



North Sonoma Valley Municipal Advisory Council
 Notice of Meeting and Agenda
February 16, 2022



PLEASE NOTE: In accordance with AB 361, Governor Newsom’s March 4, 2020 State of Emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Sonoma County Public Health Officer’s Recommendation for Teleconferenced Meetings, and the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Resolution 21-0399, the North Sonoma Valley Municipal Advisory Council meeting will be held virtually.

Join Zoom Conference Meeting:

<https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/92493979799?pwd=ZjBRUU5lWmpSWUI4RGhmdlkzWldwQT09>

Meeting ID: 924 9397 9799

Passcode: 979480

Join by Phone: 1 (669) 900-9128

5:30 p.m.

Contact: Hannah Whitman, Board Aide for Supervisor Susan Gorin – hannah.whitman@sonoma-county.org

1. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call

Call to Order 5:33

Roll Call: Vice Chair Handron

Present: Chair Dawson, Dickey, Doss, Eagles, Nardo-Morgan, Newhouser, Oldroyd, Cooper

2. Approval of January 5, 2022 & January 19, 2022 minutes

Councilmember Newhouser: I was present at the last meeting.

Councilmember Eagles made a motion to approve both meeting minutes, Councilmember Nardo-Morgan Both seconded. Both meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comments

Vicki Hill: I am a member of the Sonoma Valley Ground Water Sustainability Agency Advisory Commission. There’s a couple of workshops coming up. The Sonoma Valley Ground Water Sustainability Plan was approved in December and submitted to the State Department of Water Resources for approval. This has been a multi-year process, you can get more info at sonomavalleygroundwater.org. The next step is implementation of the plan. Two important workshops will be held to discuss funding, on Tuesday, March 29 from 5:30-7 pm and Wednesday, April 13 hopefully in-person, location to be announced, also at 5:30 pm.

Alice Horowitz: I have taken issue with the letter to the editor that was published in the latest edition from the 15th, where Stephen Sorokin, a local Developer living in Diamond A, says, “I can’t help but interpret the demands by NSV MAC to keep the site intensity to 450 dwelling units and attempt to maintain an exclusionary buffer between the white enclave of central GE and the denser and Browner areas along Madrone Rd and the Springs.” There are legitimate reasons for people wanting to put housing there, and there are legitimate reasons for people wanting to not want housing there. But to just blankly throw out there that anybody who supports the NSV MAC letter is racist. I just find that so incredibly offensive. If that’s a prevalent thought, then that’s something that we need to address.

Sharon Church: I read that letter and thought, “wow he really is off base.” Most of the people in the GE Forum and the MAC have been supporting the fact that this neighborhood is GE. It’s the County who is trying to sever us and call us Eldridge, which we are not. I take offense at the whole thing and have a problem with Susan Gorin not taking any ownership on it, that supervisors don’t decide what is a community. Nobody is in charge, yet we’ve got them in the documents continuing to refer to us as Eldridge, and the housing they want to put just North of Martin is North Eldridge. It’s discouraging and I feel very unrepresented and I’m not even Brown, I can imagine what the Brown people must feel. Sorokin is off base and is trying to create an issue. If he wants to develop, build baby build.

Councilmember Eagles: I do appreciate that its being brought to us that there's some sort of false divide occurring here. I do think we need to be well aware of this. As Alice pointed out, folks who don't want a lot of housing... it means that there's all kinds of things. Those assumptions are really unfortunate, and we do need to be aware that those are happening, anti-housing and even racist and I think they're not fair we need to be aware of them and maybe consider messaging and action around that.

Chair Dawson: We do have in the plan to have the County Office of Equity speaking in the MAC. I'm not sure if it's happening in the next month but in the next couple of months.

3. Certificate of Recognition for Nikita Ducarroz

Chair Dawson: I'm so happy to be able to do this. We don't have a city council in Glen Ellen or Kenwood, so this is the closest thing we have. I don't know you personally very well, I know your mom a little better, so I just feel like you're part of the GE family. The fact that you made it to the Olympics and earned a bronze medal, and your openness with challenges with anxiety, that I think everybody faces at certain times in their lives. It has been very heartwarming and appreciated, we're just really proud that you're from GE and no matter where you end up, you'll always have a place here in GE.

Nikita Ducarroz: I feel very lucky to have grown up in Glen Ellen, it's such a tight community. I wouldn't have preferred to grow up anywhere else. An awesome place to grow up.

Councilmember Nardo-Morgan: Hi Nikita, I know your mom very well. My sons and your brothers attended school together. I remember you as a little girl riding your bike around like crazy. You are so brave, so talented, and so amazing. It's so special to see you grown up and at the Olympics. We're so proud that you're from GE and what you've accomplished, and I think you should be so proud also and we love you.

Supervisor Gorin: Thank you to Leslie B who organized the incredible reception that the City and County gave to you a few weeks ago and the incredible parade. Nikita heard this story before but when I was first elected, her mom came in and said we have incredible youth who need a place to practice BMX and we want to create a track on Maxwell. Congratulations to you Nikita, I hope that we are going to start a crown raising effort to build that pump track in honor of you. An indeed, all of us, even beyond GE are so proud of you. You are so bold & so brave.

4. Supervisor Gorin Update

Grateful for passion around SDC. I still have some disagreement on how the Permit Sonoma characterized our board of discussion. We did not have a meeting this week, we won't have one until March 1st, where we will discuss & bring forward a plan for a new County Center. Our team of 4 have not really met in person at the office for 2 years, I think county employees will continue to move that way, but it doesn't mean we don't have a need to have a county facility.

It's unfortunate that we've gotten to this point of having divisiveness over lack of diversity or diversity and the advocacy that you and the MAC are putting forward in advocating for something within the scale of GE, I think it's totally appropriate that you're doing that. Maybe a little higher density than you are proposing but not 1,000 units, I've been very clear about that. Sharon, thank you for your letter, you made it very clear a year ago that you want to be known as Glen Ellen. We started the GE Forum around the divisiveness of the GE triangle and the original person who was not happy with what was going on there for legitimate reasons. I said please GE organize yourself, come up with a name & a design for the signs. I can find funding to pay for the signs at the triangle South of Marty Drive.

Chair Dawson: What would it take to get a sign at the South corner of Madrone that says now entering Glen Ellen?

Supervisor Gorin: I think it would be totally fine. I'll work with Johannes Averts who is now the Director for transportation and public works, and general services.

Councilmember Cooper: I feel kind of like an outsider living in Kenwood. I've been here since 1980 and when I talk to people about the council I'm on, they never really know where Eldridge is. People know where Glen Ellen is, but they don't know exactly where Eldridge is. When people in GE don't feel like they're acknowledge or known...

Supervisor Gorin: Eldridge is really referring, to what I believe is the SDC.

Chair Dawson: I have a whole article I can send you about Captain Eldridge. I think the problem is that the census bureau designated that whole neighborhood South of what we're calling Eldridge. It's Eldridge a census-designated place. That's what Permit Sonoma is using. It has nothing to do with how people living there think of themselves. That's part of the problem, there's an overlapping bureaucratic designation that Permit Sonoma has grabbed onto and is refusing to let go.

Supervisor Gorin: you raise an interesting point, Arthur. What would it take to rename that census tract and that's above my pay grade, but at least I can ask the question.

Councilmember Newhouser: I wanted to address the sign issue briefly because as part of the design that was submitted to the County for what we call the firehouse triangle, which is that little piece of earth located directly across the firehouse, actually has a welcome to GE sign. It was suggested that a sign closer to the Dunbar triangle, which is that Sonoma Land Trust triangle area, also being caretaken by the GE Forum. The wild card in all of this is the ballot box issue, which we're hoping to resolve sooner rather than later. Then, we could move forward with the design. I think what's inspiring about this is this could lead to a sign at either end, and I think that would be wonderful. They could both be designed, or they could be similar.

Supervisor Gorin: Three locations Mark; North, South, and Warm Springs Rd.

Councilmember Newhouser: Exactly where is the dividing line?

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Sharon Church: Susan, I am encouraged by your comments. I think signage is a great idea. We are an inclusive community. Our ballots are mailed to us in GE, my DL is GE, my passport is GE, the title of our house was GE, so the census business & Google Maps is very upsetting because it's like you're being pushed out of your community, so your support is greatly appreciated. Thank you to MAC board members.

Elisa Stancil: I think it's fantastic to have the signage, I'm really happy we're going to do it as a group. Mark Newhouser worked with the Dunbar triangle a little bit. It's important to do a careful consideration and not end up with something like whatever the entry to what is Boyes Hot Springs or whatever that thing that they built... we aren't doing something like that. We'll work on doing something distinctive and welcoming and if we have this done in 2 years that would be heavenly.

Tracy Salcedo: I know that the U.S. Geological Survey has a board of domestic names. I use that a lot in my research, I know you can appeal to that to get a place name changed, so that's something we may want to look into in terms of formally getting the Eldridge name applied to the SDC property, if that's what we want to do, and changing the name of what some people call Eldridge, to Glen Ellen.

Teresa Murphy: I just wanted to say that the reason why Eldridge is Eldridge is because it had its own zip code, 95431, that encompasses the property of the SDC that was Eldridge.

Chair Dawson: Basically, it's a mess. But I think on the other hand, within the community there's a clear sense of what GE is, so it's just these outside bureaucracies that are messing with us.

Bean Anderson: I was reading the Census website. The census area there has a multi-digit code and the names come from what the local people want to call them and apparently no one responded to this before, so they chose this

thing that was contiguous to Eldridge and our next chance to change it might not be for another 10 years, but it's still worth the try.

Supervisor Gorin: Gratitude towards all commenting, great sources of info. One of the conundrums that hasn't been discussed within the SDC plan is the location of the post office. I fear that once the post office is closed it will be gone forever. I am not sure if SDC will be able to have its own zip code and post office once again.

5. Letter of Support: Sonoma Valley Fire Department

Reviewed and approved the letter of support for Sonoma Valley Fire Department vegetation management grant applications.

Chair Dawson: Moving on to item #6, which is our letter of support for the Sonoma Valley Fire Department which was requested by Fire Chief Steve Acre. Thank you Councilmember Newhouser for communicating with the Fire Chief and drafting the letters.

Councilmember Newhouser: The only comment I want to make about it is that in our outreach for our grant proposals for our funding for the MAC proposed planning process, to do neighborhood outreach, and the do kind of organizing & development of CWPP, community wildlife protection plan. We did a lot of outreach to get letters of support and Sonoma Valley Fire provided letters and in fact, they provided commitments and resources. I am more than happy & pleased that we are reciprocating in providing support for his project as he has for ours.

Letter shared on screen and read out loud by Councilmember Newhouser.

Councilmember Eagles: I do have one comment, and this is back to the zip codes and who lives where. I consider myself as a resident of Glen Ellen and community but technically I live in the Rancho madrone neighborhood, South of Madrone. Is it important to call that out? What do we call the neighborhood? I call it Rancho Madrone. Am I overthinking this? It's important to me and people in my neighborhood to make that distinction and we are the Southern boundary of the MAC.

Councilmember Newhouser: This is great. I live in the Jack London Estates, so...

Councilmember Eagles: Well, that's in Glen Ellen Mark. I'm not in Glen Ellen.

Councilmember Newhouser: Oh, you're not in GE. How did you get in the MAC?

Councilmember Eagles: I guess I'm in the community. We're part of the Southern boundary.

Chair Dawson: She has friends.

Councilmember Newhouser: I was drawing on the kind of generality that the 3 communities that are listed in this letter comprise the MAC area, so I think that if that needs to be clarified and other neighborhoods or communities need to be brought into the fold to be officially recognized as part of the MAC are, then we should do that.

Councilmember Eagles: There are no other neighborhood or communities that are outside Kenwood or GE. There aren't any except for ours, I just want to make sure that we don't get forgotten in the mix. But I do acknowledge we are part of the community, so I leave it for you guys.

Chair Dawson: To me you are totally part of GE, your kids went to Dunbar, you're part of the community. Maybe we'll work with the post office to rearrange the zip code.

Councilmember Nardo-Morgan: Do you have a different zip code?

Councilmember Eagles: I have a Sonoma zip code. It's 25 yards away but it won't deliver.

Vice Chair Handron: Kate, in support of your position, it is my understanding that the zip code boundary has changed on Madrone Road several times over the years, so in the past, at least the South side of Madrone Road has been Glen Ellen but more recently it's Sonoma. Maybe it's that historical reference that brings you to the GE community.

Councilmember Eagles: I didn't know that Vicki, thank you. I appreciate you guys listening, I just want to make sure that the constituents in that neighborhood understand that they are represented by the MAC.

Chair Dawson made a motion to approve & send the letter of support for Sonoma Valley Fire Department Vegetation Management Grant Application, Eagles seconded. Unanimously passed.

6. North Sonoma Valley MAC Annual Report

Councilmember Dickey: I think you should put proposed cannabis dispensary. I would add the word cannabis, just to be clear.

Councilmember Nardo-Morgan: We had a pretty successful project in partnership with Sonoma County Water Agency and community outreach with drought signs, we might want to put that.

Hannah Withman: Councilmember Nardo-Morgan did send that to me and I'm adding it right now. I'll start sharing my screen again. Alright, there it is.

Chair Dawson: any public comments?

Elisa Stancil: I think in the Ad Hoc committees it'd be nice to move the dates to the front of the comment of the paragraph because it give people more of a sense of a timeline. Under the GE Village Fair, the word draw/drew, and resonance should have an apostrophe after less. And you need to change the tense in the ad hoc committee about the letter if you're trying to make it something you're releasing now.

Bean Anderson: Ad Hoc, is it one word or two words? There's in the document and I think we should be consistent. And where it says crosswalk, also where is says "which," I think it should be "that."

Chair Dawson: I think it's one.

Alice Horowitz: No editorial comments from me. Just seeing the letter and seeing all that has been accomplished in the last year, so many people appreciate what you're doing.

Tracy Salcedo: Webster says Ad Hoc is two words. I want to echo what Elise said, way back when we talked about the GE Forum and the MAC as being two wings of the same bird and with everything that you guys are doing and with everything that the GE Forum is doing in terms of education, yea GE has taken wing and it's really encouraging.

Councilmember Newhouser made a motion to approve the letter, Councilmember Eagles seconded. Motion to approve the letter was passed unanimously.

7. SDC Ad Hoc Update and Next Steps

Chair Dawson: I asked the SDC and Ad Hoc committee to draft a scoping letter. Our next meeting in March, we'll look at the letter and hopefully approve it to send it to Permit Sonoma. That will be next month, this month we will get an update & brainstorm. Tonight, we have Vicki Hill who is our local GE resident and professional planner.

Councilmember Eagles: In our special meeting on the 6th of January was where we approved our letter. We wanted to give a quick update on what's happened with the letter since. The letter had a pretty extensive cc list and was sent out to them and the local media. Also, a petition was started in support of the letter, which has garnered close to 1600 signatures. The letter has been endorsed by lots of folks.

Chair Dawson: I'm very pleased with the reception it has gotten. The Springs MAC didn't explicitly endorse the letter but their letter is very close aligned with what we put in ours, so I feel like there isn't any real conflict between what they wrote and what we wrote. We're all pretty much in alignment and that's what we want, we want the community to be together on this as much as possible.

Vicki Hill: I would like to go over the SDC Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process, what it is and why we need one.

What is CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) and why we do EIRs:

- The objectives of CEQA are to inform governmental decision makers & the public about the potential significant adverse effects of a proposed activity, such as a specific plan to identify ways to reduce/avoid environmental damage by requiring changes in a project.
- Provide opportunities for other agencies & the public to review & comment on a project.
- EIR is required when the lead agency determines the project would potentially have one or more significant impacts.
- An EIR follows a certain format, has a project description, has an environmental setting where the project occurs, it looks at impacts, must require an analysis of alternatives to the proposed project or to its location.

The EIR process starts with scoping (that's where we are now), then the draft EIR & draft specific plan will be prepared, followed by 45-day public comment period, and likely a hearing, then a final EIR is prepared. No formal public comment period on that but EIR must respond to comments made on the draft. Finally, certification of the EIR and approval of the specific plan by the County Board of Supervisors.

- Critical to understand an EIR does not tell us if a project should be approved, it does not make project recommendations.
- It identifies environmental impacts & mitigation measures, the County is the decision maker. It may approve a project that has impacts or reject a project that does not have significant impacts. An EIR is not a decision document.
- Purpose of scoping: solicit comments re scope/content of the EIR (what needs to be analyzed & how should it be analyzed, what alternatives & what potential environmental impacts should be studied).
- Scoping process starts with an issuance of a notice of preparation (NOP). The NOP solicits comments & must allow not less than 30 days to respond to that NOP. Then, there's usually a scoping meeting.
- In the case of the SDC. The NOP was issued last week and the scoping meeting is tomorrow at 5:30, you can find out more at: www.sdcspecificplan.com.
- What is a NOP? A document stating that an EIR will be prepared for the project (it's the 1st step in the EIR process). Its primary focus is notifying local, state & public agencies about the project. Comments submitted before this step are not required to be addressed by the planning team in the EIR, that's why it's important to respond to the NOP and submit scoping comments.

The SDC NOP:

- Plan provides limited amount of project description information and no site plan. This makes it difficult to make meaningful comments on what should be studied in the EIR.
- NOP contains: housing development program ranging from 400-1,000 residential units; a non-housing developmental program including institutional office, research & development and other creative uses; parks & community gathering spaces, potential creation of a new road to connect Arnold to Hwy 12 and other community facilities; open space preservation.

EIR Scoping Comments:

Purpose of submitting scoping comments is to inform the County of environmental concerns & alternatives that should be addressed in the EIR.

Resubmit comments regarding environmental & alternatives.

What to include in comments:

- EIR issues (air quality, traffic, etc.)
- Review & address the project description contained in the NOP
- Comments should identify environmental issues, alternatives that should be included in the EIR analysis
- Methodologies that should be used
- Environmental thresholds
- Mitigation measures
- Information sources or studies that should be consulted
- 45-day deadline
- Comments should be submitted to Brian O by tomorrow.

Chair Dawson: Vicki, you said there's another comment period after the draft, so this is not our only chance, correct?

Vicki Hill: Correct, this is just scoping. The focus is to contact local & state agencies that have jurisdiction over the project. Members of the public can comment too but it's not our job to identify every single issue that needs to be analyzed. I'm sure the planning commission is well-informed about the topics but there may be a specific issue that has not been mentioned so far that you feel is important. After the EIR draft is published, you will have at least 45 days to review and make comments on the EIR.

Councilmember Dickey: The details are vague, how can they get away with that? How can you address something where the details, like the site plan, are seemingly deliberately avoided?

Vicki Hill: that's a good question, it's not unusual when doing a general or specific plan, that they don't have more details. I should note that this is a program EIR, it's not a project specific EIR. When I say project EIR they will look at the whole of the project. It will not go in and analyze every individual housing unit that is being proposed, it looks at the total development on the site. The planning staff indicated they wanted to maintain some flexibility & the project description, that's why we haven't defined a site plan. When the EIR is published they will have site plans for each of the alternatives. For right now, you can look back at the alternatives report or project description that was presented to the board on Jan 25th to get an idea of the types of uses they're thinking about and the general locations, but again, what they present in the EIR may be something different than that.

Councilmember Oldroyd: I am curious on who is creating the EIR report, is that the county?

Vicki Hill: The consultant for this specific plan, Nina Bellucci is doing both the specific plan and the EIR.

Councilmember Doss: Can you go a little more on the 450 homes that were recommended by the MAC, and you mentioned they will have to be addressed in different way for the EIR, to make sure they're included, can you say a little more?

Vicki Hill: The board directed staff to study 450-700 or 800 homes & the planning team did something different, they established a range of 450-1,000 homes. We're not clear if the 450 homes is going to be an alternative or if that's going to be part of the project, are they just going to look at a range as part of the project? I would encourage them to look at the full range as part of the project, that they maybe break it up in increments or somehow give equal analysis to 450 as well as 1,000 homes.

Councilmember Doss: How do we make that happen? That was a major point in our paper & our position was the 450. How do we even say we want them to focus on 450? I'm unclear how Permit Sonoma was able to raise it to 450 homes on their own?

Vicki Hill: I can't answer that question. There were several board members that gave direction. The planning team felt they had to study the full amount. The MAC may want to submit comments consistent with their letter & encouraging the county to study the 450 units, as a part of the proposed project.

Vice Chair Handron: You mentioned that the planning department is required to consider comments that are given but how much weight do they have to give those comments? And if there's multiple comments on the same issue does that give more weight to the comment?

Vicki Hill: I can't really answer that question, I don't know how they're going to weigh the comments or approach the analysis. If you think something is important, submit it. Under law, they do have to consider all scoping comments and they usually attach scoping comments or provide reference to those either as appendix to the EIR or make them available for review on their website.

Councilmember Newhouser: Vicki, you referred to the letter that we submitted in the appendix. Would you recommend we use that appendix & the topic areas that we had selected and build upon that with our additional comments?

Vicki Hill: Yes, to the extent that those topics are related to Environmental Impact Report issues.

Newhouser: following that template, would you suggest adding in the criteria, the recommended thresholds... even if were not experts in that area? How do you make these recommendations for mitigation measure or thresholds unless you're a scientist or trained in that land use planning?

Vicki Hill: it's not essential, it's not your job to do the analysis or the EIR, it's your job to bring up the issues that need to be analyzed in the EIR.

Chair Dawson: I'm looking for possible EIR issues and I'm looking at NOP on page 5, it has probable environmental effects. There's a whole list of probably more than a dozen environmental issue areas that will be addressed in the EIR. The obvious approach to me would be to take that list & take our letter. We would organize the letter under each one of those topics. Would that be a way to organize the whole thing?

Vicki Hill: sure, and I don't think you have to comment on every single topic. You can focus on those key areas that you think they may have missed. Remember that in the alternatives report there was some environmental assessment of certain topic areas, and you may want to go back and look at that. That's going to be expanded on in the EIR but that is providing the basis for the environmental study & the impact analysis.

Councilmember Newhouser: Vicki, are you aware of the consolidated changes that were made to the most recent version of the alternative that is being proposed?

Vicki Hill: No, we don't know what alternatives.

Newhouser: they did say they made certain changes in their presentation. Just thought maybe that information may be available.

Vicki Hill: they made changes to the presentation they made to the board on Jan 25th, but we don't know if that's the project description that is going to be used in the EIR. We can only go by what's in the NOP, which has some text identifying the types of uses & it doesn't identify the amount or location of the non-residential uses. It only identifies numbers for the residential uses, they can change it from what they presented to the board, we really don't know what going to be in the proposed project. That's the difficult part.

Councilmember Dickey: Vicki, my understanding of this process is that an EIR is going to look at the impacts of the proposed project at its largest scale and have to include an alternative that has reduced impacts of the proposed

project. based on the studies that are done on the maximum impacts and then they also have to a study or proposal that says no plan at all, is that correct?

Vicki Hill: Yes, that's correct Matt. The purpose of alternatives is it to look at changes to the plan that can reduce significant impacts of the proposed project. If the proposed project does not have significant impacts that makes it a bit different. That's why developing an alternatives doesn't come about until they're partway through the environmental review process when they determine what those significant impacts are.

Councilmember Dickey: We proposed in our MAC document a density of roughly 450 homes, if you were to negotiate a business deal, which is part of what this appears to be, is it worth whole to lower the number of homes they find acceptable? So, if they decide they're going to negotiate with and EIR report and with the community and all, we lower the number, so that if they're going to compromise they'll have to start with a lower number.

Vicki Hill: you can propose whatever you think is appropriate as the MAC, that doesn't necessarily mean they're going to consider that in the EIR. They don't have to study every alternative that is suggested. Alternatives much achieve at least some of the project objectives and an important one is economic feasibility. The EIR also has the ability to dismiss alternatives that aren't feasible.

Chair Dawson: I believe we had 400-450.

Councilmember Doss: regarding traffic... when reading off different areas that Permit Sonoma has already included, traffic is one of them. The new vehicle corridor from SDC to Hwy 12, does that mean we don't include that in our letter because that's already going to be discussed, or should we include our thoughts in re to that corridor?

Vicki Hill: the road is an option, right now it's not a done deal and I don't know if it will be included in the alternatives, but you can certainly identify the types of issues that should be looked at in assessing that new road. What are the impacts of that new road that you think are important to evaluate in the EIR?

Councilmember Doss: My concern is that even if 450 new housing units, I come from a background of fire evacuation, and even at 450 new housing units, if you consider two automobiles per unit, that's almost 1000 new cars that will need to be evacuated. How are they going to get out? That's an issue. You're correct in the first three alternative A, B and C only alternative C, included a new vehicle corridor or from SDC to Hwy 12. I don't know that we would support a new vehicle corridor, but we have to have some way, even at 450 to move those cars in case of evacuation.

Vicki Hill: You bring up a really good point and emergency evacuation routes won't be studied as part of the traffic analysis, but it should be studied as emergency response or public safety. You can make comments to look at the vehicle load on local roadways.

Councilmember Doss: I assumed it'd be in the traffic section. We need to very clear about emergency preparedness evacuation routes.

Councilmember Dickey: Vicki thank you, very clear. I have piles on my desk trying to figure this out. In terms of evacuation plans & traffic, you can request that an EIR also study the impacts of projects within a certain radius of the site. For instance, we've heard that a Hannah Boys Center is going to be developed, we know that the Old Eagle Ranch Project is going to go forward, the golf course is talking about expansion. While those projects are not necessarily proposals at the Permit Sonoma offices, at this point, we know that there's murmurings of them, how do you make sure that they study those as obvious impacts that would be associated with SDC and other projections that they would make?

Vicki Hill: that's a cumulative impact and SEQA requires the assessment of cumulative impacts, you can submit as part of your comments, a list of projects that you feel should be considered. There's case law about this project, the other projects have to be reasonably foreseeable and I'm not an attorney, but it has to be a reasonably foreseeable project it can't be speculative. I don't know what the status of the Hanna Boys Center project is but, for example, the new resort

that's going in and Gray Wolf Ranch... that's not speculative, that's happening now, and so that's reasonably foreseeable. I think that there's projects in the City of Sonoma that are going on, that would contribute to traffic, so you're certainly entitled to write comments about those types of projects that is a good scoping comment.

Councilmember Dickey: Do we have to know specifically what they might be? How specific do we have to be if we're requesting something to be considered?

Vicki Hill: try to be as specific as you can but if you don't have that specificity, then you do what you can in your comments.

Chair Dawson: We want them to study the MAC alternative, 450 homes the one outlined on the letter. As I understood, that's almost like a separate thing, we should have that as almost a standalone thing to go also with our scoping comments, did I get that right?

Vicki Hill: It's still a scoping comment. There's two main parts of scoping comments, identifying alternatives, and identifying issues that should be studied in the EIR. Spell out your alternative & be as specific as possible.

Councilmember Morgan-Nardo: Thank you Vicki, I really learned a lot. You've helped us write/outline this letter. You made a comment earlier that this is not a decision document. Who are the final decision makers in this?

Vicki Hill: The EIR does not make a recommendation to approve or deny the project, it identifies the impacts, mitigation measures, and an environmentally superior alternative that can either be the proposed project or another alternative. And it's up to staff to make recommendations to the board. It'll go to the planning commission but ultimately the board of supervisors will be making the decision on the specific plan, and they must certify the EIR as being complete & adequate, and once they do that, they can take action on the specific plan. If there are significant impacts identified in the EIR, they can still approve the specific plan by making a statement of overriding considerations and it's a series of findings that they would make as part of their approval of the specific plan.

Councilmember Newhouser: Would the financial feasibility be declared an overriding consideration and is that the point at which the preferred environmentally superior project would then be tossed out?

Vicki Hill: Let me make sure I understand what you're saying is that. Could they make an overriding consideration for economic feasibility?

Councilmember Newhouser: yeah, because you said that at some point the EIR can be overwritten by that one requirement of the project.

Vicki Hill: The EIR is not overwritten but they could make a finding to not approve the environmentally superior project. Based on these findings, and the findings can include a number of things and economic feasibility, they can make a finding that it's good for the public welfare and that's one of the findings that they can make. But if an alternative is not feasible then it's likely that the EIR would dismiss that alternative earlier in the process if it's not economically feasible.

Councilmember Newhouser: I think we have to be prepared for that reality. They said this all along that the 450 homes are not economically feasible, and I could just get set aside with during the scoping process, is that possible?

Vicki Hill: Well, I can't say. There's been a lot of comments submitted about their economic feasibility analysis about assumptions that are used in that.

Chair Dawson: How do we get someone who knows what they're doing to put that into the EIR?

Vicki Hill: You can make comments about that, but economic considerations or economic impacts are not usually analyzed in the EIR, that's not an environmental issue that's analyzed. The economic analysis was in the alternatives report and there were a lot of comments submitted. You can continue to you question what is in the alternatives report, but I don't know to what detail they're going to address any of that in the EIR. They will address it in the specific plan

itself, and you will have the opportunity to make comments on the plan itself when the draft plan has to come out with the draft EIR.

Councilmember Eagles: Re traffic vehicle miles traveled and the assumptions made about the commercial space, is it appropriate in this to request different scenarios? I think there's some assumption that there'll be more live work than then is actually practical from my early point of view, at this stage is it appropriate to get them to look at that at different levels?

Vicki Hill: Absolutely. If you if you feel that the assumptions are not valid, that they use in the alternatives report and I don't I assume that those are going to be carried forward. They may make adjustments to those assumptions, based on the comments, but absolutely, those types of comments are appropriate to make and that gets to the methodology that's used for that analysis.

Councilmember Dickey: I had the opportunity to questions some county officials & participants very specifically about the economic assumptions and none of them could offer clarity on where those numbers came from, they are in all reality fictional projections. The other thing that needs to be kept in mind is that any financial feasibility is related to the purchase price of the property. And that has not been publicly disclosed so again the projections that they have made at the county level, based on financial projections, they could be based on a potential purchase price that's been established, but that has not been revealed to us, so the likelihood is that these projections are based on the mitigation measures, the are related to the neglect of the property. And they're making those assumptions based on hey it's going to cost X number of millions of dollars to clean this site up and in order for a developer, to take the site over they need to make enough money to clean that stuff up.

Councilmember Eagles: this process is a little challenging right, because this is our moment to talk together because of Brown Act. What I'm hearing is that we should be identifying the alternatives that we'd like to see measured if they are in the NOP, right? And identifying the issues, identifying the terminals & identifying the potential issues & measurement tools to assess those issues. There's sort of two parts that can be integrated, but there are two portions to that. But I want to make clear, this is our moment so, for example, Vicki said unless we can do it right now, we're not going to get any more specific than we were in our in our MAC letter for things like location of housing units & wildlife corridor. I'm open to other suggestions on how we can work on this process wise. We are challenged here, I want to acknowledge, but we will do our best.

Chair Dawson: Let's say someone in the committee can put together a site plan with 450 units, is that worth doing, something that is that specific?

Vicki Hill: Sure, yea, I mean why not? You already have the basic elements of that alternative, are you saying to actually draw a plan?

Chair Dawson: I was just fooling around one day, and I thought what it would take to get this plan down to 450 units and I took out some of the housing along the creek because that seems like that's prime habitat and wildlife passage. It took me an hour it wasn't anything in depth, but I managed to get it down to about 450. So, I'm just wondering if that kind of an exercise would be worthwhile to submit assuming that we were able to accomplish something that met what we would like to see?

Vicki Hill: Sure, yea, I don't think that right now none of the alternatives or proposal were focused on 450 units. They're going to have to develop one, so yea if I were a land use planner it'd be great to have somebody give me what they're thinking and some concepts.

Chair Dawson: I'd be happy to pass that on to the committee. Is that a violation of the Brown Act?

Hannah (admin): I will double check and circle back to you.

Councilmember Newhouser: I don't mean to interrupt, but my understanding of the Brown Act, from our presentation last month, is that whoever is preparing the draft letter can be submitted to the MAC as long as it's posted publicly. I think that's why we've been doing this exercise, the letters also get put online. I think that was that electronic exception that allows us to do that. We're not having meetings, it's more about sharing information, so that we can all participate in the evaluation & submitting comments, so that we can add content that can then be used by the Ad hHc committee to develop the letter.

Hannah (admin): Absolutely, we can post them on the MAC website. I guess it sort of sounded like there would be a little more back & forth and refining/exchange that wasn't happening in a public meeting, that's how I interpreted it at first.

Councilmember Newhouser: It can get a little messy, but this is content we're willing to share publicly.

Chair Dawson: I'm happy to move into public comment.

Councilmember Eagles: I'd like to be respectful of Vicki's time too, so public comment is very specific to Vicki's presentation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Nancy Kirwan: In the NOP, under developmental type, it says 1,000. It doesn't say 450-1,000, it says 1,000. And further down it says project issues discussed in the document and they've checked off all these boxes, they did not check off drainage & absorption & the wetlands. They did not include schools & universities, and if we are going to have a discussion about moving Dunbar school or if we want to start a trade school or some kind of an educational institute, that should be included in here. They didn't include vegetation and did not check cumulative effects. And as Vicki said, there are numerous cumulative effects, and we should be insisting that be included. When checking various organizations & agencies, they should've included fishing game, and they should have included construction, public schools and food & agriculture.

Chair Dawson: Vicki, I didn't see the document Nancy is talking about. I'm looking at the NOP, I didn't see those boxes, but I'm guessing they're on the notice of completion, is that correct and is that something we should be concerned about at this point?

Vicki Hill: the notice of completion is a form that they send to the state. I think it's fine to make comments on that because it gets sent out to various local and state agencies. I would focus mainly on the NOP.

David Eichar: In terms of cumulative effects, another project is the hotel affordable housing project in El Verano. In terms of financial feasibility, they should include potential funding for grants for affordable housing and should recommend an alternative with 450 units with 25% affordable but also another alternative that is 100% affordable. Low-income residents have fewer vehicle miles traveled and fewer vehicles. Re scoping, the effect on wildlife corridors, which includes fencing lighting and the additional road that impact on wildlife. For the hotel, they should include vehicle miles traveled & greenhouse gas effect, there should also be public transportation availability, including routes. And should include the feasibility of being able to take public transportation to San Francisco and Marin counties.

Maud Hallin: construction in GE has been 800 per square foot and they proposed something like 375. I've been looking at prefab housing and found trackable units, 20x20 for \$50,000, which would be fabulous for low-income housing, and they can be stacked. Hopefully we can have a nonprofit developer to work on that because all we see in plans is concern for money & money for the developer, they are not concerned about the people.

Teresa Murphy: Now's the time to fix things for the future and forever. The EIR for Eldridge is coming our way and there's still outstanding issues that have not been addressed by the county regarding the property, how can the

evaluators know what to look at if there's no site plan and the numbers have not been announced? I am surprised that the consultant that did not give what the community wanted is the one doing the EIR. Is that common practice for a consultant to be doing both of those processes, it appears to me to be a conflict. The historic area previously identified by the GEHS is now slated to be residential and that's unacceptable. I am also concerned about the carbon emissions that are impacting the environment with the tear downs, and the last comment, I want to say is the legacy of care phrase in their reports, but their actions and statements, along with the county have made this phrase tired and hackneyed instead of full of promise.

Elisa Stancil: With my background with historical preservation my concerns about their methodology have to do with a remediation and the restoring or completely rebuilding of any kind of infrastructure, as well as the whole water system, heating & power. This is environmental in my opinion, I just want to check with Vicki, is this environmental? Because if they do it, depending on how they're planning to sequence this process, they can't just come and tear into the entire square without having a huge impact on noise in every other kind of denigration in the areas surrounding, wildlife and everything. So I'm planning my letter to talk about staging and the approach of how they're planning to do it and I need to read very carefully what they have but Vicki, is this timeline something worthwhile to talk about in the EIR?

Josette Brose-Eichar: One thing Dave forgot to mention is that "no hotel" should also be listed as one of the alternatives in the EIR. Interesting conflict of interest that the very same consultants that have put all of this out here are now those tasked with the EIR. Is this common practice?

Tracy Salcedo: The campus is the focus of what the planning is focused on, but the site is quite bigger than that. I think we need to point out that it's not just about the campus but also the space & community that surrounds it. This is a specific plan for the entire property for 900 acres and beyond, and we need to make sure that's what is actually scoped in the EIR.

Bean Anderson: In terms of fire evacuation, in the past, they had addressed that by saying they would build fire breaks and other defensible space as if evacuations don't happen. So what would be the best way to measure how many people can be evacuated and how long? Is there a way to make historic preservation and a museum part of the EIR comments? Is there a way to make historic preservation and no museum...make that part of the EIR comments?

Vicki Hill: Bean, there is a museum outlined in the NOP so I do believe that would be considered. Historic preservation does need to be considered; they need to look at the impacts of not preserving historical resources. Re fire evacuation, I heard there's a study going on re the public safety element of the general plan for the county that is looking at evacuation, not specifically at the SDC site.

Teresa, yes, it is common practice. If it was a developer proposing the specific plan, then it would not be common for the developer to do an EIR on its own plan. Since the consultant was hired by the county to prepare both the specific plan and the EIR, that's not uncommon and not viewed as a conflict of interest.

The sequence of remediation and staging, nothing has been discussed. I don't think it's in the alternatives report and I don't think it's been discussed at the Planning Advisory Team (PAT). The construction impacts alone are going to be major. SEQA does require an analysis of everything- construction operation, maintenance, and abandonment. So, that is a very valid comment to make, to question that or to ask for that to be included in the project description and to be analyzed.

Laurie Pile: I have some concerns about the actual construction going on in the campus and how it's going to affect the community in case of an evacuation and how that will cause effects. Also, during the construction period, the noise level, the emissions, the light...how is that going to affect the wildlife corridor and the surrounding community? When families move-in and perhaps a hotel or whatever, what kind of assurances are we going to have as far as noise levels & what effects will domestic animals have on wildlife corridors?

Chair Dawson: I think if you look at the NOP in page 5, a lot of what you mentioned is on there.

Alice Horowitz: With all this talk about evacuations, there's been a couple of big developments that have been shut down. There have been a number of lawsuits recently against their county because evacuations & stuff. Does anyone know if those lawsuits were SEQA oriented in response to an EIR or were they lawsuits that were specific about the evacuation element that was not addressed?

Councilmember Eagles: if a school or something like a school is not in the scope yet, we don't have to comment on that?

Vicki Hill: What do you mean with school?

Councilmember Eagles: the school is a different kind of decision, and the school may or may not move and there's no direct environmental impact. I would think there's no environmental impacts to be measured in conjunction with potential school... so things of that nature we wouldn't have to comment on? I don't think.

Vicki Hill: As a group if you support locating a school on the campus, then you would want an alternative that provides space for that. If you feel that should be included, then you can make that comment. The difficulty is that the school district hasn't proposed the movement/construction of the school there, and the analysis hasn't been conducted to determine whether there is a need for a new school as a result of the population that would go on to the new site.

Councilmember Eagles: A school is not the best example, but you answered my question in a more general sense. If we think there should be space for something, then we might want to add that in.

Chair Dawson: Vicki, thank you so much for coming tonight and all your sharing and your expertise...

Vicki Hill: My pleasure. If you have questions, feel free to reach out. I'm here as a resource.

Councilmember Eagles: I do want to make one more comment on what Councilmember Newhouser and Hannah were talking about. I do think Mark, that we cannot collaborate. We still can't take collaborative comments until we all get together again is my understanding. What we did last time with the letter, we put it up 5 days before the meeting, but we weren't able to collaborate. We're able to see it, but can't take collaborative comments again until we get together again. If Hannah goes back and checks and we're able to take input, but not come back to you, just say thank you for the input, then Hannah will address that question but we cannot collaborate.

Councilmember Newhouser: My understanding is... I know we can't share info back and forth. Let's say a draft/a structure of the document or the plans for document can be shared with the community, that means publicly, as well as with the other council members, and then other council members & public can use that information to provide comments back to Hannah that can then be posted and utilized by the Ad Hoc committee.

Chair Dawson: I think that if it's just input, it might be acceptable, but I'm not sure about that.

Councilmember Dickey: Just an observation about this particular issue. Fortunately, though the MAC is going to develop this document, as individuals we're also to comment. Not everything can or will be covered in the MAC doc but we can cover it as individuals.

Chair Dawson: Good point, the MAC letter doesn't have to be exhaustive and there will be a chance to comment on the draft EIR as well.

Councilmember Eagles: I wish it were otherwise. I'm not advocating this, but I just want to be clear that I think this is the way it is... and Hannah will comment. I wish it was different.

Chair Dawson: Do you and other Ad Hoc members feel you have enough to draft the letter?

Councilmember Eagles: I can't speak for Matt and Angela, but I feel pretty good.

Councilmember Doss: Ad Hoc committees can use community consultant like Vicki, you just can't use us. Those are community experts or individuals within the community. The Brown Act is also concerned about powerful individuals within the group having greater influence than just one vote and that's part of the reason things work this way.

Councilmember Nardo-Morgan: I agree with Daymond and when we wrote the 1st letter, we did have input from Vicki and Jon McCaull and it was very helpful. I do think we have enough info and I think it was particularly helpful to get comments from the public.

Councilmember Dickey: My thought originally was there were two templates we can use for info, one was the backend of the NOP. Fortunately, we did a lot of work in the appendix in the MAC doc that can be applied in the comments.

Vice Chair Handron: Thank you to the committee for putting the time in and doing the hard work on this, I really appreciate it.

Councilmember Copper: I like it, I really appreciate it.

Councilmember Oldroyd: I also appreciate the public comments, they were very carefully noted.

Councilmember Newhouser: I previously submitted a document to the Ad Hoc committee that had recommendations in it from the Jan 5th meeting. I respectfully submit that as my recommendations for inclusion in the scoping letter, specifically to address limits that would help mitigate/prevent environmental har. I'd like those included. I think we need to call out the distinction between open space and habitat corridors. Even in the 30x30 definition of open space, it's really about accessible open space. One of the major issues surrounding habitat corridors is the incursion of human occupation into those areas. There's specific things we can recommend carefully designed & constructed corridors to keep wildlife & habitat separate from human occupation. I think I also included increased setbacks to accommodate fire safety setbacks. How do we get our comments to the Ad Hoc, and if we want to submit additional comments to the committee how do we do that? Can we have an emergency meeting perhaps?

Hannah (admin): I am going to clarify but think if it's a one-way flow of comments from non-Ad Hoc members to the Ad Hoc...with the things that they would like to include and then we post those publicly along with all the content that the Ad Hoc produces, I'm pretty sure that'll work, but I do want to double check to clarify.

Councilmember Eagles: Daymond has reminded us we have resources and Matt has reminded us that other folks are going to comment. We're going to do our best in the letter, it may not be perfect, and we may not cover everything, but we'll do our best. We just have to set reasonable expectations.

Councilmember Copper: Who do we send our one-way letter to?

Hannah (admin): I want to confirm, but it would be sent to me, I would distribute to the whole MAC and post it on the website, so it'd be available to the public.

8. Ad Hoc Committee Update and Review

Chair Dawson: Anybody object if we move Hannah's presentation for the next meeting?

Hannah's presentation was moved to next meeting.

9. Consideration of items for future agenda

Councilmember Dickey: I'm curious to know who we contact if we want to have a party at the SDC?

Hannah (admin): I am not sure, but I can find out.

Councilmember Dickey: Aug 20th

Newhouser: I tried to schedule a meeting at SDC and went through all the channels and they won't allow any indoor meetings, they say it's because of COVID.

Nardo-Morgan: We've had a couple historical meetings outside, it was fund. It can happen.

Chair Dawson: Any other items for next month? The letter is going to be a big thing. I think the Office of Equity may be presenting. We'll also have the Ad Hoc committee presentation by Hannah.

Nardo-Morgan: The Jack-to-Jack Race is going to be at the Jack London Yacht Club on Saturday March 26 from 10-2. They raise money and give it back to many nonprofits in Sonoma. There's going to be a beer garden, food, music... it'll be fun.

Chair Dawson: I know the GE Forum is meeting for their town cleanup March 6th from 9-11, meeting at the post office.

Dickey made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Nardo-Morgan seconded.

10. Adjournment 8:27

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the North Valley Municipal Advisory Council after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Board of Supervisors' Office located at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100-A, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours.

Note: Consideration of agenda items will proceed as follows:

1. Presentation
2. Questions by Councilmembers
3. Questions and comments from the public
4. Response by presenter, if required
5. Comments by Councilmembers
6. Resolution, if indicated

Web Links: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/North-Valley-Municipal-Advisory-Council/>