

City of Sebastopol City Council Regular Meeting
Minutes of
Meeting of February 20, 2018

As approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of March 6, 2018

The public is advised that pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.5 all writings submitted to the City Council are public records and will be made available for review.

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

Notice: All resolutions and ordinances introduced and/or adopted under this agenda are waived of all reading of entire resolution(s) and ordinance(s).

The Sebastopol City Council welcomes you to its meetings that are generally scheduled for the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of every month. Your interest and participation are encouraged and appreciated.

SIMULTANEOUS MEETING COMPENSATION DISCLOSURE (Government Code § 54952.3): Members of the City Council receive no additional compensation as a result of convening a joint meeting of the City Council and Successor Agency to the Former Community Development Agency

SB 751 Legislative bodies of local agencies must publicly report: (1) any action taken and (2) the vote or abstention on each action taken by each member present for the action at a meeting.

A notice of the meeting was posted by the City Clerk on February 13, 2018.

6:00 pm CONVENE CITY COUNCIL MEETING, Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Slayter called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mayor Slayter
 Vice Mayor Hinton
 Councilmember Glass
 Councilmember Gurney
Absent: Councilmember Carnacchi (excused)
Staff: City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin
 Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley
 Finance Director Ana Kwong
 Planning Director Kenyon Webster
 Police Chief James Conner

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

Mayor Slayter made a statement personally supporting the student actions in response to the recent tragedy at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland Florida.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Speakers are allowed to speak for a maximum of three minutes so that all speakers have an opportunity to address the City Council. Power point or visual presentations for public comment shall not be permitted unless approved by the Agenda Review Committee two weeks prior to the requested meeting date.
- Yielding Time: Speakers may not "yield" a portion of their allotted time to others.
- The Mayor has the authority to limit or extend the time allowed for speakers dependent on the number of speakers in attendance.
- The Mayor can poll the members of the public for an indication of the number of people wishing to speak, then call on individuals to speak.
- It is the goal of the Council to conclude the public comments portion of the agenda within 20 minutes. If the public comment period exceeds twenty minutes, the presiding officer, typically the Mayor, reserves the right to reduce the time per speaker or carry over public comments to after all business items are completed.
- The City Clerk will monitor the time for public comments and inform the speakers when the time limitation has been reached.
- The Mayor could survey the members of the public, as appropriate, to move agenda items up or back to address the members of the public items of concern.
- Public participation is encouraged on all public agenda items.
- Council and staff will treat participants and each other with courtesy. Derogatory or sarcastic comments are inappropriate.
- The public will likewise be encouraged by the Mayor to maintain meeting decorum.
- In Council meetings when citizens are agitated, the Mayor may call a short recess to calm the situation.
- If a member of the public is unable to attend the Council meeting, written communications may be sent to the City Clerk by e-mail or by regular mail. Communications received after distribution of the agenda packet will be made available to the Council at the meeting.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Linda Berg commented as follows:

- Thanked the Mayor for his comments
- Discussed the leader of the movement – Emmet Gonzales
- Discussed donors for the march
- Wireless technology - Killing us all
- Killing the children too
- Matter of fact - not opinion
- Dangerous (EMF and EMR)
- Discussed harm that this causes
- Discussed the application submitted from Verizon
- 130 pages of the file and application
- Small antennas on utility poles in our town
- Fraud, omissions and lies
- Discussed the real estate agent – not an engineer
- Cookie cutter in putting these small cell antennas in 15 towns and cities at the same time
- Recognize the danger that it is
- Cooking us faster
- Requested rescheduling of the March 13th Planning Commission item
- Organizing people in town prior to this meeting

Cindy Craig commented as follows:

- Ragle crosswalk and intersection
- Maintain visibility
- Thanked for removing 40 MPH sign
- Discussed vertical posts in crosswalk or K rails
- Narrow crosswalk down

- Install orange signs on crosswalk signs
- Done for interim period of time – changed condition
- Benefit for those who are tourists and visitors
- Narrow the roadway itself
- Neighborhood would love to see that happen
- Looking forward to RRFB – hoping that is on track

Deborah Tavares commented as follows:

- Disturbing report - Paris Climate Action Talks
- Available on Stopthecrime.net
- Involving summary of policy makers for climate change talks of 2014
- Population Engineering and the Fight against Climate Change
- Read bullet points (page 1, page 2, page 5)
- Horrifying
- Hope our lives matter
- Listen and pay attention to the policies being put into place on GHG emissions
- Discussed the water meeting attended in Santa Rosa – area of homes in Fountain Grove – will issue building permits but not occupancy permits – water system compromised due to fire

Alan Horn commented as follows:

- Business Owner
- Resident
- Member of Chamber of Commerce
- Member of EMF safety network
- Continue to educate to understand danger of non-ionizing radiation
- Discussed Verizon application for major use permit
- General Plan calls for reduction
- Proposal is increase what is in the General Plan
- Must be stopped as soon as possible
- Application from Verizon wireless through Mark Lobough from Lodi, Ca
- Claims to be engineer
- Real estate license not engineer
- Fraudulent document
- Needs to be corrected and stopped
- Council works for the City not Verizon
- Discussed warning signs that will need to be placed on poles
- Travesty
- Urgency to stop machine guns
- Need to stop non-ionizing radiation

Paul Menconi commented as follows:

- Southeast corner of Ragle and Bodega
- Thanked Council for removal of 40 MPH sign - One improvement
- Hoping Council has not forgotten discussion about temporary measures (K rails to shrink size of intersection; traffic Kitty – hard to see where located)

- Observed several instances where flags (temporary measure) that are being utilized by the pedestrians are seen as a way of cars to speed up to establish control of the intersection
- Nice to see ground broken for HAWK - Hope RRFB installed sooner rather than later

Lou Tavares commented as follows:

- Support Mr. Horn and Ms. Berg's comments
- Person who is sensitive to these frequencies that are being talked about (Ms. Berg)
- Not all of us are that sensitive but it is affecting all of us
- Discussed interview on hazards of radio frequencies
- We Fry is what they should be called
- Designed as military weapons
- Discussed speech from Mayor – AR 15 is not a machine gun
- AR does not stand for assault rifle or automatic rifle
- AR – company that built it – does not fire automatically
- Semi-automatic sporting gun design similar to military weapon look like
- Illegal to hunt deer with AR 15
- Load impact and low velocity projectile
- More likely to wound and harm deer rather than kill it
- Discussed media and hype of events
- Create public opinion that all guns need to be taken away

Carla Rosen commented as follows:

- Concerns at the market
- Thanked City for the support
- Discussed the bricks in the plaza – tripping a weekly occurrence
- Safety tape there now
- Know that it is on the agenda for future to look into that and fix it
- Discussed signage for the Farmer's market
- Cars parked there over-night on weekly basis
- Requested extra signage to make clear the parking area for Farmer's Market

STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST BY MAYOR/CITY COUNCILMEMBERS FOR ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

(This is the time for the Mayor or City Councilmembers to indicate any statements of conflicts of interests for any item listed on this agenda). *There were none.*

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 the consent calendar items; ask if a Councilmember wishes to remove one or more items from the consent calendar; and then open public comment to the members of the public in attendance. At this time, a member of the public may speak for up to three minutes on the entire consent calendar and request at that time that an agenda item or items be removed for discussion.
- If an item or items are removed from the consent calendar, the item shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tern.
- 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 or Mayor Pro Tern.

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATION:

1. Informational Presentation from Badawi and Associates (City Consultant) on City's Annual Audit for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2017 - Each year the City of Sebastopol has an audit conducted by an independent auditing firm. The goal of the independent audit was to provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the City of Sebastopol for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, are free of material misstatement. Badawi & Associates is a licensed Certified Public Accountants, who specializes in governmental audits, has audited the City of Sebastopol's financial statements has issued the City a clean audit report and that the accompanying financial statements have no significant or unusual transactions in the City's statement of net assets and fund statements. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) is an audited summary report of the financial transactions of the City for the Fiscal Year 2016/17, ending June 30, 2017. The report is presented to the City Council and designed to provide summary financial information for citizens, other government agencies, municipal lenders and other interested parties. (Finance Director)

Finance Director Kwong presented the staff report recommending the City Council receive the report from Badawi and Associates (City Consultant) on City's Annual Audit for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2017

The consultants, Badawi and Associates, presented a visual presentation to the City Council.

Mayor Slayter asked for questions of staff or the consultant.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed the Capital asset number
- Discussed face value of land that the City owns that contains sidewalks, streets, parking lots
- Is there a way to be able to determine the values similar to the City determining the values of vehicles, equipment, well equipment, etc.
- Largest asset is most likely the land that we use as commons
- \$13 million plus – seems low if taken into account all that land

The consultants commented as follows:

- Value of land is usually at the acquisition cost – no fair value of land
- Land could have been purchased 20 years ago and would have that value, not the value of today
- May have paid \$100,000- then but now would be worth \$2 million but the value would be \$100,000
- Most cities will account for streets and infrastructure assets
- Have to make distinction whether maintenance or building a new street
- Street resurfacing = regular maintenance and does not add to the value

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- When give measure of capital assets, does that include the value of the real estate too; and if sold separately, would that figure only include the acquisition price
- Questioned where the acquisition price is in the record
- Is that figured considered somewhere

The consultants commented as follows:

- Hard to identify every mile of the street
- Account for average cost per mile
- Discussed how many miles the City has
- Discussed scope of audit
- City maintains listing of parcels
- Focus on major activity during the year
- Not test every purchase done since 1902
- Focus on major activity during the year
- Not have listing of what was acquired in the past

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed obtaining real estate with a building
- Questioned if one sold over the other
- Only acquisition price would be backed out of that number
- Remainder would be profit

The consultant stated it would be profit.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows: If a subdivision was built in 1950 and as part of that subdivision streets were installed by the developer, would the City put that cost as capital on the City books.

The consultant stated yes and discussed dedication to the City and stated it would become a City asset.

Councilmember Glass questioned if this is for 2002 and forward.

The consultant stated yes, and that cities do not need to go back prior to 2002.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed that this is an annual mandatory audit
- Questioned what is the cost to the City

Director Kwong commented this is a required audit and the cost of the contract is \$24,000 for the first year and 5% each year. It is a three-year contract with provisions for two-year extension.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment

Deborah Tavares commented as follows:

- Did not understand OPEB – page 16
- Like to know what that means
- Heard drought on page 5
- Not in drought now
- Questioned if something financial changed
- When look at financial infrastructure assets, would it not be important to have that infrastructure assessed like other cities in event of major weather event
- Santa Rosa hit monstrously

- Infrastructure costs are antiquated values
- Replacement now not near what they antiquated values were
- Promised to have increased weather events
- Know that the idea of increased weather events is going to roll more frequently
- Seems prudent for City to understand their value of their assets
- Misunderstanding what CAFR is
- Double set of books

The consultants replied to public comment as follows:

- OPEB – Other Post-Employment Benefits
- Drought – Set expectations where numbers should be before numbers are set (many factors)
- Most cities and water agencies have mandatory or voluntary conservation – resulted in less consumption – revenues went down
- When lifted – expecting to see consumptions to go up a little bit
- Adequate infrastructure assessment – City maintains insurance coverage on its facilities
- Umbrella coverage
- Confirmed with insurance agency of City's coverage – coverage standard – Not saying it is sufficient for every asset of the City
- Assuming normally how insurance is purchased is based on value
- CAFR- Not aware of two sets of books – Not standard practice
- CAFR – financial statement that has additional items – required by professional associations
- Statistical section – fund balance, equity, debt, and adds transmittal letter

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Wondering how to address that cities are expected to have 2-3 months of financial reserves
- Noticed reported looked at in terms of months
- Look at in terms of percentage for City policy
- How many small cities have the consultants run in to that can say they have 10 months of reserves

The consultants commented as follows:

- Minimum recommendation is two months
- Nothing wrong with having more
- 10 months – healthy fund balance
- Not majority of cities in that situation
- Good fund balance

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed page 10 of the report
- Questioned if this was due to the dissolution of the redevelopment agency
- Debt transferred to the County

Director Kwong stated that is correct.

Council deliberations:

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Displayed the written copy of the presentation
- Displayed the comprehensive annual financial report
- Detailed report full of numbers
- Questioned who prepared all of the charts and spreadsheets or work of firm
- How assembled

The consultant commented a follow:

- Partnership with the City
- Responsible for taking City data and put into CAFR format
- City responsible for transmittal letter
- Financial statement and notice of disclosure based on numbers provided by the City
- Joint effort
- See City name on report

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Point out to the public that a lot of the way this is presented is defined by the Government Accounting Standards Boards (GASB)
- Takes a lot of skill and understanding in how this is presented
- Defined/know exactly what the format is and what has to be included
- Standards are set and we are complying with them

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Added congratulations to staff
- City getting good remarks from auditors

Mayor Slayer commented as follows:

- Hard work that has gone in both the part of staff, Council, budget sub-committee and community over the course of several years
- Strong financial position
- Planning for future
- Pension Liability: Unfunded Liabilities: When on budget sub-committee, our term is funded liabilities
- Can predict, budget and fund for it
- Minor ticks on part of the State – go from 9 million to 11 million could go up/down
- Need to keep firm hand on that
- Questioned if the pension sub-committee has met

City Manager McLaughlin commented the pension sub-committee has met about a month ago and had a lengthy discussion of this item.

Mayor Slayter questioned if it would be seen in the upcoming budget.

City Manager McLaughlin commented yes with recommendations from the sub-committee.

The City Council thanked the consultants for the time and good work.

Director Kwong commented as follows:

- Thanked the Council for their support
- Been challenging these last three years
- With the Council support, Finance has been able to create a foundation with a new system
- Had a new auditor this year – great to work with and go through the transition
- Had two financial software systems to work with which were independent to each other
- First time City had submitted a report to the GFOA for an award
- Without funding and Council support, this could not have been done
- City is on the right path – see light at the end of the tunnel
- Putting things in place
- Report listed areas of deficiencies – trying to address that
- Need purchasing order system module in place
- Need to encumber funds as best practice
- Part of mid-year budget adjustment
- Funding fixed assets system
- Not maintaining in spreadsheet anymore
- Will do a study of fair value assets
- See if budget can accommodate that kind of costs
- Putting things in place for a good foundation
- Thanked the City Council
- Thanked the City Manager
- Thanked the Assistant City Manager/city Clerk
- Thanked the consultants, Badawi and associates

City Council Action: None Required. The City Council received the report and thanked the consultants and staff.

Reference Order Number: 2018-034

PUBLIC HEARING(s):

2. PUBLIC HEARING – To conduct a public hearing on a comprehensive update to the City’s cannabis ordinance. The City has existing allowances for medical cannabis dispensaries and collectives, as well as allowances for personal growing by medical cannabis patients and caregivers. The amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would replace these regulations, and would include revisions to achieve consistency with new provisions of State law as a result of both State legislation and a voter-approved initiative. The proposed ordinance would allow a variety of both medical and adult-use cannabis-related businesses, and would also include provisions consistent with State law regarding allowances for personal growing of cannabis. The ordinance would allow adult-use sales at the City’s two existing medical cannabis dispensaries, if they also obtain required State licenses. Cannabis businesses would be required to have security and odor control measures in place. The City Council has adopted a temporary urgency ordinance that allows adult use cannabis sales at two existing dispensaries. (Planning Director)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council conduct a public hearing and approve waiving of further reading and introduction of comprehensive update to the City’s cannabis ordinance.

Mayor Slayter asked for questions of staff.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Page 3 of staff report (summary)
- Personal cannabis cultivation – item 1
- 100 per SF per residence – questioned if this is a total for both interior and exterior cultivation

Staff stated it would be for either.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Page 4
- Cannabis special events – TUP
- Questioned if this is a staff level approval

Staff stated that is correct.

Councilmember Gurney disclosed that she has spoken with Craig Litwin.

Mayor Slayter opened the public hearing.

Craig Litwin commented as follows:

- Sebastopol resident
- Former Mayor
- Thanked the Council for what they are doing
- Important to have a comprehensive ordinance
- Urged the Council to look at more than two delivery services
- Made more sense to allow for additional (unlimited)
- If limit – so be it
- Two is insufficient especially with existing dispensaries
- Open this to other businesses
- Revenue for the City
- Think special events are fantastic
- Discussed distribution license and conditional use permits
- Goes before Planning Commission
- Santa Rose does it over the counter
- Looking at alleviating more onerous difficulties such as a public hearing
- Go to planning department instead
- Police dept. for security
- Staff support sufficient to not have to make this a public hearing for distribution type licenses
- Thanked the City Council for not looking at heavy taxes on this and allow existing dispensaries to thrive
- Confident this industry is here to stay
- Regulations more important than prohibition
- Increase tax base wise for city

Noriah Dangers commented as follows:

- Two delivery retailers are not sufficient for competition

- Have quite a few – not a risk for competition
- Security measures are the same
- Competition is a not a risk to the existing dispensaries
- Good for economy
- Current draft ordinance allows for micro businesses
- Cannot have cultivation/manufacturing
- Does not make sense
- Needs to be reviewed and clarified before going forward
- Great opportunity for town to benefit financially
- Delivery retailers to not have to sell/live in Sebastopol
- Getting fees for applications
- Towns applying special cannabis tax
- Make as much money from the industry
- Put this money back into the town
- Cancels out lack of Sebastopol tax

Katie Callahan commented as follows:

- Why would we want delivery companies in Sebastopol - Excellent choice - Allows seniors to have autonomy for cannabis to be delivered - Gives mothers suffering from post-partum depression to take cannabis as medicine
- Autonomy
- Incredible gift to community to allow people to run low equity businesses
- Run it by the book
- Urged the Council to allow for more than two deliveries
- Thanked the Council

Andrew Dobbs Kramer commented as follows:

- Thanked the Council for considering this update
- Need a permanent set of rules to live by
- Thanked the Council for the urgency ordinance
- Looking forward to this update
- Discussed items as listed below:
- Operating requirements – odor control – not appropriate for retailers in new model retails (page 14 of ordinance)
- All cannabis packaged
- If tampered containers, not used and has to be thrown away
- No odor out of retail site where no onsite consumption
- Where no onsite consumption, retailers are not required to install a system not needed
- Discussed permit expiration: received permit under urgency ordinance
- Requested clarification on those permits before moving forward
- Questioned if these rights continue on
- Discussed existing permits do not expire one year from urgency ordinance as originally stipulated
- Ambiguity around minor access in DRAFT
- Wording ...of age ...
- Ambiguous in the State of California

- Different states have different ages for consent
- Make as easy for possible to enforce
- Great comprehensive ordinance
- Thanked the Council and staff

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

Council deliberations:

Vice Mayor Hinton questioned that the City would not be able to get taxes for deliveries outside of the City.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- City ability to collect sales taxes on delivery within/outside is still unclear
- Asked sales tax consultant to provide advice
- They are not able to do so definitively
- Heard that it depends on how the business is structured and how orders are taken
- Asked staff to ask the consultant again for an update
- Consultant stated it is still unclear

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed the current operators have delivery
- Discussed point of sale
- Those businesses get tax revenue for delivery

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Stated that is correct
- Portion of sales tax proceeds put into pool
- Share in that pool no matter what for deliveries
- Receive a portion of that
- Transactions creates sales tax somewhere
- Will get specifics

Vice Mayor Hinton questioned the estimate of that percentage.

City Manager McLaughlin stated it is a small percentage, less than three percent.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed definition of micro businesses
- Questioned if this definition is from the State

Director Webster stated that is correct.

Mayor Slayter questioned if it is 10,000 SF.

Staff stated that is correct.

Mayor Slayter commented that figure seems large for micro businesses.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Combination of several different types of uses
- May not be totally clear in table at back
- Did recommendation to eliminate this as a conditionally permitted use in two commercial zones
- Not be in those commercial zone
- In industrial zones

Mayor Slayter questioned if micro businesses are an allowed use.

Director Webster stated that is correct.

Mayor Slayter discussed cottage industry.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Not that type of cannabis
- Not listed in this ordinance
- Home business
- Not issue business license under this ordinance

Mayor Slayter questioned if staff looked at other municipalities and how they address that.

Staff stated they are not aware of any.

Julie Terry, Cannabis Advisory Group for Sonoma County, commented as follows:

- Micro business came from State
- State Law
- Allows up to 10,000 SF of cultivation
- Integrated business model – have three different licenses
- Cultivation, manufacture, distribution and/or retail
- Have on one premise a fully integrated business model
- Not required to have 10,000 SF of cultivation
- Have to have three of the licenses to qualify as a micro business
- Cottage – does not have anything to do with making small things
- Definition for size of cultivation
- Up to 500 SF of canopy
- Defined by mature plants – canopy not vegetative part of grow cycle
- When bloom cycle - canopy size
- Home based manufacturer: Cottage definition – determination of what it means for manufacturing
- Cottage definition based
- Still unclear
- Determine according to revenue, not size

Councilmember Glass questioned if the City allows for home-based businesses such as baking of cookies, brownies, etc.

Planning Director Webster commented as follows:

- State passed allowances for home-based businesses
- Some food productions
- Exceptions to standard requirements
- Enacted that a few years ago
- Cottage food allowances in ZO
- Consistent with that (ZO)
- Are permitted in the State of CA
- Limit based on revenue
- Lower health standards among other things as well

Councilmember Glass commented if someone was baking brownies or non-edibles, does that fall under the permitted uses without having to obtain a use permit under this ordinance.

Director Webster commented that the ordinance is the intent to regulate cannabis. If there is no allowance for this type of business under this ordinance in the zoning district, the interpretation would be that it would not be allowed.

Councilmember Glass questioned if the ordinance cannot engage any cannabis related business unless as passed within this ordinance.

Director Webster stated that is correct.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Problematic with new zoning map
- Hard to interpret colors
- Discussed categories on the chart in the DRAFT ordinance
- Discussed permitted with conditional use permit in commercial office or industrial zone
- Cannabis cultivation 5000 SF indoor
- Cannabis 1-10,000 SF indoor only
- Both are micro business

Director Webster stated it is just cultivation.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Permitted uses in the heavy commercial; general industrial office/ light industrial
- Heavy commercial – Aubergine as example
- General Industrial – Morris Street
- Office/Light Industrial – O Reilly Property
- Permitted use – no UP required
- Cultivate up to 10,000 SF
- Nursery indoor only with no size restriction

Director Webster discussed definition of immature plants and stated there are no restrictions.

Mayor Slayter discussed light industrial office zones such as O'Reilly and questioned if it is permitted without a use permit.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Most sensitive aspect is when it is a retail business
- Key part of the thinking of these allowances of what is the kind of use that might generate more impacts during the hours of use
- Minimal public coming and going
- Logic to how other in existing zoning ordinance talks of the use of allowances
- Some tracking of similar uses
- Following that logic
- Distribution and warehouse are treated the same way in those districts

Mayor Slayter discussed the delivery licenses for the City to consider.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed the Planning Commission minutes
- Remarked on how they spent a lot of time on the number of dispensaries
- Increase up to 3
- Allow delivery businesses
- When came down to straw poll – 2 in favor of (3) delivery for those two plus two additional non-storefront deliveries
- 5 opposed to expansion
- Issues linked
- No idea of other dispensary expanding to delivery services by way recorded
- Delivery is issue
- Topic in front of us
- Consider history leading community with original ordinance and the business record and safety record of existing dispensaries
- Feel Council can decide with some comfort on expanding the delivery services
- Trusting go well within our community
- History indicates doing well with this particular business
- Hoping to have received more clarity from the Planning Commission on this topic

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Some thought no limit on numbers
- Tried to find compromise
- Not find solution everyone could agree on
- Planning Commission was in consensus to go with the DRAFT

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Planning Commission went with more conservative choice
- History indicates to go with more open-ended number
- Made comments if the City allowed a larger number it could not draw back on that number

- Sense of where the balance is
- How much change or expansion allowed
- Value the idea of being conservative
- Not to point of where it would hold the industry back
- Comfortable expanding delivery service options
- Not need another dispensary right now
- Moved by Omar's argument
- If take delivery licenses, have whole market cornered
- Sense of restriction not matches business community
- City is more than that – more accepting
- Tight limits not wear well for our community

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Agree with comments
- Allowing businesses to grow and expand in measured and reasonable way
- Maybe 2 not enough
- Maybe 4 too many
- Maybe 3 right

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Feel better allowing a third dispensary for option for third delivery
- Great success with two existing dispensaries
- Having experienced operators – commitment to City
- Confident on tax revenue
- Delivery services may not benefit us at all
- Special events permit unlimited – use permit – questioned no limit on those
- Adding limits on cannabis special events
- Only allow a certain number per year
- Feel uncomfortable with unlimited
- Find interesting not a single City in Sonoma County allows delivery only yet
- Suggested four versus three with three brick/mortar

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Expand delivery services because of timing
- Expand up to four
- Two associated with dispensaries and two independents
- Happy with number of dispensaries have now
- Not see so much competition that everyone is doing badly
- Two dispensaries working on new adult use rules
- Look at in one year

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Hearing that the Council is saying that they might want to review in one year
- Suggest that as well
- Do not know Planning Commission discussion – hesitancy
- Straight forward thing to do

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Comment regarding odor control and engineering requirement if no on-site consumption
- Seems logical if sealed product – no odor – common sense

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Relevant section is on page 11
- Language added to that
- Except those that only deal with packaged cannabis and have no on-site consumption

Mayor Slayter questioned the comment of existing permits expiring.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- 17.140.160
- Page 17
- Rescission of urgency ordinance
- Permits that were granted under such ordinance and not in conflict with this ordinance shall remain effective

Mayor Slayter questioned the comment of age of minors.

Staff stated as follows:

- State laws provide for difference in ages for minor consent for medical treatment
- No space or need to list the differences
- Ages vary by medical treatment
- Intended to say if minor emancipated allowed to make own decision
- Not sure how work in real life
- Intended to be short form – if can consent to medical treatment can carry that forward in this ordinance
- Protection of minors who can consent to their own medical treatment

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Nano businesses as opposed to micro businesses
- Why not true cottage thing considered

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Only came up in recent conversation
- Not issue discussed by Planning Commission or staff
- Not seen in other ordinances
- State may be looking at how to deal with that issue
- Not issue staff has delved into

Councilmember Glass commented this may be an issue that the City might want to look into in the long run.

Director Webster stated staff will track what the State is developing regarding rules and will bring back if appropriate.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Need to resolve the number of dispensaries and delivery services
- Current dispensaries – stick with two dispensaries and City can always expand
- Going to three delivery services (two existing dispensaries and one independent delivery operator)

Councilmember Glass suggested two delivery services for existing dispensaries and two independent delivery services.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Up to four deliveries
- Not tied to dispensaries
- Questioned if Peace in Medicine is not considering delivery at this time
- Cannot assume dispensaries go right into delivery

Director Webster stated they have applied for a delivery license and will assume the second dispensary will also apply for a delivery license.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Two dispensaries; two deliveries
- Potential for two other deliveries not connected to dispensaries
- Compromise for three deliveries
- When reviewing in a year, can see if that is working and acceptable
- Look at tax revenue and any related revenue issues
- Looking at potential for another dispensary and cottage industry issue when issue is brought back
- Points that could change in next year

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Supports three delivery services
- Support that rather than no additional independent deliveries

Mayor Slayter stated next year there will be a number of items to be revisited.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Why limit three rather than four
- Providing only one new opportunity initially
- Why one and not two new opportunities

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Seems more measured
- Learning simultaneously from original permitting of dispensaries
- New operations in City limits
- Untested business entities
- Now know track record of existing dispensaries
- Allow second dispensary conversation – carefully considered everything at that time

- Do this carefully
- Going at that same careful pace of three delivery licenses for a City of 7200 people
- Measured and appropriate

Mayor Slayter reviewed the issues discussed:

- Introduction of ordinance for first reading
- Address licenses granted under urgency ordinance
- Clarify odor control provisions
- Limit on special events (not more than 4) in any calendar year – no single promoter shall be allowed to conduct more than two events

Councilmember Gurney questioned how the City would measure who the event promoter is and stated the City does not limit other events.

Director Webster stated these are different types of events.

Councilmember Glass commented she would prefer to see limiting the number of special events permits for a period of some time to see how it goes with the public.

Katie Callahan commented as follows:

- Capacity to gather public in small town events
- Have multiple people permitted for a year
- Look into it further down the road
- Get information to see how it goes
- Let people do more events than just two

Mayor Slayter suggested a total of four events per year and no more than 2 per any single operator for the first year.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Not clear of what events consist of
- Need to think of event thing more clearly
- If looking at smaller events – present measures of how permitting events that are small rather than taking up all of Ives park

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed special events
- Discussed if a business such as Crooked Goat wanted to do an event – there limits within their ABC license
- Not want to see number to limit events
- Questioned what triggers a special event

Staff stated that it depends on number of people, if alcohol or other outside activities are involved, etc.

Tasha Beauchamp, Cittaslow, commented as follows:

- Strongly considering a hospitality task force

- Possibility of making that decision for something like this that is tourism related
- Arrange hospitality task force made up of members of the community similar to GPAC

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Stated that is a good idea but we want to work with local industry to figure out what is good for them
- What is the ordinance going to end up having in it
- What are the special events
- Parcel into three or four events per year
- Put lid on grandiose events
- Perceive potential problem
- What would they be looking for in ordinance that would make the industry happy
- Protect the City
- Need more information
- Not undertake in permanent ordinance

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Discussed having no more than 4 special events
- Conservative limitation
- Can come back later to amend
- Impose greater limitation on draft ordinance

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed renting the community center
- No way to know what kinds of events will come up
- Discussed setting rules

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- No way to know what event will come up when someone comes in for a special event permit
- Discussed not know size restrictions for events
- Generic format allowing up to four events
- Gives time to see what demand will be and how to refine it

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed special events in the County
- Harvest festival
- Never out of hand
- No big regulations
- Consumption contained
- Discussed businesses coming together and doing one event

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Not know what demand will be
- Not know size
- Not know number of people

The Council discussed the following:

- Number of dispensaries (2)
- Number of delivery permits (3); two for existing and one independent delivery
- Hospitality task force idea
- Not needing odor control engineering
- Rescission of restrictions on existing permit for delivery under urgency ordinance
- Four special events per year with no more than two per promoter
- Languages changes as discussed by staff

Councilmember Glass moved and Vice Mayor Hinton seconded the motion to approve waiving of further reading and introduction of comprehensive update to the City's cannabis ordinance with the following changes:

- Number of dispensaries (2)
- Number of delivery permits (3) two for existing and one independent delivery
- Not needing odor control engineering
- Rescission of restrictions on existing permit for delivery under urgency ordinance
- Four special events per year with no more than two per promoter

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmember Carnacchi

Abstain:None

Councilmember Gurney discussed the hospitality task force and would like to hear more information on this idea from Cittaslow.

City Council Action: approved waiving of further reading and introduction of comprehensive update to the City's cannabis ordinance with the following changes:

- Number of dispensaries (2)
- Number of delivery permits (3) two for existing and one independent delivery
- Not needing odor control engineering
- Rescission of restrictions on existing permit for delivery under urgency ordinance
- Four special events per year with no more than two per promoter

Minute Order Number: 2018-035

Mayor Slayter called for a break at 8:40 pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:52 pm.

3. PUBLIC HEARING – To Conduct a Public Hearing on Resolution Modifying Selected Housing Impact Fees (Planning Director/Housing Sub-Committee).

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council conduct a public hearing and approve Resolution Modifying Selected Housing Impact Fees.

Mayor Slayter asked for questions of staff.

Mayor Slayter questioned if other municipalities have any graduated fee lists such as the City is proposing.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- This issue is being discussed in number of cities
- Other cities are taking actions to reduce fees for smaller SF
- Some are doing this thing

Councilmember Gurney questioned the timing when the zoning ordinance will be returning to the Council.

Director Webster stated April time frame.

Councilmember Gurney questioned the industry standard for SF for bedrooms.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Stated the figure was based on looking at some statistical information of typical sized apartments
- Information from elder organizations on typical size of one bedrooms
- Not based on scientific thing
- Seemed reasonable number for modest units

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Good lines in the sand
- Lives in a 1350 SF three-bedroom home
- Small house
- Could fit two-bedroom house in 1100 SF
- Industry standard sizes

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Not based on historical inventory of housing stock
- Not based on past building criteria
- Have a small house also
- Personal standards seem adequate
- Planning for rebuild industry
- Energy efficiency
- Not based on arbitrary numbers
- Bodega Avenue project – number feels appropriate

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed scaling fees
- 840 SF house
- Scaling fees no matter what SF is or how many bedrooms
- Using as an example

Councilmember Gurney questioned if the bedrooms are linked to the fee.

Director Webster stated it is based on the SF.

Mayor Slayter opened the public hearing.

Tasha Beauchamp, Cittaslow, commented as follows:

- Discussed hospitality task force
- Discussed having a housing fair
- Like to put on fair where people could come see information
- Expo room of vendors
- Possibility to jump start this and get it out to the public

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

Council deliberations:

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Wish way could be sure that this would be passed on to buying public and not just windfall
- Trying to reduce cost of housing not increase profit margin for people building it

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Passing on to buying public
- City losing revenues fees
- Might get more units built

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed getting more units
- Discussed having more housing

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Graduated installment plan contribution by the City to provide affordable housing
- Not guarantee outcome want to have

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Not sure how guarantee that
- Number of residential building permits annually
- Very few permits now
- Net reduction in City fees impossible to guess how many building permits would be issued because of this spurring people on
- Can't hurt to do this

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Get historical average of permits over 10-15-20 years
- Once exceed that average number all fees go into an affordable housing fund
- Future housing access for affordability
- Sub-committee come back with recommendations

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed actions on temporary basis in order to create sale type of atmosphere
- Enact lower fees for a one a half year trial
- Incentives for people to get permits now

- Price will go up in future
- Make term limited
- Incentive up front
- Incentive for short period of time

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Impossible at this point to hire anyone
- Going to be that way for at least two to five years
- People are crazy busy now

Vice Mayor Hinton commented that this will encourage someone to do something now rather than wait two years.

Councilmember Gurney questioned the length of time of a permit.

Staff stated a permit is valid for three years.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed the need for an impact fee update
- Opportunity to take another look at what we put on the scale
- Not sure if what is on the scale is a reasonable number

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed that the impact fee study will require an outside consultant
- Questioned if there is an estimate of the cost for the study
- Questioned the length of time to conduct the study

Director Webster stated he is working on a ball park figure and will put that number into the upcoming budget.

Councilmember Gurney discussed updating the value of the infrastructure as well.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed the traffic impact fee schedule
- Discussed \$2601
- Questioned if this is directly related to a 750 SF one bedroom
- Questioned if it does not matter if it is 750, 800 or 900 SF one bedroom, the cost would be \$2601

Director Webster commented that if it was a 500 SF one bedroom it would be that much of the fee and that it would not be the full fee.

Vice Mayor Hinton clarified it would be pro-rated. Staff stated that is correct.

Councilmember Gurney questioned how is that explained to the public.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Staff is devising a new handout for the public
- Stated it is very complicated
- Will have examples for the public

Vice Mayor Hinton questioned the school impact fees.

Director Webster stated the school impact fees are not set by the City.

Vice Mayor Hinton moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve the Resolution Modifying Selected Housing Impact Fees for a Period Three years at which time the Resolution will be reviewed:

Discussion:

Councilmember Gurney questioned the reason to limit it to three years.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented that it would be good to have a say in the fees a few years down the road and the impact fee review gives the Council the opportunity to do that.

Mayor Slayter discussed the need to review the impact fee schedule.

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmember Carnacchi

Abstain:None

City Council Action: Approved the Resolution Modifying Selected Housing Impact Fees for a Period Three years at which time the Resolution will be reviewed:

Minute Order Number: 2018-036

Resolution Number: 6173

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

4. Continuation of Consideration and Discussion of Design Review of application from Armstrong Development for a 4,400-sq. ft. two-tenant building near the corner of Petaluma Avenue/Abbott Avenue. The Council's review is subject to a Settlement Agreement with CVS Pharmacy and Armstrong Development and other parties. (Planning Director/City Council Sub-Committee) **This item has been continued to the City Council Meeting of March 20, 2018 at or after 6:00 p.m.**

City Council Action: None Required. Item Continued.

Reference Order Number: 2018-037

Mayor Slayter moved Item Number 7 prior to Item Number 5.

7. Consideration of Approval and Distribution of "Sound like a fit?" brochure. This brochure is proposed to proactively help businesses understand the composition of our town, as well as the community priorities outlined in our General Plan and gathered from an Internet survey and Community Forum conducted in the fall of 2016. The overall idea was to start a conversation by sharing what we know about ourselves to businesses so that they could be advised of the types of enterprises likely to be well-received. (Community Impact Report City Council Sub-Committee)

City Manager McLaughlin presented the staff report recommending the City Council Consider the Brochure for Distribution.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Only bringing part of work forward this evening (brochure)
- Sub-committee is looking to be positive and expressing message of small town character
- Attract businesses to be successful
- Coordinated with other items from Chamber of Commerce
- Provided a sampling of items mentioned
- Engaging, inviting, informational piece

Tasha Beauchamp, Cittaslow, commented as follows:

- Thanked Holly Hansen for her contributions
- Brought things from General Plan and community forum forward
- Discussed growth opportunities from the General Plan
- Drew upon data from the census – what are the demographics of Sebastopol
- Included information from national data base of consumer habits
- Nationally recognized data base
- Highlighting three business sectors
- Promoting resources
- Welcoming document
- City staff setting up a business@Cityofsebastopol.org email address goes to Planning
- Working with the Chamber to distribute this
- City distributing map from Chamber
- Collaborative projects

Mayor Slayter asked for questions of staff or the sub-committee. There were none.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There were none.

Council deliberations:

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Photo same on the other brochure (experience Sebastopol)
- Have different photos

Tasha Beauchamp commented as follows:

- Four themes similar from experience Sebastopol
- Different photos were used

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Likes the brochure
- Great idea to do this
- Wondering of putting something – looking for unique businesses for our town
- Not looking for chain that says it is organic and artistic

Tasha Beauchamp commented as follows:

- Cittaslow
- Not promoting organization - Sebastopol joined this organization
- Another document not made it through City staff
- Operating off the General Plan
- Questions from Community Forum
- Questions to ask developers – how is business unique
- Start conversation

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Graphic design – agree it goes nicely with the previous piece
- Feels old
- Commentary from people in creative world
- Does not feel contemporary
- Look at Petaluma – contemporary, snappy and modern design
- This does not snap

Tasha Beauchamp commented as follows:

- Problem with white border
- Graphic designer did work for the City on previous projects

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- This and previous piece- feedback – wonder if current
- Feels dated
- Colors
- Layout
- Font
- Information contained is spot on
- Resources useful information
- Look at what other communities have done
- Community brochures
- What does that graphic package look like

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Discussed changing the front
- If using the same designer as used before, look into paying for an hour and have Sprint reformat it and look at it
- May have new take

Tasha Beauchamp commented she used the same designer as the City used previously.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Valuable suggestions
- A lot of time has gone by since this started
- Suggested going with it – check in in year or two for redesign
- 2015 numbers may not be interesting in 2019

- Updated pictures
- Hard to design by committee – bring design – then have other design comments
- Need to do something pro-active
- Market ourselves
- Working with Chamber of Commerce
- Have Downtown Association involved
- Center for the Arts involved
- Do trial run
- Come back in a year or two

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Should get it done
- Dense brochure
- Busy
- One bigger picture with items compelling on the list

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- One compelling photograph of Main Street
- People would not get the photo if did not know it was the solar dragon

Tasha Beauchamp commented as follows:

- If featured just Barlow – human pride involved
- Trying to be diplomatic
- More important to have information or graphics

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Large compelling thing is the solar dragon going across the whole thing with writing across it
- Unique
- Solar Projects
- Patrick Amiot art

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Both problematic images
- People not know solar dragon
- If pick Patrick Amiot over other artists – be mad or pleased
- Carefully done with a lot of information packed into it
- Did in diplomatic way
- Three business districts
- Four photos
- Need to decide
- Try it out
- Be reviewed
- If want to be redone- need more information

Council was in consensus to review the brochure in the future.

Vice Mayor Hinton moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve the Brochure for Distribution.

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmembers Glass, Gurney, and Vice Mayor Hinton

Noes: Mayor Slayter

Absent: Councilmember Carnacchi

Abstain:None

City Council Action: Approved the Brochure for Distribution.

Minute Order Number: 2018-040

5. Recommendation from Public Arts Committee to Issue Call for Artist Proposals for Public Art Project on Bodega Avenue Frontage of Library Forum Room Building (Planning Director)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council approve the Recommendation from the Public Arts Committee to Issue Call for Artist Proposals for Public Art Project on Bodega Avenue Frontage of Library Forum Room Building.

Mayor Slayter asked for questions of staff.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Submittal dates similar to last RFP
- Not specific in RFP draft
- Window of opportunity

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Three-month time line
- Generous schedule for artists
- Visit Sebastopol
- Do similar as last time
- Not a short time period

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Previous submittal suggested this location
- Compelling art piece

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Landscape subcommittee not consulted
- Raised bed is first part of a four-part surrounding landscape in play
- Has historical Luther Burbank plants in that area
- No one checked with the landscape committee
- Discussed landscaping that might be installed
- Would be heartbreaking to pull it out for purpose of this art
- No minutes of the meeting discussing this
- Discussed the RFP
- Did the Arts Committee talk of the potential interference with the landscape

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Could add that to the RFP
- Desirable to minimize impact of the existing landscaping

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- That wording needs to be required in terms of the RFP
- In terms of art, difficult piece to not take away from the landscaping
- Not sure compatible with landscaping
- Need to add something that would protect that historical landscaping
- Appreciative they considered site and identified it this time
- Design from site

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There were none.

Council deliberations:

The Council was in consensus to require a statement to protect and have the existing landscape remain.

Councilmember Gurney moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve a Call for Artist Proposals for Public Art Project on Bodega Avenue Frontage of Library Forum Room Building with the addition that the project preserve the existing landscaping.

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: Councilmember Carnacchi

Abstain:None

City Council Action: Approved a Call for Artist Proposals for Public Art Project on Bodega Avenue Frontage of Library Forum Room Building with the addition that the project preserve the existing landscaping.

Minute Order Number: 2018-038

6. Consideration of City Recognition Program of "Every Day Heroes" Featured on City Light Poles (Vice Mayor Hinton)

Vice Mayor Hinton presented the report recommending the City Council Consider City Recognition Program of "Every Day Heroes" Featured on City Light Poles.

Mayor Slayter asked for questions of Vice Mayor Hinton or staff.

Councilmember Glass questioned if it would be one banner or multiple banners for the same person.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Focus on one person at a time or one organization
- Fire Department for example
- Banner created
- Change out person/name
- Creating sub-committee to come up with nominating process and first person

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed the potential work of the sub-committee
- If idea of interest in this sub-committee, that sub-committee would report back the mechanics of how the program would work
- Would report back on nomination process; concept of banners; timing; coordination with staff; policies; reservation of poles
- Like idea
- Puts face to community
- Puts thank you message out
- Important for us to have that outward expression of high self-esteem and identity
- How remarkable for City to be doing that for ourselves rather than Chamber of events
- Feature our people and faces
- Brings our community to life
- We are real people who know how to talk to each other
- This is rare in a community
- Like that dimension
- Concept is leaders rather than heroes

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Work of sub-committee to play with name for program
- City recognizing those everyday people
- Have marketing person in City to help promote this program

Councilmember Gurney stated that a lot of people contribute in ways that are often taken for granted. She stated that she would like to be on the sub-committee.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There was none.

Council deliberations:

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Nice idea
- Way to identify people who do all this great stuff in town
- Would never consider themselves heroic
- See potential costs; monetarily as well as staff time
- Work with Public Works to install and remove and change out banners
- Would like to see as part of policy: preliminary application; selection criteria; who makes the selection; vetting process, etc.

Councilmember Gurney stated the sub-committee would recommend the names and the Council would decide.

Mayor Slayter commented that this would tie in well with the community awards.

Councilmember Glass moved and Mayor Slayter seconded the motion to support the concept of a City Recognition Program of "Every Day Heroes" Featured on City Light Poles and created a sub-committee of Vice Mayor Hinton, Councilmember Gurney and City staff.

VOTE:

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

Noes: None

Absent: Carnacchi

Abstain:None

City Council Action: Supported the concept of a City Recognition Program of "Every Day Heroes" Featured on City Light Poles and created a sub-committee of Vice Mayor Hinton, Councilmember Gurney and City staff.

Minute Order Number: 2018-039

CITY COUNCIL REPORTS:

8. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports:

- Agenda Review Committee Meeting Tomorrow at 8:30 am
- Tomorrow Leader's Today event at 1:00 pm at City Hall

9. 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):

Vice Mayor Hinton reported as follows:

- League of CA Cities Legislative committee
- Report handed out to the City Council
- Support 68 and 69
- Oppose SB 827
- Working on legislative matrix for voting records
- Track how leadership votes
- Put out report card
- Attended local chapter of Gravenstein Health Action
- Meets every month at Palm Drive Health Care District
- Gave park village a grant that helped purchase a number of trailers for \$67,000
- Three mobile homes are from that grant
- Respite plan being worked on

Councilmember Glass reported as follows:

- Met with two rotary clubs
- Interested in supporting the City in getting a map your neighborhood program up and running
- Committed to raising \$4000 or so to produce the map your neighborhood materials
- May be other commitments in the future
- Idea of having an interface person from the City to work with
- City may look into having a paid volunteer manager that works with Fire Department to coordinate that

- Trying to encourage idea of more money coming from that source to help City implement program
- Discussed Map Your Neighborhood and how it works
- Rotary looking at us be pilot program for entire district

Mayor Slayter stated the City Council emergency management plan update Sub-committee meets tomorrow.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Wonderful opportunity for someone to write grant to fund the volunteer position
- Had two public transit meetings
- Questions about improvements like to see
- Afternoon session
- ¾ of attendees
- ¼ in evening sessions
- Answers: similar
- Extend weekday hours
- Extend weekend hours
- Add new stops
- Synchronize schedules with wider network
- Help us come up with ideas to increase ridership
- Slogan – riding high see the town
- Operate trip planning events
- Character for bus
- Decorate bus
- Reduce carbon footprint
- Personal chauffeur – let us drive you
- Save money – cheaper than owning a car
- Bus to look at ambassador
- High school student earns public service hours
- Ads on side of busses

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed topics for Sonoma County Mayors and Councilmembers 2018
- Council can informally send topics to the Mayor
- Fire recover topics

Councilmember Gurney thanked the Mayor and Vice Mayor for a good program at the last meeting.

Vice Mayor Hinton report as follows:

- Open Space Presentation meeting and speaker
- Fire Burned Open Space topic
- May be speaker for the next MC Meeting

10. Council Communications Received: None reported.

11. Future City Meeting Dates/Events (Informational Only): (See Agenda Below and City Web site for Up to Date Meeting Dates/Times)

CLOSED SESSION: None

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING: Mayor Slayter adjourned the regular City Council meeting of February 20, 2018 at 10:15 p.m. The meeting will be adjourned to the next Regular City Council Meeting which will be held on Tuesday, March 6, at 6:00 pm, at the Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted,



Mary Gourley
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC