

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

**Public Works Operations Supervisor,
Acting Public Works Director**

Erik Billing
ebilling@cityofsebastopol.gov

Sebastopol Commons Committee

Councilmember Stephen Zollman – Chair
RM Horrell – Vice Chair

**SEBASTOPOL COMMONS: BUILDING THE COMMONS COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2026
1:00 pm**

MEETING AGENDA

In Person Location: Sebastopol City Hall, City Hall Conference Room, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol

REMOTE TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION

Pursuant to Government Code §54953(e) of the Brown Act, the following Committee member will participate in this meeting remotely:

Committee Member Fred Engbarth, joining from 12125 Ramsey Road, Sebastopol

Due to remote participation by a committee member, for this meeting only, members of the public may also participate in the meeting and provide public comment remotely via Zoom.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84941469738?pwd=Zm9udmNQLPhCHRv5kES83fUFI9FmB4JvLy4o>

Meeting ID: 849 4146 9738

Passcode: 744217

One Tap Mobile

+16694449171, 82876197596# US

+16699006833, 82876197596# US (San Jose)

Join Instructions

https://us02web.zoom.us/join/84941469738?signature=JO2V_h2Wa0dzmNQLPhCHRv5kES83fUFI9FmB4JvLy4o

COUNCIL PROTOCOLS FOR MEETING:

This in person and virtual/remote meeting is compliant with the Governor’s Executive Order allowing for a deviation of teleconference rules required by the Brown Act. Traditional Brown Act and AB 2449 requirements can be utilized for all City Council meetings as long as required notice and posting is conducted per the Brown Act.

Please note the presiding member of the legislative body conducting a meeting or their designee may remove, or cause the removal of, an individual for disrupting the meeting. “Disrupting” means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT: *Written comments can be submitted to the Committee by sending them by email to: citypw@cityofsebastopol.gov with "Sebastopol Commons 02-10-2026" written in the subject line. Emails are posted to the Committee page as a public comment.*

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

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

PUBLIC COMMENT (2 Minute public comment time limit per speaker)

Consent Calendar Item(s):

1. Approval of Minutes of the February 10, 2026 Building the Commons Committee Meeting

Subcommittee Update(s):

2. Update from the Funding Assessment Subcommittee
3. Update from the Community Needs Assessment Subcommittee
 - a. COMMONS INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
 - b. 031026 Commons Survey Discussions
 - c. Refined Stakeholder Questions

New Business:

4. Quarterly Report to the City Council for the April 7, 2026 City Council Meeting.
 - a. Attachment A: DRAFT Agenda Second Quarterly Report Building the Commons_2026-04-14
 - b. Attachment B: 260210_commons_fin_subcom_report
 - c. Attachment C: Map

Subcommittee Composition:

5. Discussion of Restructuring of current Subcommittees or establishment of additional subcommittees (this is a standing agenda item and will only be discussed if new subcommittees are requested)
6. Identify focus topics of newly created subcommittees (this is a standing agenda item and will only be discussed if new subcommittees are created)

Timelines/Milestones/Next Steps:

7. What is required to be accomplished by the next meeting
8. What is required to be accomplished within three months
9. What is required to be accomplished within six months

Future Meetings:

10. Next Meeting Date: April 14, 2026 1:00 pm
11. Meeting Agenda Items for April 14, 2026 (the committee process is to approve the agenda items for the next Committee meeting)
12. Request for Future Agenda items (this is an opportunity for members to make requests for topics/agenda items/information for next meeting)

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

INFORMATION ONLY

13. A list of resources in the drop box for this Committee are *attached* (“13. Dropbox Items”) and can be found at the link below:
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/jukixk5i0u6qc6m6aopqm/AGhv7odAoAxAg1fG9gtrU4?rlkey=k418e247e7af3&st=1i2plhoj&dl=0>
14. Brown Act: <https://www.cacities.org/uploadedfiles/leagueinternet/Od/0dd433d2-29c5-410c-af4f-418e247e7af3.pdf>
15. Public Document Access: <https://www.cityofsebastopol.gov/boards-commissions-committees/>

American Disability Act Accommodations/Accessibility: A request can be made orally or in writing, and submitted to the ADA Coordinator by email: building@cityofsebastopol.org or to the City Clerk’s Office as to avoid delay in reviewing and processing the request. Requests can be made by contacting the ADA Coordinator’s Office at (707) 823-8597, via email at building@cityofsebastopol.org or by mailing such a request to the ADA Coordinator’s Office located at 7425 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA. Note that if you contact the ADA Coordinators Office, via mail, you need to make the request early enough that a response can be timely provided.

If you have any questions regarding this meeting, please contact the City at citypw@cityofsebastopol.gov or please call: 707-823-5331. The public is advised that pursuant to Government Code section 54957.5 all writings submitted to the Committee are public records and will be made available for review at 714 Johnson Street, Sebastopol, CA during normal business hours.

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

**Public Works Operations Supervisor,
Acting Public Works Director**
Erik Billing
ebilling@cityofsebastopol.gov

Sebastopol Commons Committee

Councilmember Stephen Zollman – Chair
RM Horrell – Vice Chair

**SEBASTOPOL COMMONS: BUILDING THE COMMONS COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2026
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm**

**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
(ABBREVIATED)**

In Person Location: Sebastopol City Hall, City Hall Conference Room, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol
Remote Teleconference Participation: 12125 Ramsey Road, Sebastopol

CALL TO ORDER: *Councilmember Zollman called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm*

ROLL CALL:

Attendees: ***Committee:*** *Councilmember Stephen Zollman, Councilmember Phill Carter, RM Horrell, Sarah Glade Gurney, Naomi Hupert, Kent Jenkins, Mary Lou Schmidt, Remote: Fred Engbarth and Deb Hoadley (non-voting)*
Other: *None*
Absent:
City Staff: *Mary Gourley, Erik Billing, Elissa Overton*

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.

Consent Calendar Item(s):

- 1. Approval of Minutes of the January 13, 2026 Building the Commons Committee Meeting
 - a. **Motion for Approval: Yay’s: 8, Nay’s: 0, Absent: 1**

Subcommittee Update(s):

- 2. Update from the Funding Assessment Subcommittee
 - a. Presentation. Visual not recorded. Audio available.
- 3. Update from the Community Needs Assessment Subcommittee
 - a. Will be given at the next meeting

Subcommittee Composition:

- 4. Discussion of Restructuring of current Subcommittees or establishment of additional subcommittees (this is a standing agenda item and will only be discussed if new subcommittees are requested)
- 5. Identify focus topics of newly created subcommittees (this is a standing agenda item and will only be discussed if new subcommittees are created)

Motion to define purpose of the committee:

Our purpose is to create a long-term solution included with the charge of our advent and that in doing so we're weighing the elements of cost, location, and access, and that timeliness and immediacy of satisfaction of these needs are elements thereof.

Motion for Approval: Yay's: 8, Nay's: 0, Absent: 1

New Business:

6. Discuss quarterly Report to the City Council for the April 7, 2026 City Council Meeting

Timelines/Milestones/Next Steps:

7. What is required to be accomplished by the next meeting
8. What is required to be accomplished within three months
9. What is required to be accomplished within six months

Future Meetings:

10. Next Meeting Date: **March 10, 2026 at 1:00 pm**
11. Meeting Agenda Items for March 10, 2026 (the committee process is to approve the agenda items for the next Committee meeting
 - a. **Reminders will be sent two weeks and one week prior to the meeting, with one week prior being the deadline for subcommittee reports.**
12. Request for Future Agenda items (this is an opportunity for members to make requests for topics/agenda items/information for next meeting)

I. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

- Councilmember Zollman adjourned the meeting at: 3:00 pm

Submitted by: Elissa Overton, City Staff Member

ATTACHED:

Attachment A – AI transcription of meeting minutes

ATTACHMENT A

THE FOLLOWING DATA IS GENERATED BY AI AND CONTAINS INACCURATE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE DISCUSSIONS THAT TOOK PLACE. PLEASE LISTEN TO THE AUDIO RECORDING FOR CLARIFICATION AND FURTHER DETAILS.

The Finance Committee presented a comprehensive analysis of potential locations for the Sebastopol Commons project, evaluating sites including the O'Reilly building, Railroad Forest, Calder Creek corridor, and downtown locations. Each site was assessed using SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) considering factors like cost, accessibility, flood risk, parking, and timelines. The committee passed a motion establishing that location selection will be guided by financial viability, accessibility, community impact, agency accommodation, and timeliness. A key discussion focused on whether the committee should pursue immediate solutions versus long-term vision, ultimately agreeing to create a lasting solution where timeliness is a weighted factor rather than a separate short-term approach. The committee confirmed their next meeting on March 10th to review both the finance and needs assessment reports, with a potential additional meeting between March 10-31st to finalize the April 7th City Council report. The Council report will be informational, including summary findings and attached detailed reports with a map of evaluated locations.

Key Considerations Discussed

- **Transportation:** Senior accessibility is a concern for any location. Committee noted that transportation services are provided for those who need it, and no location within city boundaries eliminates walking challenges for all residents.
- **Parking:** O'Reilly has existing adequate parking. Other sites would require creative solutions including multi-level parking structures (\$2 million per 40 cars).
- **Urgency:** Senior Center has immediate space needs and is ready to launch a capital campaign within 18 months. Community Center also faces current space challenges.
- **Funding approach:** O'Reilly option would require partnership with 3-5 different entities. Long-term vision sites would need 1-2 major donors attracted by architectural vision.
- **Climate resilience:** O'Reilly building offers high ground, generator, heating/cooling, and potential evacuation center capability.
- **Sustainability:** Repurposing O'Reilly keeps 45,000 sq ft of material out of landfill.

Sites Evaluated

1. **O'Reilly Campus:** Existing 45,000 sq ft facility available for approximately \$20 million with three buildings including warehouse space. Advantages include immediate availability, ADA compliance, existing parking, fiber internet, generator, and climate resilience (out of floodplain). Could serve as evacuation center. Challenges include distance from downtown core and need for creative financing with multiple partner entities.

2. **Railroad Forest:** New build opportunity with green space access and trail connectivity. Estimated \$12-23 million. Challenges include single access point on busy road, flooding issues, and significant infrastructure requirements.
3. **Calder Creek Civic Commons:** City-owned space between existing buildings. Would require significant investment (\$60+ million) for creek daylighting, remediation of former laundry site contamination, and multi-story construction. Offers downtown location but faces long timeline and complex challenges.
4. **Rite Aid Building Adaptive Reuse:** \$10 million purchase with \$40K/month rent. Poor condition would require extensive work, total cost approaching \$30 million.
5. **Current library/City Hall:** Expanding would require relocating City Hall, taking down existing buildings, and addressing parking. Estimated 5+ years of planning and potential lawsuits.
6. **Hall Site:** 1.5-2 million acquisition, suitable for library only, would be new build far from center.
7. **Tow Building (Petaluma Ave):** 3,700 sq ft at \$1.5 million. Deemed inadequate for needs and would require extensive renovation or rebuild.

After extensive discussion about whether to pursue short-term solutions versus long-term vision. It was discussed that in the process of selecting a location, factors will include financial viability, accessibility, ease of access, community impact, availability for all agencies the committee is looking to partner with, and timeliness. The committee will recommend a location to Council that represents a long-term solution, with timeliness being one of the weighted factors in decision-making rather than pursuing separate short-term and long-term solutions.

RM Horrell stated “The goal is to live up to the charge and create this vision. One of the elements of getting the decision around which place to go is also going to include the turnaround timeline of making it happen. That saves money because the economy continues to get more expensive. Looking at building this year vs. 10 years saves money.

Timeliness is an element to making long-term decisions about the vision, but it’s not separate and indistinct. We are going to work on this in the meantime

We are going to create this vision that has ongoing and lasting and legacy impact for the City, Senior Center, The Library, etc., in these ways. Part of our decision about where it is going to go and what we do is going to include prioritizing the timeliness thereof because we save money on building, we save money in the long run “

The committee passed a motion clarifying their approach:

Motion (unanimously approved):

Our purpose is to create a long-term solution included with the charge of our advent and that in doing so we're weighing the elements of cost, location, and access, and that timeliness and immediacy of satisfaction of these needs are elements thereof.

This motion resolved ongoing debate about the committee's scope. Key points of discussion included:

- Fred emphasized the importance of community representation and questioned whether the committee should focus on short-term or long-term investments
- RM clarified that the Finance Committee is currently evaluating financial implications of potential visions before moving to funding development, as donors need a clear plan to support
- Kent stressed that the Senior Center has immediate needs and questioned whether the committee should address current problems or focus solely on visionary projects
- Mary expressed concern about alignment with City Council's original charge, which established the committee to create a vision for a commons
- The group agreed that pursuing a location like O'Reilly could fulfill both the commons vision and address immediate needs without constituting a "short-term solution" separate from the vision
- Naomi emphasized that delaying too long would cause organizations with immediate needs to pursue separate solutions, undermining the commons concept

Vision and Funding Strategy Alignment

Fred raised important questions about the committee's scope, asking whether they should focus on financial analysis versus funding development, and expressing concern about community representation in the process.

RM responded by clarifying the committee's phased approach:

1. Current phase: Evaluating financial implications of various location options
2. Next phase: Once a vision/location is selected, transition to funding development
3. Rationale: Cannot approach donors (county, state, major donors) without a concrete plan to present

The committee has compiled an internal document listing dozens of potential funding sources, which will be refined once a specific location and vision are selected. The choice of location will influence which donors to approach (e.g., pursuing O'Reilly family donations if selecting the O'Reilly building).

Mary clarified that the committee's charge from City Council is to create a visionary commons solution. If the committee wants to explicitly address immediate needs as part of that vision (rather than solely focusing on a future project), this should be clarified with Council to ensure alignment with their intent when establishing the committee.

Community Commons Vision Implementation

The committee clarified that the library has been the assumed baseline throughout all discussions. The Finance Committee's work focused on identifying locations that could accommodate library expansion while partnering with other organizations (senior center, community center, nonprofits, health services) to create a true commons.

Key commons principles discussed:

- Multi-generational spaces serving children, families, and seniors
- Shared reception/welcome desk reducing administrative redundancy
- Coordinated scheduling among partner organizations
- Cafe and outdoor spaces for community gathering
- Flexible spaces for nonprofits, county services, or private practice offices
- Meeting rooms, auditorium/performance space, and exercise facilities
- Expanded library concept with study spaces and modern amenities

The O'Reilly building was highlighted as offering courtyard space for outdoor dining, potential daycare with playground access, numerous existing offices that could be leased to offset costs, and a large warehouse space suitable for performances, exercise, or community events.

Bill noted that a 10-year study already identified the current library needs to double in size, and current facilities don't serve the purposes envisioned in expanded library concepts like those in Roseland, Petaluma, Walnut Creek, and Boulder, Colorado.

Next City Council Report Planning

The committee extensively discussed logistics for their April 7th report to City Council:

Timeline Established

- **March 10th (Regular Meeting):** Review both Finance Assessment Subcommittee and Community Needs Assessment Subcommittee reports, discuss Mary's compiled draft Agenda Report for Council
- **Between March 10-31st:** Hold additional special meeting if needed to finalize edits to the Agenda Report before April 7th Council meeting
- **Staff preparation:** Coordinate interpreters for any additional meeting

Report Content and Format

After debate about whether to provide a summary versus detailed report, the committee decided:

- **Format:** Informational report (not requiring Council action/direction)
- **Content:** Mary will prepare a summary based on both subcommittee reports
- **Attachments:** Full detailed reports from both sub committees, plus map showing all evaluated locations with addresses
- **Approach:** Make clear that no immediate recommendations are being made; committee is showing progress and continuing to explore options
- **Philosophy:** Be transparent about work completed while avoiding premature specificity that might generate controversy before committee is ready

Sarah advocated for transparency, arguing the public and Council need to see the detailed work. RM emphasized that the Finance Committee report is already written to avoid appearing as a recommendation, clearly stating options are being ruled in/out based on preliminary analysis and remaining open to new suggestions.

Phil noted the April timeline to head to City Council is feasible, rather than delaying to May (which would conflict with Council budget work and goals-setting).

Next Steps Summary

- Mary will prepare a summary report for the April 7th City Council meeting, integrating the Finance Assessment subcommittee and Community Assessment subcommittee reports, with attached detailed documents and a map of potential locations with addresses

DRAFT SURVEY PACKET

INTRODUCTION
INTERVIEWS WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS

1. ONE-ON-ONE INTERVIEWS WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS

One-on-one (1-on-1) interviews with community leaders provide high-value, in-depth insights, building trust and strengthening relationships to foster collaboration and engagement. These personalized, confidential sessions uncover community assets, motivations, and hidden issues while allowing for detailed exploration of topics that group discussions might miss. They are essential for mapping local power structures and identifying key stakeholders.

One-on-one face to face interviews is in many ways mini 'immersions', as the researcher goes into people's homes combining interview with observation, so they have lots of value.

For more information:

Social Work Skills for Community Practice, 2nd Edition

Chapter 2: Entering the Community and Using Interviewing Skills to Understand People, Issues, and Opportunities

https://connect.springerpub.com/highwire_display/entity_view/node/165211/content_details

The Guide to Interview Analysis

<https://atlasti.com/guides/interview-analysis-guide/face-to-face-interview-research>

2. CIVIC COMMONS

Urban spaces periodically need to be rethought and renewed by their communities,

The City of Sebastopol has this unique opportunity to revitalize the heart of its downtown, a challenge that so many small towns now face.

Sebastopol usually has limited levers to materially influence its economic vitality. Reimagining our use of public spaces into as a new civic commons is the most powerful and immediate lever our community can use to boost

economic vitality and give our community a significant community-gathering place.

We believe the new civic commons will inspire people from all over Sebastopol, Sonoma County and the Greater Bay Area to come, enjoy the space, and experience all that our beautiful downtown has to offer—shopping, dining, entertainment and leisure.

Building the Sebastopol Commons focuses on revitalizing public spaces—like parks, libraries, and trails—to build social capital and trust

For more Information on Civic Commons and Public Spaces see:

Why America Needs a Strong Civic Commons

<https://civiccommons.us/app/uploads/2024/10/Why-America-Needs-a-Strong-Civic-Commons.pdf>

How Cities Are Getting Creative To Reclaim Public Space for People

<https://usa.streetsblog.org/2024/09/03/how-cities-are-getting-creative-to-reclaim-public-space-for-people>

Why public spaces are a basic need for cities (World Economic Forum)

<https://www.weforum.org/stories/2015/04/why-public-spaces-are-a-basic-need-for-cities/>

Public spaces could better meet community needs: survey

<https://www.smartcitiesdive.com/news/public-spaces-could-better-meet-community-needs-survey/744346/#:~:text=He%20suggested%20that%20streamlining%20bureaucratic,2023:%20chief%20public%20realm%20officer.>

What public spaces inspire you? The nonprofit Project for Public Spaces asked more than 700 public space stakeholders that question in a survey to mark its 50th anniversary. Respondents named 375 public spaces or placemaking projects around the world. U.S. locations ranged from Soldotna Creek Park in Soldotna, Alaska, which the city website calls “our community’s back yard,” to a “place of celebration” in front of Casa Museo Ismael Rivera in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in the words of architect Omayra Rivera Crespo.

PART 1. DICSCUSSION GUIDE

Interviewee Name:
Title / Organization:
Interviewer:
Date:

Directions for Use

This discussion guide is designed to facilitate conversations with community leaders. While the questions are structured by area of focus, we've included supplemental questions on topics that you may add if relevant and time permits.

Be flexible and allow the discussion to evolve organically, even if it leads to areas outside of the pre-listed questions. Valuable insights can often emerge from these less structured exchanges.

1. ICE BREAKERS:

How long have you lived in Sebastopol?

Please tell me about your organization and your role within it.

What are the top 3 changes your organization has encountered in the past two years?

From your organization's perspective, what are the top 1-3 critical challenges facing Sonoma County and its residents today? (e.g., housing, workforce, education, aging population)

Are you working at your/your organization's full potential?

What are the obstacles in the way of your accomplishment of your full potential?

Can you suggest potential partners with whom you could experience synergy and/or build collaboration towards your goals?

Do you know of any missing element for others that you might also experience or not experience?

If you could add any service that would enhance our community, what would it be and who would provide it?

2. PLACES IN SEBASTOPOL

Trusting spaces indicate whether people have places to meet and connect with neighbors. We assess that in two ways.

Can you provide me with examples of “third spaces” known to foster conversation and exchange in or within ¼ mile of a neighborhood?

Can you provide me with examples of green or public spaces in or within ¼ mile of a neighborhood?

What are examples of small-scale projects that enhance the quality of life for residents can result in meaningful impact in rural communities. Using the following questions, think through the places that are not only unique, but significant to your community’s identity.

Where is the place that is most representative of our community’s identity?

What spaces in our community best reflect our collective identity?

Where are the places in our community that we bring our visitors to experience the best that we offer?

3. PARTNERSHIPS TO HELP BUILD THE CIVIC COMMONS

Successful and sustainable community building efforts are driven by the collaboration of community leaders, elected officials, nonprofits, small businesses, and other stakeholders in the community – but most importantly those efforts are typically driven by people who love their community. Using the following questions, identify the stakeholders and partners in your community that can help you achieve your goals.

Who are the partners involved in our small-scale and large-scale community projects?

Who are our community champions or changemakers?

Who are the individuals that are effective spokespersons for our community, find funding opportunities, and push for new projects?

What organizations are the glue of our community?

Who can be involved in this initiative as a partner, sponsor, or volunteer?

4. STRENGTHS AND ASSETS OF OUR COMMUNITY:

We don’t have to start from scratch when it comes to community placemaking. Leveraging the strengths and assets already in place can be a great place to start for small-scale community building projects.

What are the best things about our community?
What are elements of our community that we want to preserve and maintain?
What are some small-scale projects that could help enhance our community?

5. TIMELINE

When considering your answers to this survey consider the following questions to assess a realistic timeline:

Where should we start?
What are specific activities that can be completed within one year?
When do we want to have our goals accomplished?

6. OPPORTUNITIES

Based on your answers to the questions above, identify your view of our opportunities:

What are the gaps that we need to fill?
What impact could we have, even with a small-scale effort?

II. SUPPLEMENTAL TOPICS

If time allows or interest is expressed the following are some addition areas of discussion.

We would like you opinion on any one or all of the following Optional Interview Questions:

1. COMMUNITY RESILIENCY: Community resilience is the sustained ability of a community to utilize available resources to prepare for, withstand, adapt to, and recover from adverse situations, such as natural disasters, economic downturns, or public health emergencies. It involves strengthening social, economic, and infrastructure systems to minimize disruption, promote equity, and ensure rapid, proactive recovery.

"How do you rate our community's resilience?" This question seeks to your assessment of our community's ability to address, social, economic, or environmental challenges

2. SEBASTOPOL AS A SELF-HEALING COMMUNITY: A self-healing community is a locality that uses data, cross-sector collaboration, and local leadership to proactively address the root causes of adversity—such as trauma and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)—to foster long-term resilience and

well-being. By changing cultural norms and improving social connections, these communities create safe, stable, and nurturing environments.

Based on recent community planning documents, surveys, and local initiatives, Sebastopol is actively working toward becoming a self-healing and resilient community, with specific focus on environmental sustainability, mental health support, and trauma-informed care/ Areas of improvement?

What is your assessment of Sebastopol as a self-healing community

3. INFORMATION COMMONS: An information commons are a shared, collaborative, and often physical space—typically within libraries or academic institutions—designed to provide free or easy access to digital resources, technology, and information services. It serves as a hub for learning and research, bridging traditional information resources with modern, digital, and collaborative tools.

What is your opinion on the value of an information commons to our community? Describe you vision of such an information hub.

PART 2: GUIDE FOR THE PEOPLE CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS

Hello,

Thank you for contributing such a strong list of influential community leaders for the upcoming interviews. We have a robust list of over ____ names.

We've prioritized the list. In developing this prioritization, we were intentional about ensuring representation across leadership influence, diverse perspectives, and service locations. We believe this approach will help capture a broader and more inclusive range of voices.

To streamline the process, we've pre-assigned interviewers based on service location, role alignment, and areas of expertise.

Attached you'll find:

- Your assigned list of community leaders/contacts to interview. We aimed for no more than two interviews per person.
- Discussion guidelines and questions, organized by category specific to your assigned interview area of focus. Please note that there are option topics guides based on interviewee. Please ensure that you use the correct one.
- Sample invitation/script for outreach.
- Tips for conducting interviews (before, during, and after).

If you're available to take on additional interviews, we'd greatly appreciate the support — please reach out to _____ directly. This will ensure that we do not duplicate our efforts and that our geographic representations are maintained.

Please note that, in addition to the interviews, we will conduct a heavily marketed community survey, to ensure that everyone in the county has an opportunity to share feedback.

Interview timeline: Now through _____. Whenever possible and to create connection, conduct interviews in person, via Zoom, or by phone. Some participants may prefer to review the questions in advance — that's perfectly fine. When completed, please email them to me at _____--.

Thank you again for your commitment to this important effort and for helping us build authentic connections across our community.

Warm regards,
Building the Commons

at

PART 3: SAMPLE LETTER OF INVITATIONS TO COMMUNITY LEADER

Subject line: Invitation to Share Your Insights on Building the Sebastopol Commons.

Hello [Name],

The City of Sebastopol has launched a Building the Sebastopol Commons planning process, an exciting new initiative to better understand the services our community values—both now and in the years ahead. As part of this effort, we’re speaking with key community leaders to gather their insights and perspectives.

WHAT IS A CIVIC COMMONS? A Civic Commons is a network of shared public spaces—such as parks, libraries, trails, and community centers—reimagined to foster social connection, equity, and community resilience. These initiatives aim to transform public assets into places where people of all backgrounds can gather, bridging socioeconomic divides and improving quality of life in cities.

The concept emphasizes that public spaces are not just "nice to have" amenities but essential, critical infrastructure that can combat economic segregation and social isolation. Reimagined spaces are intentionally designed to encourage interaction among diverse groups of people.

Building the Commons" is a City of Sebastopol initiative focusing on community-driven development to address local needs through a three-stage process: initiation, implementation, and sustainability. The project involves an Oversight Committee holding meetings at City Hall, with a recent focus on establishing core values and assessing community assets.

Given your influence we would greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak with you.

Would you be willing to join me for a conversation about Sebastopol's future and how a revisioning of public spaces withing Sebastopol can best support your organization’s mission and the support our community. The discussion should take no more than 45 minutes, and I’m happy to adjust to your schedule.

Thank you for considering this invitation—I hope you’ll be able to participate.

Warm regards,
[Your Name]
[Your Title / Organization]

PART 4

SOME COMMUNITY LEADER INTERVIEW TIPS

Before the interviews:

1. The Building the Commons Committee identified organizations/individuals to be interviewed and assigned interviewers based on location and priority. See interview list.
2. Target date for the completion of interviews is _____ -
3. 3.Suggest that the person you are interviewing spend some time, before the interview, reviewing and thinking about their response to the selected topics.
4. Schedule the interviews in advance. It's a good idea to give prospective interviewees an idea of how long the discussion may last - up to 45 minutes is generally a safe bet.

During the interviews:

1. Use a convent method to record the results of the interviews using the Core and Supplement Topics as desire.
- 2 Your time with the person being interview should as dialogue. not an interrogation.
3. f the interviewee strays from the questionnaire and is providing valuable or relevant Information, embrace the tangent!

After the interviews:

1. Encourage the interviewee to follow up the interview with written and/or recorded comments.
2. Discuss the work of the Building the Common's Committee and inform the interviewee on how he/she could participate in the planning process.
3. Send prompt thank you notes to all individuals who participate and ask them what the best way would be to share the community survey link with their networks.

For 3/10/26 meeting, “Agenda Item #3a. Commons Interview Questions”
Submitted by Kent Jenkins, Member

At the February 10th Committee meeting, we added “timeliness” to our conceptualization of “The Commons.” As representative of the Sebastopol Area Senior Center, I am committed to bringing Commons Concepts to solving immediate space and collaboration needs. That is different from furthering the development of Commons Concepts that will one day be applied to a City project. I believe we should be emphasizing who can come together now, and how the City can support and benefit from an immediate execution of a Commons approach.

With that addition in mind, I’ve reviewed the Draft Survey Packet and pulled together a single page summary, seeking the answers we need to move ahead now. This compact survey is intended only for our identified community leaders, who already are familiar with the local scene. Broader public surveys will require a different approach and will be needed to inform final execution steps.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

We are asking leading members of our community for their thoughts about creating a West County Commons that would be in the City of Sebastopol. The Commons will be a place that brings together the library, civic functions and key community non-profits to share resources and facilitate collaboration.

1) WHO & WHAT?

- Who should be invited to join the Commons?
 - Who needs a new home?
 - Who is willing to join others?
 - What are their space needs and special feature requirements?
- What commercial entities might be a good fit?
- Who would be influential in bringing these people and entities together?
- Who in the greater Sonoma County needs to be involved?

2) WHERE?

- If you could put the Commons anywhere in Sebastopol, where would it go?
- What do you see as the biggest advantage and obstacle to your first choice location?

3) INTENDED AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES...

- What do you find most exciting about the possibility of a Commons?
- What is your biggest concern about creating a Commons?

Needs Assessment Subcommittee's Refined Stakeholder Questions

For interviews with business or non profit leaders

- How large is your organization/ business
- What will help your organization or business succeed in West county (or this community)
- Are there major obstacles for your business or organization at this time? What would help to address them?
- Have you or would you considering partnering with another business or organization to achieve your goals?
- If there was a community space to share , what would make it work for you ?

Note: Other practical questions (square footage, \$, etc.) are all good ones to ask if someone is interested.

For community members

- What do you feel are the most important spaces a community needs to thrive?
- Do you feel these spaces are adequately addressed in our community (west County?)
- If not, what would you like to change to make you want to use community spaces?
- Out of the following what do you feel are the most important community space
 - Library
 - Senior center
 - Community center
 - Meeting rooms
 - Playgrounds/parks



CITY OF SEBASTOPOL CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM REPORT FOR MEETING OF: April 7, 2026

To: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
From: Sebastopol Commons: Building the Commons Committee
Responsible Department: Public Works
Subject: Sebastopol Commons: Building the Commons Committee Second Quarterly Report

RECOMMENDATION That the City Council receive the second informational report from the Building the Commons Committee.

PROCESS OF AGENDA ITEM:

- a. Presentation of agenda item by the Requestor or Responsible Department
- b. Questions and discussion from Councilmembers
- c. Public comment period
- d. Presentation Received

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY This report reflects the Committee’s continued work and progress to advance the Sebastopol Commons as a vibrant, shared civic asset.

BACKGROUND The Sebastopol Commons is envisioned as a shared civic space and multi-use community hub within Sebastopol city limits, serving West Sonoma County residents. It is intended to support education, arts & culture, health & wellness, senior services, community connection, recreational classes, and potentially public library or library-adjacent functions that foster learning, access, and civic engagement.

The Building the Commons Oversight Committee was established by City Council action in 2025. It is charged with guiding early concept development, assessing community needs, exploring funding strategies, and providing quarterly reports to Council on progress in the following areas:

- Identifying and securing membership
- Developing lists of needs and shared needs
- Compiling research on similar projects
- Exploring and defining the project concept and determining the scope of a feasibility study
- Performing other related duties as assigned by the City Council

DISCUSSION:

As part of the responsibilities of the Committee, the Committee was tasked with providing quarterly updates. Tonight’s item provides the second quarterly update. The Committee has two ad hoc committees formed: The Finance Committee and the Community Needs Committee. Both have provided informational status reports and those are attached for reference. Highlights of the reports are listed below:

BUILDING THE COMMONS AD HOC FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:

The attached February 10, 2026 report from the Ad Hoc Finance Subcommittee provides a preliminary analysis of six location/approach options. No location is final or preferred; all are early-stage concepts only. The committee



City of Sebastopol

discussed preliminary options, financing overview on preliminary options, as well as Facility Needs Priorities (critical/immediate/future/peripheral and subsidiary).

At the February 10, 2026 Committee Meeting, the Committee approved to: (Add Motion from Meeting as moved by RM and seconded by Sarah)

BUILDING THE COMMONS AD HOC NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:

The attached DRAFT survey packet is a guide that the ad hoc committee members will be using to conduct one-on-one interviews with community leaders to gather high-value, in-depth insights on community assets, motivations, challenges, partnerships, public spaces, identity, resiliency, and priorities. These personalized sessions will build trust, strengthen relationships, map stakeholders, and uncover opportunities that inform the Commons vision.

Future Items:

It is anticipated that the Committee will complete initial community needs assessments; advance potential site and funding options evaluation; and report back with progress toward a viable commons concept with recommendations at that time for Council discussion and consideration.

STAFF ANALYSIS The Committee continues refining the vision while working on immediate needs as planning progresses.

CITY COUNCIL GOALS / PRIORITIES / GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY This item aligns with City Council goals:

- Community Vitality: Enhance Sebastopol as a great place to live that values community health and wellbeing; preserve unique character.
- Infrastructure: Maintain high-quality facilities and services, including repairing/replacing outdated city facilities.
- High Performance Organization: Restore public trust; improve public communications.
- Economic Development

General Plan Consistency

- Action CSF 6c–6d: Collaborate with County library system and partners to expand library services/facilities.
- Action CSF 6j: Conduct needs assessments and prioritize public/community facility improvements with extensive outreach.
- Action CSF 6e: Establish innovative funding approaches for cultural, community, and library facilities/services.

Supports Sonoma County Mayors and Councilmembers Association priorities on shared facilities, mental health, homelessness, and emergency preparedness.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH One-on-one leader interviews using the attached discussion guide to gather insights on assets, challenges, partnerships, public spaces, and priorities will be conducted.



City of Sebastopol

PUBLIC COMMENT As of preparation, no written public comments received. Any received after publication will be provided as supplemental materials. Oral comments may be provided during the public comment period.

PUBLIC NOTICE Noticed in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act; available for public review at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT There is no additional fiscal impact associated with receipt of this informational item.

RESTATED RECOMMENDATION That the City Council receive the informational report.

OPTION(S) None. This item is informational only.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Sebastopol Commons Finance Subcommittee Second Quarterly Report to Full Committee, dated February 10, 2026 (6 pages; includes S.W.O.T., financing analysis, and needs summary).
2. Draft Survey Packet: Interviews with Community Leaders – Building the Sebastopol Commons (Discussion Guide Final Draft, dated 02-08-2026; full interview questions, supplemental topics, interviewer guide, sample invitation, and tips).

Sebastopol Commons Finance Subcommittee

02/10/2026 Report to Full Committee

Subcommittee Members:

RM Horrell (Chair)

Phill Carter (Council Member)

Naomi Hupert

Kent Jenkins

PROCESS and PRIORITIES

The following is the Finance Subcommittee's February Report to the full Committee.

This Subcommittee is focused on serving the community's needs and ensuring the City's financial viability. The Finance Subcommittee invites the full Committee, and indeed the Community, to collaborate in this process.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Below, this Subcommittee has identified several different options that we are considering as possible locations for a Commons location.

These are each examples of different approaches:

- a **new build**, where new construction is needed to create a Commons building;
- the **repurposing or remodeling** of an existing structure that would need a moderate to extensive amount of construction to accommodate a Commons; and
- a **remediation or rebuilding** of an existing structure that would take minimal to moderate construction to accommodate a Commons.

Please note:

- These are options that we have considered in light of their respective:
 - location, size, availability, proximity to Sebastopol's downtown, and
 - a range of other criteria that we have gathered from members of the Commons Committee as they continue their outreach to the community.
- None of these options has been pursued outside of gathering the information below. We encourage feedback or questions regarding this information, and additional suggestions regarding locations to consider.

S.W.O.T

The following is a preliminary analysis of plausible locations, looking at Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats of each.

	New Build	Repurposed/Remodel	Remediated/Rebuild
Proof of Concept/ Example	RAILROAD PROPERTY	THE TOWING CO. BUILDING/Other brownfield	CALDER CREEK CORRIDOR
STRENGTHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Laguna/forest area ~Beautiful and well treed, ~Centrally located ~Walkable location ~Purchase Price (1.5M) ~Lot is big enough to build a 40,000 sqft building envelope ~Existing building has a footprint of 15k feet and 35k usable interior space. ~ PRIVATE FINANCING more enticing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Walkable Location ~Ives Calder Creek Corridor adjacent ~Lowest cost option by far (\$2-4.5M) Fastest acquisition and retrofit timeline (12-18 months) ~Low risk—small investment, reversible decision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Central and close to other city-related institutions: city hall, Center for the Arts ~remediates environmental problems ~Walkable location ~Possible collaboration with ongoing Corridor walkway planning
WEAKNESSES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Not city-owned, ~floodplane ~Outside of the heart of downtown Sebastopol ~Likely extended development process for purchase, planning and new construction (Laguna environmental studies) ~Impacts on traffic on the congested 12 and 116. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Not city-owned ~Likely extended development process for purchase, planning and new construction ~Existing conditions UNDERSIZED: 3,700 SF existing + space for parking and vs. 20-30k+ SF need— ~Existing requires full renovation or demo Cinderblock construction limits architectural quality ~Difficult to solve for 2 library, Senior Center or CommunityCenter ~Location not central, not environmentally beautiful (Library), nor high-visibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~MOST COMPLEX option (building + creek restoration + business relocations) ~City-owned portion limited/existing facilities ~Extensive remediation ~Possible conflict with ongoing Corridor walkway planning ~Likely extended development process and cost for purchase, planning and new construction
OPPORTUNITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Revitalizes the Sebastopol edge of the Joe Rodota Trail ~Accessible via the Joe Rodota Trail for equitable access via bike/foot/bus/car ~ Position Sebastopol as model for nature-integrated civic infrastructure ~Create year-round outdoor programming connection to forest/trails ~Potential partnership with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Revitalizes a Sebastopol derelict property ~Interim solution while planning larger project ~Could become permanent satellite senior activity space ~Low-stakes pilot for city facility operations (Resellable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Transform downtown identity—becomes 'the creek town' destination ~ Combine grant potential from state/federal climate and CUSP and CalTrans ~Create model for California downtown ecological restoration ~Attract regional visitors and tourism with iconic public space

	Laguna Foundation for stewardship		~Catalyze private investment in adjacent parcels
THREATS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Proximity to Joe Rodota Trail and any safety issues connected thereto ~Challenging street crossing at 12 despite crosswalk lighting ~ Laguna flooding /environmental issues could delay or halt project CEQA review ~ Property owner may not sell or may demand premium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates distraction from necessary larger investment Consumes staff time and political capital for minimal benefit Community perceives as 'giving up' on real solution Renovation costs could exceed value for such small space May require additional investment just to meet accessibility standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Cost overruns on complex multi-phase project ~Business displacement creates political opposition ~Environmental permitting delays from multiple agencies ~Economic downturn could strand project mid-construction ~Creek restoration could uncover contamination or infrastructure conflicts ~Community fatigue from extended construction period
SCALE:			
SUBTOTAL			
WEIGHT			
TOTAL			
FOLLOW-UP			

	Renovate/Remodel	Renovate/Remodel	Repurpose
<i>Proof of Concept/ Example</i>	The Rite Aid Building Adaptive reuse	CURRENT LIBRARY BUILDING	O'RILEY BUILDING
STRENGTHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Downtown location (50 yards from current senior center) ~Fastest timeline of renovation options (18-24 months) ~30'+ ceiling height enables dramatic loft library design ~Solves site vacancy problem if Grocery Outlet permit is denied ~Supports downtown businesses and walkability, near current assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~No land acquisition cost—city owned ~Downtown location preserves library's current central role ~Maintains continuity with existing civic campus identity ~Could integrate City Hall modernization in single project ~Avoids 'abandoning downtown' political narrative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Protected outdoor open space ~Multigenerational safety and access ~Walkable location, but outside of Central downtown ~Ample parking already on-site—no parking crisis to solve ~On protected walking train from Analay to location ~Proximate to new 80-home Canopy project Single-site consolidation of ~ALL civic functions (library, senior center, commons, potentially City Hall)

			<p>~Existing building infrastructure significantly reduces construction costs vs. new build</p> <p>~Turnkey - Low entitlement risk (existing commercial use, minimal regulatory hurdles)</p> <p>~Highway 12 visibility provides strong regional access and wayfinding</p> <p>~Partnerships with private office medical or Sonoma County</p>
WEAKNESSES	<p>~UNDERSIZED for cost?: 36K+ SF community need if city subsidized property leveraged</p> <p>~Substantial retrofit required (HVAC, interior build-out, accessibility, acoustics, parking)</p> <p>~Grocery Outlet wildcard (outcome by August 2026)</p> <p>~Not purpose-built, compromises on library/senior center design ideals (Not as stunning as new build)</p> <p>~Structural condition and true retrofit costs uncertain until acquisition</p>	<p>~Existing buildings cannot support additions—FULL DEMOLITION required</p> <p>~Parking crisis: Current lot already strained; doubling size makes it worse</p> <p>~Downtown businesses harmed by 2-3 year construction disruption</p> <p>~Operational transition nightmare: Where does library/City Hall operate during rebuild/cost??</p> <p>~Site constraints limit optimal building layout and future expansion</p> <p>~May NOT solve Community Center and Senior Center Needs</p> <p>~FINANCING: Zero asset sale potential + adds temporary relocation costs</p>	<p>~Not city-owned</p> <p>~Sidewalk improvements needed between Main Street and location</p> <p>~Not downtown—perceived disconnect from Main Street commercial core</p> <p>~Requires relocating library from current downtown location (political/emotional resistance)</p> <p>~May require significant interior build-out, or commercial kitchen addition</p> <p>~Lease/acquisition private partnership negotiations for supportive leasing of unused space</p>
OPPORTUNITIES	<p>~Quick win: Could be operational before other new build renovation options</p> <p>~Demonstrate city commitment to downtown investment</p>	<p>~Modernize City Hall infrastructure simultaneously</p> <p>~Redesign site for better pedestrian/traffic flow</p> <p>~Signal commitment to downtown core</p> <p>~Potential for more downtown underground parking (expensive)</p>	<p>~Separates traffic flow to allow less traffic congestion</p> <p>~Proximal to Analy highschool</p> <p>~Bikable stop on the West County Trail</p> <p>~School pickup alternate site</p> <p>~High elevation site during flooding episodes/alternate evacuation site</p> <p>~Fire-resistant construction and on-site generator</p>
THREATS	~Grocery Outlet permit	~Construction costs	~Downtown businesses may

	<p>approved or → option disappears entirely ~Retrofit costs exceed estimates once building is opened up ~Creates 'good enough' complacency that prevents visionary solution ~Divides community support between this and transformational options ~Property owner may not accept city's offer price</p>	<p>escalate during extended timeline ~Temporary relocation costs add significantly to budget ~Downtown businesses suffer during multi-year disruption ~Community opposition to demolishing familiar buildings ~Project creep as City Hall needs expand scope Senior or Community center STILL not solved even after \$20M spent</p>	<p>oppose losing library foot traffic ~Community perception: 'abandoning downtown' narrative could gain traction ~Building owner may decline to sell on City's terms ~Economic downturn could reduce City's ability to absorb costs or city bond capacity</p>
SCALE:			
SUBTOTAL			
WEIGHT			
TOTAL			
FOLLOW-UP			

FINANCING STRATEGY ANALYSIS

Each option's assessment for development costs, operations during build, fundraising ability and incorporation of city owned property (usage or sale proceeds).

Option	Time from initial decision	Rough Cost / or realistic budget	City Owned (\$) or City Asset Sale \$1.5, \$4M	Difficulty Funding Site-Development (Scope relative)
O'Reilly Campus	20 months	\$12-\$23M	\$4	Least Difficult (Least inflation sensitive)
Railroad Forest Community Commons	5-10 years	\$12-\$23M	\$4	Medium Difficult- Laguna Permits
Calder Creek Civic Commons	8-15 Years	\$12-50M (w/o Calder Creek Daylight)	\$0-\$3.5	Difficult-Extremely Difficult Creek Opening in city plan / Office Movement
Rite Aid Building Adaptive Reuse	2-5 Years	\$13-20M	\$1.5	Medium Difficult
Current Library/City	5-8 Years	\$13-20M	\$1.5	Difficult - Very Difficult unless

Hall Site Rebuild				parking garage
Tow Building (or other brownfield) 332 Petaluma Ave	2-5 Years	\$13-20M	\$1.5	Medium Difficult

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: APPROACH & CONTEXT

It is essential to recognize that Sebastopol faces both immediate and longer-term facility needs, each with different urgency levels. This analysis examines six potential pathways for addressing Sebastopol's civic facility needs, each evaluated with sincerity and an open mind toward its merits and challenges.

While this is not an exhaustive inventory of every conceivable alternative—new properties may become available, and creative combinations of these options could emerge—it represents an initial examination of currently viable opportunities. All city-owned property has been assessed. The current civic campus footprint and the Calder Creek corridor represent the only city-controlled sites capable of accommodating expanded facilities. The following table outlines those needs and organizes them into levels of priority:

Priority	Facility	Need	Status
Critical Need	Senior Center	10k+ (15-20k total) SF for expanded services, full kitchen, craft store	Most pressing—current space cannot meet demand, craft store lease renewal near
Immediate Need	Community Center	Significant Building repairs + ongoing operational sustainability. Modernization	Deferred maintenance and budget strain
Future Need	Library	Additional 10k SF would enable full utilization	Functional but constrained; not in crisis
Peripheral Need	City Offices/ Meeting Space	Consolidation preferred; multiple locations not optimal	Some consolidation achieved; workable for now
Subsidiary Need	NonProfit Space	Unconfirmed 5k SF?	



DROPBOX ITEMS

Link

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/jukixk5i0u6qc6m6aopqm/AGhv7odAoAxq1fG9gtrU4?rlkey=kh83eobwmz20x0q915zpmrlfk&st=1i2plhoj&dl=0>

Meetings

- 2025-10-07
- 2025-01-21
- 2025-11-07
- 2025-12-09
- 2026-01-13
- 2026-01-22
- 2026-02-10
- 2026-03-10

Resources

- **Fred Engbarth's Contributions (folder)**
 - **About (folder)**
 1. Institute for Local Public Government
 2. How Local Agencies Make Things Happen
 - **Article (folder)**
 1. Local Agency Decision Making
 2. Rural Communities and Economic Resilience
 3. Self-Healing Community
 4. The Futures We Create
 5. The Value of Public Spaces in Civic Life.
 6. Protecting Civic Life & Liberties in Public Space (Link)
 - **Survey (folder)**
 1. Help Sonoma County Library Plan Its Future
 2. QR_SCL Survey 2025-30
 3. Strategic Plan Survey Press Release 12.11.25
 4. Stratigic.25_FB
 5. Stratigic.25_Insta
 - **Toolbox - Community Planning (folder)**
 1. Participatory Planning Overview
 2. Meaningful Community Engagement
 3. Informed Planning
 4. Visioning
 5. Community Assets and Needs Assessment
 6. Plan Development
 7. Implementation
 8. Monitoring & Evaluation
- **Roseland (folder)**
 - Various files from Ray Holley
- **Brown Act**
- **Library Ad Hoc Committee Report**