF MAYBE WE HAVE A FUND CALLED THE FAILED PROGRAM FUND THAT WE COULD TAKE IT OUT OF. BESIDES THE GENERAL FUND, ARE THERE ANY OTHER FUNDS BUT IT COULD COME OUT OF? WE HAVE A LOT OF DIFFERENT FUNDS.

I THINK WE NEED A MISTAKE FUND, WE SEEM TO HAVE THIS HAPPENING A LOT. OKAY, THANK YOU. GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER.

I THINK OF THAT, THERE IS FIVE SO THE BILL IS SEVEN. WE NEED TO BE ON TOP OF OUR GAME AND MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE KEEPING UP WITH THESE PROGRAMS. AS THAT ONE PERSON SAID, GETTING INTO MORE PROGRAMS ISN'T GREAT. WE NEED TO KEEP THINGS VERY SIMPLE. LIKE COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, AND MY FELLOW ENTERPRISE FUNDS COLLEAGUES, SUPPORT PUTTING TO THE GENERAL FUND, THIS LEFTOVER MONEY, IT'S UNFORTUNATE BUT, IT BASICALLY SAVES OUR STAFF TIME, AND IT DOES PUNISH RATEPAYERS WHILE IT BENEFITS A FEW PEOPLE WHO RECEIVED THESE SERVICES. BUT BETTER JUST TO CLOSE IT OUT.



I HAVE COMMENTS, I'VE GOT A LOT OF THOUGHTS, I'VE BEEN WATCHING THESE COUNCIL MEETINGS FOR A DECADE, I HAVE TO SAY, I'M SORRY BECAUSE, I'M DISAPPOINTED WITH ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. THERE'S NOT ENOUGH ACCURACY, THERE'S NOT ENOUGH CARE, THESE ARE RESIDENTS WHO ARE PAYING THIS MONEY. AND NOW WE'RE ASKING THEM TO WRITE THEM OFF AND PAY MORE MONEY OUT OF THEIR POCKET AND AS SOMEONE WHO'S PAYING THESE HIGH WATER BILLS ALL THE TIME, WHOSE WATER BILL NEARLY TRIPLED, EVEN REMEMBERS I WAS NOT SUPPORTIVE OF US RAISING THESE RATES THE WAY WE DID BECAUSE I FELT LIKE IT PUNISHED FAMILIES, AND TO HEAR THIS OVER AND OVER AGAIN, I COULD GO BACK TO THE MEETINGS AND PERHAPS I WILL, THE VARIOUS MISTAKES THROUGHOUT TIME SINCE I'VE BEEN HERE ON THE COUNCIL WITH MATH AND WITH BILLING AND JUST, I THINK IT'S FLAGRANT, IT'S JUST OUTRAGEOUS TO ME. THAT WE TALK ABOUT THIS OVER AND OVER AGAIN AND FRANKLY IT MAKES ALL OF US AT THE DAIS LOOK FOOLISH. THAT WE DON'T HAVE PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY TAKE CARE OF THIS BILLING AND GET IT RIGHT, AND I UNDERSTAND THAT MISTAKES ARE MADE, BUT I AM HERE TO SAY THAT I'M TIRED OF SEEING THESE MISTAKES. I'M REALLY DISAPPOINTED AND I'M FRUSTRATED, AND I AM. I'M ANGRY, I GET THESE LARGE BILLS ALL THE TIME AND I THINK ABOUT THE FAMILIES THAT GET THEM, AT THIS POINT I'M UNHAPPY THAT I HAVE TO SAY THAT WE PROBABLY DO NEED TO MOVE ON FROM THIS, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO COME OUT OF THE GENERAL FUND, I'D LIKE IT ALSO TO COME OUT OF SOMEONE'S HIDE BECAUSE I'M TIRED OF HAVING THESE MISTAKES. I AM SICK OF IT. I'VE WATCHED IT FOR A DECADE AND I'VE WATCHED IT FOR YEARS JUST SITTING HERE IT'S ALWAYS THE SAME DEPARTMENT AND I THINK THAT NEEDS TO BE STATED SO THAT THE PUBLIC COMMENT, I KNOW IT SOUNDS HARSH AND I DON'T LIKE TO BE HARSH, BUT IT MAKES US LOOK FOOLISH UP HERE THAT WE CAN'T GET IT RIGHT. AND WE CONSISTENTLY MISSED THE MARK WITH IT. THERE'S BEEN MISSED BILLING SO MANY TIMES AND I KNOW THAT OTHER COUNCILMEMBERS HERE HAVE EXPRESSED THAT. THAT EVERYBODY ELSE IS FEELING, AND IT'S BEST TO BE STRAIGHT AND FOR PEOPLE TO UNDERSTAND WHERE THE FRUSTRATION LIES, THEY DON'T DESERVE TO BE TREATED LIKE THIS, IT MAKES ME SO ANGRY. I SUPPORT, WE DO NEED TO MOVE ON, AND I WOULD LIKE TO COME OUT OF THE GENERAL FUND, I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A FUTURE CONVERSATION ABOUT THIS BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THIS CAN CONTINUE. THANK YOU. GO AHEAD.

TO ME, THIS IS A FAILED PROGRAM OF BAYREN. I CAN'T FAULT THE CITY AT ALL. THE CITY HAS WORKED HARD TO TRY AND NEGOTIATE A WAY OUT. WE HAD A CONTRACT WITH THEM, AND I THINK THAT THEY DID THEIR BEST TO TRY TO GET OUT OF A BAD SITUATION. SO, I WANT TO MAKE A MOTION TO MOVE THIS FORWARD. WHATEVER I NEED TO SAY, HERE. WE HAVE ANOTHER ISSUE TO DEAL WITH.

[ INAUDIBLE ]

I'LL SECOND THAT.

SO I HAD IT SO MOVED BY THE VICE MAYOR, AND SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN. TWO APPROVE SETTLING THE CITY'S REMAINING OBLIGATION TO BAYREN FOR THE \$13,141.23. WE WILL TAKE THIS FROM THE GENERAL FUND, COUNCILMEMBER CARTER? [ ROLL BEING CALLED ] MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY. ALL RIGHT. I'M SORRY, WHAT TIME IS IT? IT'S 10:00. SURE.

I JUST KNOW IT'S 10 AFTER. ZACH, CAN YOU START THE MEETING, PLEASE?

RECORDING IN PROGRESS.



WE'RE BACK HERE AT THE DAIS. WE HAVE ONE MORE ITEM, I BELIEVE. I NUMBER 10. IN DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF 2026-27 CITY COUNCIL GOALS AND PRIORITIES MEETING DATE FACILITATOR AND PROCESS THE ITEM ASKED THE COUNCIL TO DECIDE ON WHETHER TO HIRE AN EXTERNAL FACILITATOR FOR A DEDICATED GOALSETTING WORKSHOP, HANDLE THE PROCESS INTERNALLY WITHOUT A FACILITATOR, AND TO SET A SPECIFIC DATE FOR THE GOALS/PRIORITIES DISCUSSION SESSION. THIS IS TO GUIDE POLICY BUDGETING ESPECIALLY FOR FISCAL YEAR 26-27 IN OPERATIONS FOR THE COMING PERIOD. AND INTERIM CITY MANAGER IS GOING TO DO THE PRESENTATION.

YOU TO THE WHOLE STAFF REPORT. DUE TO THE TIMING I'M GOING TO TRY TO KEEP, IT'S ALL GOOD. DUE TO THE TIMING, AND BASICALLY THE ITEM TONIGHT IS WHETHER OR NOT THEY WANT TO HIRE AN OUTSIDE FACILITATOR TO DO GOALS AND PRIORITY SETTING. I DID SEND OUT REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS, WE DID RECEIVE TWO, THEY ARE ATTACHED TO YOUR AGENDA ITEM. ONE WAS FOR AROUND 9000, ONE WAS FOR 4500. THEY ARE BOTH HIGHLY QUALIFIED, HIGHLY RECOMMENDED, THAT IS ONE OPTION FOR THE COUNCIL TO CONSIDER. ANOTHER OPTION IS TO HANDLE IT WITHOUT A FACILITATOR, WAYS THAT WE COULD DO THIS, WE CAN SEND OUT MEMOS ONE-WAY COMMUNICATION FROM THE CITY MANAGER TO THE COUNCILMEMBERS. ASKING FOR TOPICS. WE WOULD BE USING OUR SIX GOALS, I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT FOR THOSE GOALS THAT ARE NOT COMPLETED AS OF THIS YEAR, THAT WE CAN MOVE THOSE TO THE NEW YEAR, AND ANOTHER PROCESS I'VE BEEN THINKING ABOUT IS NOT TO GO WITH A FACILITATOR, IT'S TO DO SOME TYPE OF FORM THAT THE COMMUNITY MEMBERS CAN FILL OUT IN ADVANCE AS WELL INSTEAD OF WAITING FOR EVERYONE TO COME TO A CITY COUNCIL MEETING. SO WE CAN HAVE THAT INFORMATION PRESENTED AND PUT THEM IN GROUPS, SO, WITHOUT GOING INTO THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GUYS DON'T WANT TO HEAR ABOUT THE GOALS WHICH YOU ALREADY KNOW ABOUT, IS TO CONSIDER WHETHER YOU WANT A FACILITATOR BASED UPON THE PROPOSALS AND IF NOT, TO DIRECT STAFF TO DO THE PROCESS AS FAR AS SENDING OUT INFORMATION TO THE COUNCILMEMBERS GAINING INFORMATION THERE, TO OUR PUBLIC TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY ARE HEARD AND BRINGING IT BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL. THE KEY THING IS TO SET A DATE. I WILL SAY THAT TUESDAYS ARE THE BEST BECAUSE WE DO HAVE THIS ROOM, IT'S ALWAYS BEEN BOOKS FOR US. WE COULD DO IT ON AN OFF CITY COUNCIL MEETING OR IF THEY WANT TO DO IT ON A CITY COUNCIL MEETING NIGHT I WOULD SAY YOUR AGENDA COMING UP ARE PRETTY FULL. TO TRY TO DO GOALS ON AGENDA, OR PRIOR TO THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING BUT THE ITEM TONIGHT IS, DO YOU WANT A FACILITATOR AND IF YES THEN WE WILL BRING BACK A BUDGET AMENDMENT BECAUSE THERE'S NO, HAS NOT BEEN ALLOCATED, SO WE WOULD BRING THAT BACK ON CONSENT. IF NOT THEN WE WOULD MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PROCESS AND THE AGENDA REPORT.

COUNCILMEMBER CARTER?

I DON'T REALLY HAVE A QUESTION, IT MIGHT BE A RHETORICAL QUESTION. I KNOW BOTH OF THE FACILITATORS, THE ULTIMATE FACILITATOR, THE CITY MANAGEMENT BEING THE FACILITATOR COULD DO A WONDERFUL JOB, I'M LEANING TOWARD THAT CAN MAKE LIFE EASIER FOR ALL OF US, AND TRY TO, MY PREFERENCE WOULD BE ON A TUESDAY FOR SURE. NOT ON A COUNCIL DAY BUT EVERYTHING THAT YOU JUST SAID AS FAR AS SETTING THE PUBLIC UP, FEELS REALLY GOOD AS FAR AS ROLLING THINGS OVER,

IS THIS A QUESTION? I JUST HAVE TO ASK. GO AHEAD. VICE MAYOR.



I LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT BASED ON THE BUDGET COMMITTEE. WE DID DISCUSS AND REVIEW THAT ISSUE I THINK IT WAS. WE BOTH AGREED THAT IT WOULD BE BETTER NOT TO HIRE A FACILITATOR. A BIG PART OF THIS IS TIMING, IT WOULD BE, WE CAN PROGRESS THIS FASTER IF WE DO IT OURSELVES. SO TIMING WAS A BIG PART OF THAT.

I THINK YOU SHOULD GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT IF WE DON'T HAVE ANYONE ELSE.

THIS IS PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE PROCESS FOR THE CITY COUNCIL GOALS AND PRIORITIES UPCOMING SESSION FOR THE UPCOMING FISCAL YEAR 26-27 BUDGET IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT, I WILL GO TO CHAMBERS FIRST. SEEING NONE I WILL GO TO ZOOM, IF THERE'S ANYONE ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THE USE OF A FACILITATOR FOR THE PROCESS, PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE, THERE IS NO PUBLIC COMMENT.

GO AHEAD.

THE BUDGET COMMITTEE, I AGREE WITH YOUR RECOMMENDATION, WE DON'T NEED TO PAY THE MONEY AND IT BOGS DOWN THE PROCESS OF GETTING US TO AN APPROVED BUDGET. SO, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE WE DON'T NEED A FACILITATOR. THANK YOU FOR COMING UP WITH YOUR POTENTIAL AND YOUR GRADE AND EVERYTHING ELSE THAT WE CAN SUBMIT IF WE HAVE SOMETHING BEYOND THE SIX THAT WE ALREADY HAVE AND I'M FINE WITH PICKING A TUESDAY DATE IN APRIL.

I'M GOING TO GIVE MY COMMENTS REAL QUICK. I DON'T WANT TO PAY A FACILITATOR, WE JUST HIT THE GENERAL FUNDS. I DON'T WANT A FACILITATOR AND THEN ALSO, I PERSONALLY, TUESDAY'S WORK, BUT I WOULD LIKE FOR US TO TRY TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO DO IT ON THE MEETING. DAY, AND NOT, I'M TEAM, LET'S HAVE, LET'S NOT ADD MORE MEETINGS AND TRY TO FIGURE THAT OUT IF THAT DOES WORK. TIMING WISE. AND I DO LIKE THE IDEA OF PULLING THE COMMUNITY AHEAD OF TIME, I THINK IT WOULD ALLOW US TO BE MORE EXPEDIENT IN OUR DISCUSSION, LIKE YOU SAID, GROUPING THEM TOGETHER. THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE. THAT'S WHERE I MET WITH IT. ANYONE ELSE? DO YOU WANT TO FINISH YOUR COMMENTS?

YES.

TOO BAD.

OKAY. I WAS GOING TO ASK, HERE IT SAYS FOR US TO PICK A DATE, YOU'RE WANTING US TO PICK A DATE HERE, IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE ASKING?

I DON'T MIND IF I JUMP IT REALLY QUICK. PICKING A DATE IS VERY HELPFUL, YOU'RE ALL HERE, IT AVOIDS TRYING TO GO BACK AND FORTH. WE CAN START THE PROCESS SOONER RATHER THAN LATER, SO THAT WE HAVE GETTING INFORMATION TO THE COMMUNITY, GIVING THEM MORE TIME.

SO I DID CHECK WITH THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, WE HAVE A COUNCIL MEETING APRIL 7th, APRIL 14th IS THE PLANNING COMMISSION THEY DON'T ANTICIPATE HAVING A MEETING THAT NIGHT. SO WE CAN LOOK AT HAVING IT DURING THE DAY, OR DURING THE NIGHT. OR THE COUNCIL IF THEY WANT TO DO BEFORE COUNCIL MEETING WE COULD DO IT DURING THE DAY AS WELL. I KNOW VICE MAYOR MAURER HAD A COMMENT.



MARCH 31st, IS THE FIFTH TUESDAY. CAN WE DO IT THEN?

IT'S A CITY HOLIDAY. IT IS CESAR CHAVEZ DAY BUT THE COMMUNITY CENTER HAS RENTED OUT THE BUILDING.

OKAY.

I'M GOOD WITH THE 14th IN THE EVENING.

[ INAUDIBLE ]

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, HOW LONG ARE WE TALKING ABOUT FOR A MEETING?

THAT WOULD DEPEND HOW LONG THE COUNCIL WANTS TO MEET. OUR GOALS AND PRIORITIES WAS ABOUT SIX HOURS, I BELIEVE. I DON'T ANTICIPATE IT TAKING AS LONG, BECAUSE WE BASICALLY, WASN'T IT? I THOUGHT IT WAS BEFORE CITY COUNCIL MEETING IT STARTED AT --

IT WAS AN ALL DAY EVENT.

IT WAS AT LEAST FOUR HOURS. I THINK IF WE GIVE A LOT OF THE INFORMATION, IF WE HAVE A LOT OF THE INFORMATION COMPILED, LAST TIME WE WAITED UNTIL THAT DAY AND THEN WE TOOK PUBLIC COMMENT, INTO PROVIDING US THAT INFORMATION, BEFORE THIS MEETING SO THAT I CAN COMPILE IT, I DON'T THINK THAT WILL BRING US AS LONG. I WOULD LIKE TO NOT GO BEYOND THE APRIL 14th OR 15th DATE, BECAUSE WE HAVE THE BUDGET PROCESS COMING UP AND WE WANT TO INCORPORATE SOME OF THESE ITEMS INTO THE UPCOMING BUDGET.

OKAY. COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

I AM NOT WILLING TO TAKE A DAY OFF TO DO THIS DURING THE DAY. I'M SORRY. THAT MIGHT BE CONVENIENT FOR YOU BUT I'M WILLING TO DO IT ON THE NIGHT OF THE 14th OR ANY OTHER EVENING THAT WE CAN MAKE WORK FOR OUR CALENDARS.

GO AHEAD, VICE MAYOR.

LAST YEAR THE MEETING WAS FIVE HOURS, FROM 1:00 TO 6:00 AND WE FOLLOWED IT WITH A COUNCIL MEETING, MAYBE. WE DID. WE COULD PROBABLY DO IT IN FOUR, BECAUSE WE WON'T NEED ALL THE OTHER, WHEN WE DID IT LAST YEAR, THEY HAD A COUPLE HOURS OF REVIEW OF THIS AND THAT, I DON'T THINK WE NEED THAT.

WHAT TIME WOULD WE WANT TO BE STARTING? I'M NOT PRO ANOTHER FOUR HOUR MEETING, THAT PUTS US WEEK AFTER WEEK WHERE WE'RE HERE UNTIL 10:00 AT NIGHT. ARE YOU ALL KEEN ON THAT? I'M NOT ADVOCATING, I'M ADVOCATING FOR A SHORTER MEETING. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WHATEVER WE DO WE'RE NOT HERE UNTIL 10:00, 10:30 AT NIGHT.

LET'S SEE HOW WE CAN CUT IT.

WE CAN'T, THE SPIRIT OF IT.



I LIKE SHORTER MEETINGS BUT I'M WILLING TO GO TO WHAT IT TAKES. I LIKE SHORTER MEETINGS BUT I'M WILLING TO DO WHAT IT TAKES. WHATEVER THAT IS DEPENDING ON THE PROCESS.

LOOKING AT THE AGENDA FOR THE LAST MEETING, THE ACTUAL GOAL SET IN WAS BLOCKED OUT FOR BASICALLY THREE HOURS. AND THE REST OF IT, THERE WAS A REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL UPDATE, THE MODELS, AND WHAT MAKES GOOD GOVERNANCE, AND OTHER STUFF THAT TOOK UP THE REST OF THE TIME.

SO WHAT'S ON THE TABLE IS APRIL 14th, AT 6:00 P.M., IS THAT WHAT WE'RE SAYING?

WE COULD DO IT AT 5:30 IF THAT HELPS IN TERMS OF TIMING.

MY COMMITMENT TO THIS COUNCIL HAS ALWAYS BEEN TO 6:00 MEETINGS. IT'S DIFFICULT TO GET THROUGH TRAFFIC IF YOU HAVEN'T GONE DOWN 101 DURING COMMUTE HOURS AND YOU CAN'T GET IN THE COMMUTE LANE.

I'M OKAY WITH 6:00.

WE'LL NEED A MOTION TO RECOMMEND NOT HIRING A FACILITATOR INTO PROCEEDING WITH THE PROCESS AS OUTLINED IN THE CITY MANAGER AND PICKING THE APRIL 14th DATE, AND WILL BEGIN ANNOUNCING THAT AND GETTING INFORMATION TO THE COMMUNITY. AT 6:00 P.M.

OKAY, SO MOVED BY MAYOR McLEWIS, SECONDED BY VICE MAYOR MAURER TO NOT RECOMMEND SELECTION OF A FACILITATOR BUT TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PROCESS AS OUTLINED IN THE AGENDA REPORT, WITH A DATE OF APRIL 14th AT 6:00 P.M. TO BE HELD HERE. COUNCILMEMBER CARTER? [ ROLL BEING CALLED ] MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

LOOKING AT THE TIME, WE HAVE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT.

THIS A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA. IF YOU DID NOT TALK EARLIER IN THE AGENDA IF YOU'D LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT. PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE ON ZOOM, IF THERE'S ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA? THERE'S NO PUBLIC COMMENT THAT I'M SEEING.

THE NEXT THING IS COUNCILMEMBERS REQUEST FOR FUTURE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS. DO WE HAVE ANY REQUESTS? NOT AT THIS TIME, OKAY. NOW WE HAVE CITY STAFF REPORTS.

THANK YOU. SO, AGENDA REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING, TOMORROW, AND WE ALSO HAVE THE MENTAL FROM THE POLICE CHIEF. AND I DO NOT HAVE ANY FURTHER REPORTS AT THIS TIME. OTHER THAN OUR NEW PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR, AS YOU APPROVED THE CONTRACT WILL BE OUT ON MONDAY.

ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE? OKAY. SO NOW, CITY COUNCIL REPORTS? DOES ANYBODY HAVE ANYTHING NEW TO REPORT OUT? GO AHEAD.

I ATTENDED A CT CA LAST MONDAY. FOR THE MEETING, AND IT WAS REALLY A LIGHT AGENDA EXCEPT IT WAS THE OFFICER CHANGE, CHANGING OF THE GUARD, THERE'S ALWAYS A CITY REPRESENTATIVE, AND SINCE KELLY FROM HEALDSBURG WAS VICE CHAIR, SHE MOVED INTO THE CHAIR POSITION, AND THEN THERE'S A



SUPERVISOR THAT FILLS THE OTHER SEAT, AND CHRIS CORSI FILLED THE VICE CHAIR SEAT. I CONTINUE ON THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AS A FULL-FLEDGED MEMBER, LINDA HOPKINS MOVED TO ALTERNATE, AND I CONTINUE ON THE TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE COUNTY. SO, THAT IS BASICALLY, WE DID HEAR FROM OUR LOBBYIST, WE DO HIRE PEOPLE TO REPRESENT TRANSPORTATION FOR US AND HELP US IN SACRAMENTO, AND OTHER THAN THAT IT WAS PRETTY MUCH BASIC REPORTS. IT WAS PRETTY STANDARD MEETING.

OKAY. ANYONE ELSE? I CAN REPORT OUT FOR MINE. IT'S BEEN A LIGHT TWO WEEKS, ATTENDED THE AGENDA REVIEW, AND THEN WE HAD OUR MAYORS AND COUNCILMEMBERS, WE HAVE THE BOARD MEETING, AND THE MEETING FOR ALL THE COUNCILMEMBERS, AND THIS PAST WEEKEND, WAS IT SUNDAY? AFTER READING A LOT OF THE STUFF, IN THE NEWS, AND SOCIAL MEDIA, AND THE STATEMENT PUT OUT BY THE HUMANE SOCIETY ABOUT NORTHBAY ANIMAL SERVICES, AND THE CONCERN FOR THE ANIMALS AND WHAT THEY HAD FOUND IN CLEARLAKE, I BECAME CONCERNED. SO ON SUNDAY, I DROVE DOWN TO THE PETALUMA FACILITY, WHERE OUR ANIMALS ARE TAKEN BECAUSE I STARTED TO GET WORRIED, AND I POPPED IN THERE AND ASKED THEM, TOLD THEM WHO I WAS AND ASKED THEM IF THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO GIVE ME A TOUR. THEY WERE VERY PLEASANT, TOOK 10 MINUTES, AND THEY WALKED ME AROUND EVERYWHERE TO SHOW ME THE FACILITY, THEY SAID THEY DO THAT A LOT NOW, WITH EVERYTHING THAT'S BEEN IN THE NEWS. AND I FOUND THINGS TO BE IN GENERAL CLEAN AND I DIDN'T SEE ANYTHING THAT WAS CONCERNING TO ME. GOT TO PLAY WITH THE CATS A LITTLE BIT, AND ANYWAY, I WANTED TO REPORT OUT THAT I DID DO THAT, I DIDN'T TALK TO THEM ABOUT ANYTHING OTHER THAN MY OWN CATS AND DOGS, BUT I WAS VERY CONCERNED ABOUT IT. AND I WANTED TO LET THE COUNCIL KNOW THAT I WENT DOWN THERE AND DID THAT. THAT'S THE ONLY THINGS THAT I HAD OVER THE LAST TWO WEEKS.

THANK YOU FOR DOING THAT AND AS A FOLLOW-UP, I DO VOLUNTEER AT OUR HUMANE SOCIETY, AND WHAT I OVERHEARD AND SAW REMAINS THE REASON WHY I'M BRINGING THE AGENDA REPORT. TWO HAVE AGENDA REVIEW TOMORROW CONSIDER IMMEDIATE TERMINATION WITH THAT CENTER. HEARING STAFF HAVE TO COME IN ON SATURDAY AND SUNDAY TO PROCESS THE NUMBER OF ANIMALS THAT THEY ENDED UP HAVING TO TAKE AND WATCHING THE DOGS IN THE CONDITION THAT THEY WERE IN, THIS IS AFTER THEY WERE SHOWERED, IT'S UNCONSCIONABLE, TO ME. I DON'T REALLY CARE WHAT IS HAPPENING WITH WHATEVER, IT'S PART OF THE SAME SYSTEM THAT MALTREATED THESE ANIMALS. AND THEN I'LL ALSO SAY THE FACT THAT TODAY IS JAM-PACKED WITH MEETINGS, ON THE PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING, COMMITTEE AND WE DID THAT FOR AN HOUR AND A HALF, AND I WENT TO THE ELECTEDS, THERE'S A GROUP OF US THAT ARE ELECTEDS, AND THAT WAS EARLIER THIS AFTERNOON AND THEN I CAME HERE. THAT'S MY STATUS.

GO AHEAD.

I WANT TO GIVE A QUICK UPDATE. TO TELL YOU GUYS THAT THE ENTERPRISE FUND IS LOOKING AT THE WATER AND SEWER IS MAKING PRETTY GOOD PROGRESS. WE HAVE A FINANCIAL GROUP AND AN OPERATIONS GROUP, THE OPERATIONS GROUP TO GENERAL TOUR, AND THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT IS TAKING A FEEL -- FINE COMB TO THE PROCESS. I FEEL GOOD ABOUT WHAT WE'RE DOING AS A GROUP AND NOT TOO BURDENSOME ON STAFF.

ALL RIGHT. SO, I THINK THAT'S IT.



CAN I DO ONE MORE UPDATE I FORGOT. FOR THE ENTIRE GROUP, THE CITY COUNCIL, THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR THE COUNCIL PROTOCOLS HAS MET AND WE WILL BE BRINGING BACK ADDITIONAL TOPICS TO BE PLACED INTO THE COUNCIL PROTOCOL. WE NEED TO DISCUSS OUR NEXT MEETING.

ALL RIGHT. MEETING ADJOURNED, 10:25. THANKS. [Event Concluded]