



**North Sonoma Valley Municipal Advisory Council**  
 Notice of Meeting and Agenda  
**December 15, 2021**



**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/99404650212?pwd=Y0pEMmJHY3Nad0toRlZzVUZDOFhVdz09>

**Meeting ID:** 994 0465 0212

**Passcode:** 990791

**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](mailto:hannah.whitman@sonoma-county.org)

**1. Meeting Called to Order by Chair Dawson at 5:34 pm**

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call: Vice Chair Handron

**Absent:** None

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

**2. Approval of October 20, 2021 & November 17, 2021 minutes**

Resolution

Motion to Approve: Vice Chair Handron

Second: Councilmember Eagles

Vote 7-0

**2. Public Comment**

Receive

**Scott Callow:** unable to connect, will wait to make comment at another time.

**Hugh Helm:** will wait to make a comment when item comes on the agenda.

**4. Supervisor Gorin Update**

Receive

Very long meeting on Tuesday 12/14 about where we may expand county through ARPA program– housing, homelessness, and other categories. Addressing the inequalities that exist in our community and hardships that many people have experienced during the past year, we thank our national government for approving this and President Biden for pushing this through. We desperately need the funds and by the time we get down to the bottom of understanding the needs of the county and the needs of the staffing, we are getting ready to dispense funds in the community, through probably CURA for those families that may not have adequate resources to keep them fed & housed. That’ll be coming forward in January. We’d like to expand some of the funds as rapidly as possible and wait for an RFP process through Alegria De La Cruz and Oscar Chavez for those community organizations to receive some funding for their programs. We also discussed potential appointments for the Director of IOLERO, Karlene Navarro who was appointed as a judge. The Executive Director for the Economic Development Board, Sheba Pearson-Whitley turned in her resignation. Had several folks comment that they want to see the county approve the use of toilets, so that people can live in tiny homes and help solve some our homeless issues and living conditions for homeless population, but the tiny homes really do not have sanitation facilities. Our final item of the day was approving the redistricting map. Thanks to all the incredible efforts of all the folks serving on the redistricting commission, the Vice Chair of the Springs MAC, Ray, Veronica Vences, and a few other good folks knowledgeable about the district. They did a great job. It was a very difficult because many of them did not understand the nuances of neighborhoods and communities of interest. I worked hard to advocate for

reunification. All are part of the Bennett Valley area plan, so it was important that we reunite that community. We divided up northern Santa Rosa into districts, not easy not fun. We worked up balancing the population and James Gore moved into some of the areas that he previously represented. I moved us into some of the areas that supervisor Coursey previously represented, but I think it will be fine. I'm very familiar with the neighborhoods and the issues in that part of Santa Rosa. James Gore and David Rabbit are both running for reelection, and they will be running in areas that they have not worked with before. I really want to thank you for another year of incredible service and great work and representing the community and being out there hearing concerns and being the voice of the community.

**Chair Dawson:** Thank you Susan and thank you for being there, and all the effort that you put into so many different things, it makes my head spin even trying to think about how you do it, it's impressive. Any councilmember comments or questions for Susan? This is an opportunity just raise your hand.

**Supervisor Gorin:** I had a good convo with Anne Ching about how to reach out to community about redistricting. It is challenging. If anyone has ideas, they need the info by February. Please contact a member of school board to talk to some of the trustees.

**Jed Cooper:** Question for Supervisor Gorin, what are the similarities with that and SDC? The state will probably move quicker than the SDC?

**Supervisor Gorin:** The county owns the entirety of the SDC campus. It has a number of aging buildings that have been thoroughly vandalized. It has been costing the county close to a million dollars a year for security and vegetation management on the campus. We still have some county services on the campus. We will be allocating some of the funding for construction on the county campus and we allocated some of the ARPA funding for that as well. Please don't get alarmed that this effort in the planning process is going to result in an immediate transfer of ownership from the state to a potential developer. It took five rounds of requests for proposals from the county to the development and received little interest until the last round, a fascinating auction with two bidders beating each other up. In my personal opinion, the state is going to be holding on to this site for a while, will it be five years, probably not, but it certainly will be longer than one. They are anxious to achieve a sell to remove liability/responsibility. Looking at sophisticated team for planning process. Can't anticipate what will happen, but I can anticipate it will take longer than state anticipates

**Copper:** if it takes too long can they just sell?

**Supervisor Gorin:** They can do that, but that is the whole reason for this specific plan and the approval going through the entitlement process. That is the official action of the county to rezone that property and it gives us a feeling of assurance that we had a hand in determining the scale of development in the standards and guidelines on the campus. But it does not necessarily mean that a development team wouldn't come in to work w/ the community.

## **5. Presentation on Vacation Rental Ordinance Update**

Receive

Presentation from Gary Helfrich, Project Planner for Vacation Ordinance Update at Permit Sonoma. Permit Sonoma public outreach workshop to receive input and recommendations to improve regulation of vacation rentals. The purpose is to receive feedback as we develop and craft the ordinance. Purpose of workshop: how to proceed w/ ordinance. What we heard is to get as much feedback. How you run your vacation rental. License is easy to enforce and revoke. Need to improve the application process and how we do enforcement & complaints and neighborhood notification. Land use restrictions (density, proximity, use). For example, x-zones and fires.

Public Input: support for licensing of vacation rentals. Support for 24-hour complaint hotline and online application process. Restrict number of permits issued to one entity. Limit corporate ownership. Better standards to avoid impacts to emergency response & eviction. X Zones, and limits on proximity and density remain controversial. Was instructed to not talk about Picasso. This specifically has to do with rentals, the classic Airbnb. Other thing heard from fire and workshops is we need a system so that people in rentals can be evacuated rapidly and effectively. We think it is important to add to the ordinance X zones and proximity. We have some gaps, especially in the valley we want to clean up.

Current Ordinance: Applies to rental of a primary home for 30 or fewer days. Not allowed in ADU's. Allowed in AR, RR, R1, LEA, DA, RRD C2, LC K and PCRR zones. Zoning permit subject to performance standards. Use permit in limited circumstances to exceed standards or allow limited exceptions. Limited by bedrooms— up to 12 persons per night, 18 persons during daytime. Prohibited in vacation rental exclusion x zone. 2 people per bedroom + 2 people (people under 3 years old don't count). Will bring policy options forward to restrict or limit those exceptions. We've seen little reduction in vacation rental in x zone.

Enforcement of Standards: Pressure on property managers. Establish a 24/7 hotline to streamline and document complaints. Call center staffed 24/7 and contacts property manager. Property Manager responds to complaint. Call center verifies and logs response.

Policy: License Program. Recommendation revised to request vacation rental license in addition to zoning permit. Zoning permit authorizes the land use. Vacation rental regulates operation of use. License only for coastal zone vacation Rentals. Annual license expiration and renewal. Renewal may be denied for violation of standards. 1<sup>st</sup> year license issued at no cost for existing vacation rentals.

Property Manager Standards: Currently no standards for property managers. Staff recommends policy to December. Want to be strict.

Proximity and Concentration: Needed to limit vacation rentals to preserve neighborhood character and/or protect public health & safety. Applied in context sensitive manner. Proximity distance will vary with existing patterns of development. Concentration (density) works best where rentals are evenly distributed but having an adverse impact on neighborhood character or public safety. Working on the maps. It's good to understand that the valley has high concentration areas in burn area but concentration in rivers is higher. It's important for people to see county-wide perspective.

Parking: We are going to clarify parking standards. No off-street parking is limited to 4 guests. Vacation rentals not permitted without off street. Vacation rentals not permitted without off street parking where vehicles cannot park 6 feet from road centerline. Questions & recommendations, things missing that should be included in the ordinance?

**Chair Dawson:** Any comments or questions from councilmembers? Appreciate all the detail, you guys put a lot of thought into this.

**Newhouser:** This deserves a whole meeting. It's a complex issue and there's lots to discuss. I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this in length at a future date and have a link to comment on the process. Vacation rentals benefitting those who may have more than one home and creating an advantage. Why don't we just ban vacation rentals like Napa County does? How many units are you restricted to having? What duration is the permit? Does it have a 3-year life, 10-year life? Can zoning be reversed, can that be changed?

**Cooper:** I did Airbnb before the fires. What about the sound and lighting restriction?

**Doss:** Restriction for day use is one of the real problems that we have in Kenwood surrounding creeks in the valleys around as vacation rental per year guidelines, but then proceed to have an all-day party that goes well into the night. If I understood what you're saying, a 6-bedroom home would have a limit of 12 w/ limit of 18 persons. With parties there's more people and more cars parked. I am trying to understand if the restriction will limit the number of people in the rental to 18?

**Oldroyd:** I have a question about if someone is an existing permit holder and then the process would be to have the zoning permit, as I understand it, then you have to acquire a new business permit, am I right?

**Vice Chair Handron:** Happy to hear you're separating licensing from permitting in order to enforce & regulate operations. And that there will be increased accountability for property managers, I think that that goes a long way to

address a lot of the issues. But when are you going to determine specific numbers of violations that would cause somebody not to have their license renewed? Specifics about density and exclusion zones? And how do people outside of this meeting get their comments or those numbers to you?

**Dickey:** Project management standards, are they being developed?

**Gary Helfirch:** If the board would give us the direction to ban rentals we would. We come back to the board with rec Both are outside scope we receive. An outright ban is not something that was recommended.

**Supervisor Gorin:** Thank you Gary for the presentation and all who have been following these issues. It's not easy to create exclusion zone. There are neighborhoods that have spent \$16,000.

**Gary Helfirch:** Yes, we do have noise standards as part of all permits. This falls back as problem with enforcement not ordinance. Expected to pay their renewal fee, they expire in one year, it's a 1-year term. We are keeping a 3-strike rule. Right now, 3 admin citations and we can take you. We can charge admin fines and we can suspend your license. Right now, not legal to have more than 18 people. Hotline will make a difference. People frustrated with enforcement process, so then we don't have a record that supports that this is a problem because public gets frustrated. The questions you asked me are for Supervisor Gorin, why don't we ban vacation rentals entirely? If the board gave us that direction, we would certainly pursue it. My role as staff is to follow the direction that we received from the board and come back to the board with a recommendation for policies that will help them carry out their direction. Zoning can be changed, but it can't be changed by staff, all zoning is a legislative act. I think both of those are outside of the scope of the direction that we received so right now we're proceeding on the direction we received from the board and an outright ban is not something that was recommended as a policy option to come back with.

**Supervisor Gorin:** Thank you, all good questions for those of you following this issue it's been part of my life for 9 years and we're fortunate to have worked with Permit Sonoma to create the exclusion zones. 10 different exclusion zones, several years ago, and now Linda Hopkins in the 5<sup>th</sup> district has recognized that the overabundance of vacation rentals has severely threatened the housing stock, so she has been advocating for exclusion zones or consideration for the past year. It took the board to create opportunities to bring this before you and consider this again. Thank you, Gary, for your research and great suggestions. It's not easy to create an exclusion zone, and there are neighborhoods in the valley who have chosen to do that, but they have had to shoulder very expensive fees from permits, that's why I was anxious for this opportunity to really look at something holistic and not have to ask neighborhoods to shoulder the financial burden. I asked colleagues during the discussion early on, for moratorium for all vacation rental permits in district 1 and my colleague said no. We created the exclusion zones and now we're dealing with some of the water balloon effects outside of the exclusion zone. We could have a whole meeting just about this.

**Gary Helfirch:** We do have noise standards, already part of everybody's permit. That falls back into a problem w/ enforcement rather than a problem w/ the ordinance, the ordinance has some very good restrictions on sound and we're adding very tight restrictions on light factor. We're going to duplicate our standard condition that we have for any design review permit if any of you have built a house in the valley and had to go through design review there's a lighting standard, and we expect any vacation rental to adhere to that lighting standard. That's an easy standard to enforce but once again enforcement is key here and that's really the companion to this ordinance. It's a matter of enforcing what we've got already. Yes, everybody's going to get a business license, we will issue them at no cost the 1<sup>st</sup> year to current holders and then they're expected to pay their renewal fee or the re-application fee every year after that, and it is a 1-year term, they expire in one year. We are keeping the 3 strikes rule and what we have to do there is do a better job of defining what a strike. Right now, if you get 3 admin citations, we can take you to a hearing for revocation. With a licensing program the nice thing is, we have a lot of other tools at our disposal, we can charge your administrative fines, we can suspend your license for 30 days, there's other things we can do they're short of full revocation. We wait till you got the strikes and then we have to take you to a public hearing. We don't have a way to administratively find an operator, for not following their standards and that has to do w/occupancy, it's not legal for anybody to have right now to add > 18 people on their property. We think it should just be limited to the number of guests they're allowed to have in the house, so you're allowed to have 12 guests. We picked a team, b/c it's realistic that people may have friends. Let's think they're not having an all-weekend long party they're just having some friends over that they know in the area.

That's not necessarily a violation and that scenario doesn't create nuisance for the neighbors as long as people are behaving well. I do want to emphasize it's not permitted for any vacation rental have >18 people on the premises right now. Another thing I want to emphasize is why the hotline is going to make such a difference. We hear people are frustrated w/ the enforcement process, so they stopped calling & making complaints, because they think that nothing is done. And then that creates a situation where we don't have an administrative record. There's no record that supports that this is a problem because there's no complaints, because the public is frankly frustrated. We want to break that cycle and we can do that internally, without any action by the board and we're going to.

**Newhouser:** Are you currently planning to restrict the cost of the number of units per entity?

**Gary Helfirch:** We don't have a policy option to do that currently. We've considered/talked about it w/ county council and the difficulty is the number of different ways that people own properties. Not talking about fractional rentals and things like that, but just simply things like family trusts. People who have undivided tenant and common interest in the property, these are kind of benign things that that everybody has so the house is owned by the family trust. Gets to be very, very difficult to come up w/ a set of regulations that would create a repeatable adequate standard. We could limit to a certain number, that's something we've heard from the public, limit the number of permits that an individual could hold. Even the industry has said, nobody should be able to hold more than 3 permits, but problems can be enforced. We can write the regulation but have to worry if it's an easily enforceable regulation.

**Newhouser:** Thank you and where to submit comments to if you could post that, are you still came taking comments and what is the deadline?

**Gary Helfirch:** We are taking comments for the ordinance sometime in the spring, we do have a 1<sup>st</sup> hearing for that. We've approached differently than other projects, and I think this is a new model for us going forward on controversial ordinances where instead of holding a hearing for the ordinances or 1<sup>st</sup> time at the planning commission, we hold a workshop of the planning commission then we come back months later, after we've digested everything & come up with a draft ordinance. We've had that workshop already in Nov and our draft ordinance will be going to the planning commission on January 20 so it would be good to get comments in before that first planning commission hearing simply so that the commission can be making their decisions and their recommendations in the context of everyone's input. Trying to avoid the illusion of inclusion. We come in with a fully done ordinance and it goes to the planning commission.

**Newhouser:** I think it's reprehensible that we're allowing vacation rentals to proliferate when we have housing crisis, we're losing worker housing, this is unfortunate that the other fellow supervisors are not willing to enforce a moratorium. I know that's not your responsibility, you have a limited purview on this issue, but I think that it would be appropriate to communicate to your superiors that this is not working. I think we should ban vacation rentals because it's driving the speculation that's forcing the people out of their homes in the affordability for workers and other people. I think that that it needs to be addressed.

**Gary Helfirch:** It's an excellent comment, and this is why the board directed us to do yet another study and we unfortunately have not been able to establish a nexus between vacation rentals, housing prices, rental prices, and housing affordability. As one of the other supervisors said, show me the data. That's a powerful thing when we're recommending point policy intuitively. This is done by a very well-respected local economist, as deep as you can dig into all the data, and it just isn't possible to find a link between the two. There were 2 reasons that we think this is one. It's picking off the high end housing, in some areas that's absolutely true and that's not affecting affordable housing and in other areas like the Russian River, it's a very different situation there were many of these vacation rentals are old family homes that never were on the market as rental homes they're just the place you go to up in the river, you've owned it forever you've got your place of vacation beach— you don't have a mortgage, you don't pay taxes on it. The thing is it's not part of our housing stock, so those numbers just slip through the cracks. If we band vacation rentals maybe those things would go on to the rental market but that's something that's tough, to even identify homes that are in that category, even though we know there's quite a bit of them in the Russian River area & then see how many of them have to be available for rent or sale to be part of the housing stock. It's a very tough question to answer and it's one of those things where common sense may tell you that the numbers in the report aren't telling the whole story, but we've tried, really, hard we've done two big studies.

Public Comments:

**Jay Gamel:** We have no street parking/ limited street parking. Why is it linked to the number of guests and not to the number of cars that show up? You can have 4 different cars. I don't understand the linkage between parking & guest numbers. I would also like to know if there is any source or any existing discussion at the policy board level? I think this is exactly why vacation rentals are needed or have short-term rentals. That's how Napa controls that, if I understand right nothing below 30 days or 2 weeks, it doesn't have to be set on overnight basis and that sort of obviates the ownership issues. Gets difficult having to buy these on ownership basis that can get very complicated.

**Meg Beeler:** I'm glad you're working on this and getting things more specific. I really didn't understand how you enforce the 24-hour complaint. It's a huge problem, could you go over that? 2<sup>nd</sup> comment is noise standards are an enormous problem in rural places where sound carries for miles & miles. I live 20 miles from Sears Point and I hear the races. Is there consideration of having no outside amplification under any circumstances because that would really help.

**Gary Helfirch:** 24-hr hotline done by 3<sup>rd</sup> party contract. It's a live phone line that is available for complaints. Same system that renders using and it's funded by the permit fees so it's a self-funding system. The noise standards are the same as the general plan noise standards. I think just enforcing those is going to be a good 1<sup>st</sup> step, and our noise standards do have a provision for adjusting the noise threshold downward based on the ambient noise.

**Josett Brose-Eichar:** The car and guest thing makes no sense, it should just be cars. Gary, is there a line of communication so I can find out what's in the draft right now? And everything has to be in by Jan 20<sup>th</sup>? And just very quickly, last time I heard you speak you mentioned there was talk about posting a sign up identifying it as a vacation rental and I was hoping that has been removed because that's going to tip off people, there are people coming and going at different times and that house may be vacant.

**Gary:** The sign was not in my presentation, it's no longer part of it. You will send a registered mail every time you renew your license to your neighbors saying you've renewed your license and that's how the neighbor notification is going to work. Clarification on parking, if you've got no parking at all you can only have a 1 bedroom regardless of the size of your vacation rental and that's here the 4 comes from, but you're limited (no matter how big your houses is) to a 1-bedroom rental, which isn't any different than if it was occupied full time. People are going to have cars parking there but that's how that works. While any legal document is under development, it is not a public document so unfortunately, we can't distribute it, but I am happy to meet & discuss w/ anybody anytime any aspect of the ordinance and you can contact me directly at my county email.

**Katie Christ:** The ambient light, I wanted to point out that the majority of Kenwood and GE do not fall under design review. The ambient light provision would only cover a very small percentage of properties in these 2 communities, and I would very much appreciate if that was somehow taken into account. That it was not limited just to properties that fall under design review. What about fractional rentals? I ask this because we do have one on our street and it's been incredibly disruptive to the neighbors who live adjacent to it, there's no one that they can identify to contact, even among the owners because when they do speak with the people who are staying there they just blow them off they just say they're just here for the week or the weekend and they've actually sustained damages and without having any point of contact it's really become problematic for them.

**Gary Helfirch:** Perhaps I should have been clear, the light standard applies to anybody who's got a vacation rental. We're just we're using the design review standard as a model for how bright things can be, so it applies whether your home is subject to design review. If you're going to run a vacation rental you've got to follow those standards for exterior lighting. Fractional rentals, if it's not being rented on a transient basis to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, we don't have any legal control over that so we can't control the owners of the property. If you have a family trust with 30 members of the trust, they can all hang out with the house anytime they want to, but if it's a vacation rental, there will be a property manager number. Neighbors will have that number and they'll have a 24/7 hotline that they can call up and have problems taken care of.

**David Eichar:** I sent an email on Aug 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2015 when vacation rentals ordinance was being discussed. I said limit density of vacation rentals, restrict vacation rental proximity, such that no one property be within 100 ft of more than 1 vacation rentals. We should listen to me 6 years ago. In terms of impact on vacation rental housing, I do agree, it's tough. Looking at the Zillow estimate for rentals, 50% of those would rent for \$4,000+ a month. I really think that vacation rentals guests shouldn't be allowed to have additional guests during the day. I do have only 1 vacation rental in the springs and no I'm not wealthy. We're getting by and part of reason we can get by is because we have income from vacation rental. What is the cost of the license per year? I know 1<sup>st</sup> year is free. How many vacation rental zoning permits have been revoked because of issues?

**Gary Helfrich:** No permits have been revoked which doesn't mean that there's no bad behavior, but it does, maybe say something about enforcement. The renewal fee will be identical to the fee you're paying now annually for your vacation rental zoning permit, it's going to be your license renewal fee, so there won't be any change and cost to the property owner.

**Deborah:** Unable to unmute.

**Elizabeth Randolph:** We're curious if any projections have been made from the anticipated revenue and the associated costs to administer and to enforce these regulations?

**Gary:** Monetary fee currently collected is more than adequate to make the enforcement program self-sustaining. That would be a question for the economic development board.

**Chair Dawson:** Thank you Gary for the presentation and you're all you're answering your questions, we appreciate your work.

**Hannah Withman:** Those who wish to contact Gary Helfrich may email him at: [Gary.helfrich@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Gary.helfrich@sonoma-county.org)

## 6. Community Visions for the Sonoma Developmental Center

Receive

**Chair Dawson:** Either I or someone I was emailing with got corrected for calling it creating a community vision. If you look at the alternatives report it has a vision spelled out in quite a bit of detail, and it also has the guiding principles. Those were developed from the community over time. I read those over and those do cover what the community wants. Important to remember that as we move forward with the process, the count has created a play field. We need to keep an eye on those things, we are not reinventing the visions because they're already there. Looking for support for these ideas. Alternative we create should be professionally done. Whether or not you like the report the report was professionally done. Looking to pull a professional planner, working on that. Working on framework for a letter to the supervisors that will be sent in Feb. We want to think about what we want for the SDC plan. If we look close to the alternatives, there's some I do support— community center, restoring the wetlands, putting in some ball fields. Those are in the report that we could support, and I think that helps make our case that we're not completely flying off to another direction that we are trying to work with what's already there. Tonight, we're going to kind of get the framework of that letter and you'll hear more about that in a little bit and then we're going to meet again. Having a special meeting of the MAC on January 5<sup>th</sup> where we're going to take the draft that has been formed by the ad hoc committee and we will edit it and if it gets far enough, we can finalize it and send it to the supervisors after that meeting. And if it doesn't, then we can come back & continue that process at the January 19 regular MAC meeting and I think we can still get it to the supervisors before their Jan 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. Susan can correct me if we need to have a quicker timeline. From what I'm hearing now, they're not going to vote on, they're going to look at this in January. They're not going to vote on it any sooner than their February meeting. There's a good chance it's going to go beyond that. This is urgent, but it's not necessarily a huge rush.

**Supervisor Gorin:** Permit Sonoma will put materials on their website. The action they will be taking is not necessarily a vote on the plan. There may be some policy options. They are going to come back and send it to the approval process.

**Chair Dawson:** Get it to the supervisors before the 25<sup>th</sup>?

**Supervisor Gorin:** Absolutely, I would encourage you to send it to the supervisors before the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Chair Dawson:** Well, that's a huge task you know.

**Supervisor Gorin:** Don't aim for fully flushed out plan, aim for a draft of a fleshed-out plan. Important to hear before Jan 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Chair Dawson:** Alright, thank you. Now we have a presentation from Tracy Salcedo who is a GE resident and very active community member, and she has been involved in this process for SDC for probably 7 years at least, maybe longer.

**Tracy Salcedo:** I'm a writer and editor, also librarian at Dunbar school and a community advocate. Have been involved since 2016. Created vision & guiding principles. Sonoma County's request for proposals is there. I've put together brief history of the various evolutions of a vision and guiding principles for the SDC. The slide starts w/ the state of California legislation- they didn't have a vision or guiding principles, but that is part of what is guiding what's going to happen on SDC. Dunbar, the GE Forum, the land trust, the Ecology Center, and the GE historical society teamed up, we put on a workshop to talk about this very thing and that's the vision that came out of that. Toby Rosenblatt is a part of all these conversations and was appointed to the presidio trust board, retired in 2005 and he had a vision statement that has been included. The SDC coalition, which is under Susan Gorin had a workshop. Eldridge is a place where people have diverse backgrounds and interests, live, and work together, where natural resources are enhanced. Concepts of sustainability & resiliency are put into practice, cultural legacies are honored, and communities preserved. I included abbreviated statement about Permit Sonoma alternatives reports vision guiding principles that came out of a couple of workshops and they are very long, very thorough. They took most of what we had talked about previously and incorporated them into their vision & guiding principles. Where that falls off is in the actual alternatives that follow on that. Basic elements that were included in all those visions and guiding principles: affordable housing, community-driven process, open space preservation, trust as governance, economic feasibility, job creation, community character, historic preservation. In the different visions & guiding principles, open space preservation came out on top. Open space got 7. Affordable housing and community character got 6 of the various visions & guiding principles. Shannon Lee decided, with the help of community members, that it was important to find out whether these vision & guiding principles still hold true, whether it's still something that that people are standing behind (things like open space preservation and affordable housing). She put together a survey and sent it out, had about a month to put together. We got 672 total responses. 247 of those folks gave us comments. Presented the questions in Spanish and English side by side on the same survey. Some of the comments that we received are in Spanish, so we will have those translated. Shannon is very data driven and the idea behind this was that we would be able to get data from these responses. We have all that data, we can put it together in a report we're happy to do that for this MAC or any MAC, county, person or whoever. A lot more to analyze so we'll be looking at what other things come out of this survey that might inform this process or inform you, as you're drafting your letter. Gives an idea of some of the people who responded, you can see that 205 are from GE. There are some very strong voices that are local, but we are talking to other people, talking to our neighbors, SV as a whole. Responses from Kenwood, Bennett Valley, and a few from outside the county. Highest priority for preservation of the creek corridor and preservation of open space: more than 90% among 668 people. That tells us is that open space needs to be preserved, and it should be preserved, it's something everybody wants to see done. Based on that we should go ahead and ask the state and county to push that open space preservation forward, and there are plans for that. Next slide shows that people interested in preserving natural resources & wildlife corridor, 95% support. Recreation was another question that was asked, and it doesn't have quite the backing of the respondents that open space overall has. 79% of people want to see recreational opportunities offered on that campus. Big the next level of importance included affordable housing and it's also a mandate from the state. In terms of numbers of units, numbers of dwelling units shows that 88% of people are looking to a number that's <450 dwellings on the property and it's not just GE that is talking about that, it's also the broader SV. We also included a bit of demographic info about people who are



employed supporting it versus people who are retired. It's very tricky to get these numbers right and that's why there are professionals who've tried to do this. 76% of people support >25% affordable housing on that property and all the alternatives. Every single one of them is at 24% so you know we're going to talk about alternatives, we might want to talk about other alternatives for the amount of affordable housing that can be put on that property. If you look at the increase the affordable housing, you can see that all of the answers from extremely important to not that important at all are fairly close. There's still a whole lot of support for affordable housing. But if you look at increasing the amount of market rate housing on the property, market rate housing is not priority among the 670 people who answered the survey. We asked questions about things that Susan had identified as types of housing, that people would like to see on the campus. Co-housing got 41%, people saying yes to duplexes. Mansions are a resounding no. Some of the other issues that have come up that are important is rural character, the idea of preserving the character of GE which, as a census identified place and also Eldridge, which I call southside GE. Both of those communities which are really one community are designated as rural per the census, and you can see, obviously GE wants to stay GE but SV wants GE to stay GE and it doesn't matter if you're employed or retired. GE as it is, is valuable and SDC is part of GE, it's right in the middle of GE so that's an important thing that kind of gets overlooked in the alternatives. I searched for the term rural character and preserving community character and it didn't come up anywhere in any of the alternatives it's only in the vision & guiding principles. So just to reiterate, this is not an urban infill site. There's no way you can construe this as an urban site it's cherished throughout the valley. And it's really the only place in the valley you can call rural so it's important, it's a gift to the valley. A gift that we should preserve. Slide addresses the idea of this being a community driven plan. Things were said over the course of all these years, and you can see it's a pretty resounding no that people did not see what they said and it's also interesting that there's a no comment element of that, that's fairly significant. There was no question in the survey about economic feasibility. However, there was a question about the state being responsible for cleaning up toxins replacing some of the infrastructure and performing basic remedial maintenance on historic resources. The economic feasibility right now is driven by the fact that there's \$100 million dollars worth of infrastructure repairs identified. At least that needs to happen on that property and so to make it economically feasible to redevelop, those costs have to be covered. 90% of people who were asked this question think the state should be responsible for that and that is a significant percentage. The driver of density that's included in the alternatives is either eliminated or its mitigated. There wasn't a question about whether a public trust should be included as an element of government governance. That clearly is not in any of the alternatives, all alternatives assume that the county via the specific plan will be responsible for enforcing that specific plan and how things are developed on the property. The question was asked if other options should be explored, other than market rate housing and commercial development? And again, the overwhelming answer is yes, it's important we consider using a different kind of a model, other than market rate housing in commercial development to fund redevelopment of SDC. About hazards and traffic impacts to the community (something not addressed in vision & guiding principles but very important) because SDC burned, GE burned, a lot of Kenwood burned in 2017. We need to be able to make sure that people have safe ways of getting in & out of our communities, and right now amongst these respondents an overwhelming majority do not think that has been adequately addressed and that the existing alternatives are too heavy. This one is about historic preservation and it's a little bit ambiguous because it doesn't talk about exactly which building should be preserved (about 50% of them gave that a high priority). Another ambiguous slide is about job creation. 66% of the respondents think that job creation on the property is important. The question that goes along w/ that is what creates a job and how much do those jobs pay? Does it have to be industrial? A hotel resort? Maybe we do another survey? Some of the public facilities that are recommended in the alternatives, what we're doing right now is a zoning exercise, we're trying to zone this property to allow for specific uses. Alternatives talk about different kinds of commercial uses like a community center on the property, which gets a lot of support. A hotel resort gets very little. How do you zone for that if zoning for that kind of use can also end up with an Amazon distribution hub? Is the current deadline viable? Susan kind of hinted at this, this is the 1<sup>st</sup> I've heard about these deadlines being pushed back for approval of these various plans and getting something formulated. It's supposed to be in June and now, I just heard the end of the year. We need more time. 81% of people agree we need more time, we need to be able to come up with a plan that addresses some of the concerns that are raised in this, not only in this survey, but just across the board, since these alternatives have come out. There are really, really good ideas out there, that are not part of the alternatives. I can send a PowerPoint out that folks could look at. It's a lot of information and people think really hard about this stuff and it's important that we do not back down or think that we do not have a voice in this process, we do, we are the state of California, we are the County of Sonoma. We need to just be fearless about going forward with developing a plan that we want to see. Something that fits with this part of the valley and that enhances this part of the valley, as well as the rest of valley and all of Sonoma County.

**Chair Dawson:** Any public comments/questions?

**Nardo-Morgan:** I just want to say excellent job Tracy. Thank you so much, that was fabulous. I don't have a question for Tracy I have a comment for Arthur. I got an email from John McCall that his power went out and he will not be able to present tonight.

**Tracy Salcedo:** Shannon did the bulk of the work on this, she's an amazing resource and one of the things that you guys should know as a MAC is that there are resources around here. And that we are at your disposal, just let us know what you need and it's a shame that John can't to be here. The idea of a trust is an idea we should be talking about. My understanding is John was going to talk about that. The county, in my opinion did a great job with its alternatives just there's a lot of work in those. But the one thing they didn't do is reflect community comment and community input, it doesn't feel like a community driven plan. Make sure that whatever is done is done, the way it's intended to be done, especially if it's a community driven plan. I have my doubts.

**Chair Dawson:** Well, unfortunately the track record at the moment I'll just say is not great. We're nervous, I'll just put it that way. And Tracy, thanks for a great presentation and thanks to Shannon. Maybe it would be possible to invite John to the January 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. It's a special meeting, so it has to have a very tight agenda, but I think that would probably fit so we'll see if we can do that. Any other questions or comments?

**Rebecca Hermosillo:** We've been working very closely on the federal side looking for federal funding sources for possible future use for SDC, so I just wanted to give you that heads up and I'm very happy answer any questions you have Tracy on funding sources for possible future use if you want to leverage that, we had a call with Supervisor Gorin with our legislative staff and we're able to identify some funding for wildlife corridors in the infrastructure plan, so I'm happy to help in any way.

**Larry Davis:** I am emotionally almost in tears seeing the things you're doing. Last year we didn't even have a MAC, just a burned town. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

**Chair Dawson:** Thank you I appreciate heartfelt comments.

**Cherie De Carlo:** Tracy, thank you very much for your survey. I was glad to take the survey. I am very pleased to hear about the need to be fearless and it's up to us to decide. It's overwhelming to hear people support the preservation of wildlife.

**Chair Dawson:** I did the research online looking at how the census is changing, it's metrics. Eldridge is a census designated place, which is part of GE it's just a bureaucratic delineation. Both are considered rural places. GE is a rural place, you can figure out how many people would need to be added to push it up into urban place and that's where those numbers came from.

**David Eichar:** Great survey, just one question I had to think about, the community/event center question. I said no to it being important because it had community center event center together. I support a community center for locals, I do not support event center, business seminars, or events for tourists, so I did not mark that as important. I think it was a great survey, so thank you very much for putting it together presenting it.

**Alice Horowitz:** What great work and how impressive what the community has been able to put together in a couple days and for free, compared to what the high-paid consultants over the course of 2 years could not even come close to touching, hitting the pulse of the community, and releasing what people are thinking. I'm just I am so impressed and so proud of our community. If you want a community-driven process look no further you know we are here, we have been ignored and it's just so great to see people coming out of the woodwork and saying no, that ain't gonna happen. We

need to be heard and appreciate all the effort being put out on so many different levels by so many different people just thank you so much, just wonderful.

**Patricia Chadwick:** I also want to appreciate the survey. I used to work at SDC and am a disability activist. Wondering what the feasibility is of going back to the state? It's my understanding that this project currently is the plan is to turn it over to one developer, the profit motive is the main thing for them. Wondering what the feasibility of going back to maybe a trust or something with the state would be so that the main motive isn't profit. I think whatever happens could be sustainable over the long-term. It looks like Mike Thompson is supporting federal funding and that the state also has a lot of money, but this could be turned over, envisioned in a different way. Community clearly has different views and developers would be taken more into account, is there any possibility of that?

**Tracy Salcedo:** Yes, there definitely is a possibility of that. We'll probably have to do it as a community at this point but the proceeds to trust is a model but it's not because it so many things are different. New box was created for the proceeds to when it was transferred from the army to the national park service. Nothing like that had ever been done before. We now have a possibility to do something, just as creative and just as visionary, as was done at the presidio it will not look the same and there will be there will need to be different and creative kinds of financing that will go along with that. We've got land trust that can take care of the open space, we've got housing trust that can help us provide the affordable housing that's mandated in the legislation, there are community trusts that can help us re-envision what happens there. The failure of the alternatives right now is that they all are looking at one alternative for economic feasibility. It's up to us to look at other alternatives for economic feasibility and they are out there, we just need the time and the political will. It could look good for the politicians if they're the ones who help us create that new box.

**Josette Brose-Eichar:** Thank you Tracy and Shannon that put the pole together. City of Sonoma meeting also taking place, couldn't be in two places at one time tonight. The City of Sonoma is sitting down on a workshop to create a resolution for what they want, what they believe should go into SDC planning. If you could please reach out to the Sonoma City council and share the data with them, I'm sure they would love to see it as soon as possible. Does anyone know where we are at with contacting the state to see about two things, extending the time limit and whether they will change their laws and resolutions about the infrastructure and the cleanup— whether they will step up because that would be a big thing for SDC if that funding did not have to be part of the financial feasibility.

**Susan Gorin:** In my conversations w/ the state they've been absolutely firm the county needs to keep to the timeline. I personally think that they will send an RFP out and seeking possible purchasers for the site. Everything is part of the negotiation, if we have a development team interested in purchasing the site and they're savvy they're going to negotiate for State contributions for some cleanup funds for the infrastructure that's all part of the negotiation between a seller and the state, but I have no reason to believe that the state is interested in creating a nonprofit trust, and I have no reason to believe that the state is interested in moving the timeline substantially from what is in the legislation.

**Jim Price:** Disappointed to hear Susan Gorin say it is the state. Not clear with timelines, we need leadership to make this a reality. Tracy, your presentation was great. This is something that unites all of us. I am thrilled that Rebecca and Mike Thompson are involved. We should get state involved now. We need to recognize that the county will not be able to protect this area.

**Maud Hallin:** I am a retired CPA, so I've been digging into the evaluation of how much costs are, and I haven't found one number that is true, they are all fake numbers. Not a chance on this earth that we can build housing for low income with less than three stories we just have to accept that, if we want some housing for low income, we can't build single family homes, we have to go up or down underground. We must consolidate, we have to protect the wildlife, we can't have lights all around the creek. I haven't seen anything that makes sense in this master plan. It seems they are from Oakland, and I don't know how they got selected, but I think they were must have been from Alabama before because it doesn't make sense anything what they do and haven't considered any items that we have expressed interest or concern about

**Richard Randolph:** I'd like to ask board who has jurisdictional responsibility to grant the permits and for site remediation and restoration and is that a possible? Perhaps some of the new federal infrastructure funding could be applied in

restoring water and soil, that's an immense task that. Who has jurisdiction in granting permits for demolition or remediation on SDC?

**Meg Beeler:** Question directly for Susan under the legislation, the timeline is not set in concrete, and I wonder if the supervisors are in constant conversation with our legislators about extending the time? I understand the State doesn't want to extend the time but in private conversations with various legislative offices, they keep saying that the supervisors have to ask, and the community has severe problems with these plans so are there any movements/plans supervisors to talk w/ the elected to get an extension?

**Supervisor Gorin:** That is one of the reasons that the supervisors will be reviewing the preferred alternative at the end of January, if in fact it is the direction of the board, then we certainly could engage in conversation about extending the timeline. Supervisors have not had an opportunity to talk amongst ourselves or with Permit Sonoma about an extension of the timeline. I have been on a phone call w/ all of our state elected leaders and the state, and they've all uniformly been firm and saying they're adhering to the timeline. Doesn't mean that they won't extend the timeline if the supervisors ask, but I think it is premature. I think the supervisors will think it's premature to extend the timeline and I would want to know what we would achieve, but that's part of the conversation that the supervisors will have.

**Nancy Kirwan:** I wanted to point out the letter to the editor today that talked about long term value to the community being worth a lot more than immediate monetary return to a developer, and that should definitely be taken into account by the BOS. In fact, it's more important that they take that into account than almost anything else, because this is their community. Once you have a specific plan put into operation, it's not easy to come up w/ a completely different plan or to negotiate aspects of it. Developers have the right to do x, y, and z. There are developers who will push the limits, we have to be very careful about what we allow to get into those specific plans. The state should absolutely be made responsible for cleaning up the mess that they created.

**Jay Gamel:** Thank you very much. I guess it is aimed for Susan and I'd like to have a specific definition of who exactly is the state when you refer to the state? When you speak to the electives, who is precisely who determines the content of the original legislation that set forth the requirements being met today? Where did those mandates come from? Did they come from the legislators themselves, the governor's office?

**Supervisor Gorin:** Legislators drafted the legislation and moved it through both the assembly and the senate, I suspect that it's Senator McGuire that had the primary drafting responsibilities. They're going to be consulting w/ the Dept of General Services and the Dept of Finance, out of the governor's office. So, when I refer to the state, there are many folks who've been involved every step along the way, discussing how this process might move forward and drafting/approving the authorizing legislation.

**Bean Anderson:** This is going to have probably the biggest impact on SV for the whole century. Whatever we do, should be worthy of what we do at that site and feel it's something we should really be proud of, and especially for those of you in government and our representatives, this is going to be a big part of your legacy, and something that you should be proud of. You should take it seriously and be able to look back on it with pride. I appreciate all the hard work that people are putting into this.

**Chair Dawson:** Just a reminder, we do have another presentation from Katie Eagles coming up soon.

**Supervisor Gorin:** I want to acknowledge the passion behind all of the comments. There have been many people involved in the coalition to preserve SDC. That coalition was started by making Sonoma Mountain preservation. This center has been a major employer in SV, a caretaking institution, certainly history of the Native Americans living on the land around and on the SDC, and many folks who've had brothers, sisters, parents, daughters, sons living at the campus, and we hoped every step along the way, that would not come to the point of closing the center. Acknowledging that it's the oldest developmental center in CA, it was inevitable that this center was going to close. We worked very hard to convince our state elected partners that we could be part of the community driven process to design the future of the campus. We have a responsibility to fulfill that promise that we made to our state elected partners that we work very hard to create something not only that fits within the context of the community, but building for the future SV- our

youth, our incredibly diverse community, educational opportunities, housing, employment services. Hopefully we can come up with something very special that fulfills the promise and the obligation that we have. I'm less concerned about economic feasibility. The cost or the development penciling out the cost of infrastructure. As Rebecca Hermosillo said, we'll be exploring all kinds of sources of revenue from the state and from the federal government to cover many of those costs. We need more affordable housing as well as employment and a few other things. Great job and I look forward to hearing the conversation. A number of you have said tonight we want the supervisors to ask for a delay. If it's appropriate to ask for a delay, I think the supervisors will. Let's try to do what we need to do, and to figure out what our vision is and then move it forward through the approval process. I'm listening.

**Chair Dawson:** Thank you Susan, that is the intent of tonight's meeting, to start making out what I'm calling the laundry list of a positive vision. We need to start thinking about what we want to put in the letter to the supervisors. So I do want to hear from everybody, but if at all possible let's keep this on the positive side. Let's talk about what we want as opposed to what's gone wrong up to this point.

**Nick Brown:** This was a unique negotiation between the state and the county to see if we can work something out and it's important to work something out for this truly sacred site. And as Supervisor Gorin just asked, what would we achieve with pushing the timetable back a little bit? Well, I think what we're achieving is creating a great project and product here. We clearly have a talented and committed community, and we can develop a really great product. Sonoma City Council meeting is very supportive of what the NSV MAC is doing, what many in GE are doing. They are looking forward to hearing and getting counsel from the NSV MAC before they ultimately send their letter off the supervisors in a couple weeks. Mayor Ding said we can do much better, we need to take more time to do this right. What does this site deserve? I think we're working that out.

**Bonnie Brown:** Repurpose and re-envision of the SDC site hasn't been addressed. Building new construction is one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions in this country. I know Permit Sonoma has said it's much more expensive to do that. I'll be sending more information and links to that. A history of architecture should be preserved. Our Earth is in trouble. We've done it and we can fix it. The amount of carbon emissions to demolish buildings, let's do this right and not create carbon emissions that are massive. We all need to do our part, and this is a beautiful example of what can be done, I know we can do it.

**Tracy Salcedo:** One of the purposes of this is that we do have a real positive vision for SDC, and we've articulated that over the last few years, and all of our conversations. Supervisors and all our legislators need to know that we've got a vision and it's good to re articulate. When we asked for more time it's because we've got what the consultants came up with, and what the planners came up with. It took them three years and \$3 million. And we're being asked to take what we've already done and make it better in a month. If we can ask for just a little bit more time so that we can do it right.

## **7. Reports and Announcements from Councilmembers and Ad Hocs**

Receive

Presentation from Kate Eagles, SDC Ad Hoc Working Group

**Chair Dawson:** We can move on to our second presenter, which is Kate Eagles who serves on the NSV MAC. The ad hoc committee is responsible for drafting the letter to the supervisors and will be delivered to the supervisors in January.

**Kate Eagles:** I'll keep it short because Tracy covered a lot of this so well. We're going to summarize what happened at the meeting on Nov 17th. We had over 300 community members participating, which was great, and that was the joint meeting w/ the Springs MAC. We had 42 members providing public comment at the end of the meeting. It was a 4.5-hour meeting. 11 submitted written comments, plus a few more that we've been getting in advance of this meeting. No public comments were supportive of the SDC alternative plans. There was certainly some support for some of those elements and we'll be talking about that as we look toward drafting the letter. We had a lot of comments about not keeping with the surrounding neighborhood in rural character and other specific comments like traffic and other concerns. The funding approach was flawed. We've talked a lot about how we have to make up the money required for mitigation or infrastructure through the density of housing commercial development that was considered a problem. There was support for affordable housing and equity and the innovative options to be explored— one thing we haven't touched on too much. We did not have a lot of comments on job and commercial jobs and commercial developments.

And I think one of the comments we did receive may identify why that's the case. It's hard when we don't have identified tenants to really understand how to comment on that, and what that means in terms of job development and how feasible, that is if there's a lot of commercial space. It was expressed that we have to get the jobs right, and then the words we have a job shortage in the valley and maybe what we really have is a housing shortage, not a job shortage. Changing times did not reflect the same sense of wildfire danger/ evacuation, water/climate, and sustainability. We have some specific requests for example a rehab facility or more agricultural emphasis.

**Chair Dawson:** Maybe we can hear from John in January.

**Eagles:** We will start to draft a letter to reflect the community feedback which would include some reinstating of the guiding principles.

**Chair Dawson:** Majority people wanted < 400 homes, which was surprising it was that low. If the community wants 400 homes, we'd like them to be 90% affordable. I'll just throw it out there, do we want to?

**Kate Eagles:** This is a good question about trying to write a letter in this process that we have a lot of good feedback from the community, as I just reviewed. And we have the survey. I would ask our community here what's helpful in terms of this process. This is a community letter.

**Chair Dawson:** Let's hear feedback from MAC council members and then we'll hear feedback from the public. Susan, you mentioned having at least a draft plan ready to get to the supervisors in January with these elements, if these were more specified. Is that enough for the supervisors to take this seriously or do they need a map, or what would the supervisors need?

**Susan Gorin:** I don't think they need a map, but I think they need some of the percentage of affordable housing. Can you add some narrative about what form the housing might look like, is it the grid kind of patterns that are in the alternatives, or is it something different? Can you find examples of what you think the housing might look like? If you want affordable housing it's going to be subsidized housing and it's going to look similar to the Fetters Apartments, is going to look similar to the Verano apartments and some of the other affordable housing projects? Probably no higher than three stories but remember, we have three stories already on the campus, that's how you're going to get affordable housing. Developers asking for local subsidies from the county or the state and matching those w/ state & federal tax credits to pencil out and how to make those apartments affordable and, but I think it would be helpful for you to create a vision, not a map a vision. What do you want to see? Some things will have to be financed by someone. Any kind of narrative or visual that you can supply is great.

**Chair Dawson:** What I'm hearing you say is that alternative financing should be a part of this letter?

**Susan Gorin:** Yes, and you were saying we recognize that affordable housing needs to have alternative financing and let's work together to identify sources of financing for the housing.

**Chair Dawson:** And if we can do some research?

**Susan Gorin:** There are many people doing research on sources of funding for affordable housing. I wouldn't spend a lot of time doing that. Have a report talking about sources of funding for infrastructure repair, replacement, and affordable housing and other things. Focus on what this feels and might look like.

**Daymon Doss:** I would hope that we would be able to carve out some space in that letter for the presentation on the land trust and housing land trust. There are very amazing innovative ways to build affordable housing and I think not all of us know all of those ways.

**Angela Nardo-Morgan:** This was a tremendous amount of information to condense, and it was really hard. Kate did a brilliant job sharing the collective voice of the community. We really need and really want to hear from the community.

This isn't really a MAC letter, it is a letter that the MAC is writing on behalf of the community, so please, if you have anything that we missed, let us know. You can email us. We're still listening so we would like your input.

**Matthew Dickey:** Many of these items that we're looking at are interrelated like housing, scale affordability, adaptive reuse, and historic preservation. A community center in a museum would probably be related to each other. Job creation if we created a micro grid or a water treatment plant or relocated a school that would be providing jobs, so I suspect our letter will probably try to tie that vision of interrelated activities and vision together. The entire web of these relationships, both financially in terms of the environmental and community impacts. We're going to talk about affordable housing. There's going to be percentages and how do we relate that to dollars that current construction costs. And we will try very hard to come up w/ some of those projections, to satisfy the supervisors preferences for data.

**Jed Cooper:** How deep should committee members be involved in gathering information? I have to send the work to the CA municipal finance authority. All up and down the state they made with county and city, governments and municipalities and it's the data is. Do you want any kind of input about detail?

**Supervisor Gorin:** This body is not to do research on the cost of construction or the cost of anything, it is painting a vision. There are lots of experts that will dive down deeply into the economic feasibility of construction costs of an adaptive reuse and I would just focus on what elements you want to see, and I think this list is a really good start.

**Jed Cooper:** So we have been talking about housing. We're just talking about a vision, whether it's three stories.

**Supervisor Gorin:** Housing that creates permanent and that maintains permeability on the site.

**Kate Eagles:** This is going to be tricky. Would be nice to have a framework of a draft by January 5. With the holidays it's not a lot of time, but if we're going to give the community something to look at. Work on that balance between a list and specific data.

**Newhouser:** I'm troubled that we're having to do this over the holidays. Maybe the 1st thing we should do is to ask for the private contractor to relinquish half of their \$3.5 million to do this and give it back to the community. I think that we can take the data that we have and put things forward with the 400 or less homes and the mix of affordability classes. It would be important to look at what the actual needs are. This is data that's readily available for affordability classes that are not available currently. Guess it's going to be mostly moderate and low. And very low. It's hard for us to make recommendations on this without having the expertise of the planning department. That's why I think there's a lot of resentment around the community. It's hard for us to make recommendations on this without having the expertise. We can at least paint a vision and if I were going to throw something out there, I would want to see that mix of affordability classes. The residential whether it's rural residential or not and have that be a mixture so that you don't have this huge segregation of other affordability classes. If we're going to get down to social equity, have it be mixed. This excludes vehicles from parking. Not everyone's going to have their own little parking garage and parking can be segregated from that and there can be pathways. I think of the village homes example in Davis, is a great example that incorporates not only the housing, but with gardens and trees and pathways. We keep invoking the trust as a way to kind of say this but, as other planners have pointed out, the trust is really about implementation of the plan, we still have to agree on and get the county & planning department to zone this the way it's going to be interpreted whether it's a master developer or a trust. The advantage of the trust is that it will help to preserve the intent of the public benefit and public vision.

**Chair Dawson:** Thank you, Mark. I am going to check out the village homes projects. It seems like a good place to start thinking about alternatives to other comments from council members, or should we move on to the public?

**Jim Price:** The creation of that trust is going to require some time and research. I think Tracy outlined a beautiful vision. I think it can only be accomplished by a trust. Also, I am very disappointed that we were not able to hear from John McCall tonight, but I think that we need to be able to have that conversation and integrate his ideas. One of the things that we may want to consider in the letter is a timeline for these various elements to provide the county supervisors with. They will review their letter at the Jan 19 meeting, so I think that fits in with the timeline that I just heard. MAC reviewing this input on Jan 5. The published survey results of the 750 people that replied to the specific plan survey

implied that there were a lot of other opinions. I would urge people to look at that. There was generally a lot of support for putting together all the ideas.

**Richard Randolph:** Heard earlier this evening that the density factor from 400 housing units would be about 1,000 residents. Have organization agencies such as Burbank housing or Petaluma had any discussion? Can you comment on their interest in participating in this development?

**Supervisor Gorin:** Absolutely, they have been following the land use process for quite a while. Looking for opportunities to build housing. But as I said before, all housing are all interested in the site. They all produce great projects, and they are and they are experts at financing affordable housing similar to the Fetters Apartments that were developed by mid pen housing and initially the Verano apartments. They're all looking at it and there's no doubt in my mind that there will be affordable housing on the site. I suspect that, I know you're all interested in a nonprofit trust, but if in fact it's sold to a development team. The development team will then negotiate with any number of different affordable housing developers for specific parcels of land to create affordable housing that will work on the site.

**Alice Horowitz:** When talking about the different things the community wants— ballparks, community center. It's said someone's gonna have to pay for it, I don't think it's out of the question to think that the community might actually do it. Give us the place, give us the opportunity, we have builders, we have architects, we have people who will support it, we can get that sucker built and we can support it. We want to be part of it, we want to own it, we want it to be ours. Would be helpful to know what is going on in the valley. Several months ago, a Supervisor Gorin mentioned a possible significant development at Hanna Boys Center and housing there. How does all of that affect what's coming down the pipeline and how do we look at it all? Helpful if we could get that sort of input from Permit Sonoma and from the county so that we have the big picture.

**Supervisor Gorin:** And you're right Alice there are multiple opportunities for the Community to pitch in to do the tenant improvements for the museum or any number of different things and philanthropy can play an enormous role in creating Community benefits on the site and a boy Center is still in discussion, but they're firming up the plans and they should probably submit their proposal early next year, for whatever they. Whatever they now think that would be appropriate, on their site.

**Nancy Kirwan:** Open space and how that was one of the highest priorities. Governor Newsome declared under executive order that he wants to look for collaborative action with the federal & local governments to conserve open space. Also created the CA natural resource agency. I am wondering if SDC is on their maps so the state would be on board with being supportive with conserving that land.

**Chair Dawson:** Who do we contact about that?

**Nancy Kirwan:** CA natural resources agency.

**Chair Dawson:** Okay, thank you.

**Nardo-Morgan:** And maybe Wade Crawford, the national resources Secretary.

**Deborah Nitasaka:** We have a lack of trades people. Electricians, plumbers, carpenters. We need a trade tech. I would like to see the campus used as an educational facility to train people to go out into the world w/ jobs that would allow them to buy a home. Build Back Better has funding for schools, for training. I see so much opportunity to create to create jobs by training people for the future. There are so many innovative ways to build now, that could be an emphasis. The housing on the campus could be for developmentally disabled, which is a requirement. We can provide housing for them, we can also provide facilities on that campus for them to receive essential services, including special education. I just see this as such a rich opportunity to really benefit the entire county by educating people, and I really don't want to see that overlooked. There's a wonderful college campus in Kentucky where everyone works on the campus. They do fantastic work. I've sent you all a letter in which I described quite a bit of this.



**Bonnie Brown:** Some exciting ideas happening here. Affordable ownership, there are ways to do that. Also, tiny homes. Young people are doing that throughout this country. The idea about a trade school is fantastic. Our young people need to have ways to earn a good living without going to college. Sounds wonderful also for home ownership, there can be a coach courtyard, that is, a trailer park or trailer mobile home park. Having a coach courtyard where people can own their home is an affordable way for ownership. I hope that we can put in there some description of creative ways of affordable homes and workspaces that can be worked in with the tradespeople training for artists and craftspeople. Affordable ownership, please include that in addition to the apartments that can be built.

**Richard Dale:** We're being asked to come up w/ a vision about how much, what types, and where on the site. In the letter, would love to describe how the elements reference each other and especially reference each other in the site. Thinking about it in terms of how it would look if you were standing in it, and what it would feel like would be, I think an interesting exercise for how to tie all the different pieces together. A trust is potentially down the road but it's going to be critical for holding the space, the way the community wants it to be in the future. I'd love to see included a nonprofit hub, a place where organizations that are nonprofits could be working together potentially sharing resources & office expenses to make. The environment is really important to the site and making sure that as we develop anything here we're looking at the environmental constraints and being very careful about that in the way we describe how we would want to vision things here, thank you.

**Patricia Chadwick:** Want to emphasize the view of the history of the site. We should re envision how disability can fit into the community and have it be accessible. Maybe we'll get housing for the developmentally disabled and job training. Integrating all the other aspects of the environment and all that this could be a model community that we could be proud of and a showcase for all the great ideas that the community has here.

**Sharon Church:** We need to have things for the developmentally disabled people. Things like that would belong at this caretaking site. We need to think about the Ecology Center continuing to have a presence there, we need to think about the ownership and not just rental for people These areas should be intermixed. Night lighting is another big thing for a wildlife corridor and the creek area so there's a lot to think about.

Thinking we might need some professional help on this, maybe a developer or architect. The name that kind of comes to mind is Dyson, he developed the Windsor green. He did some projects in Graton and some projects in Sebastopol. Seems like our timeline is short.

**Chair Dawson:** Part of our plan is to get a planner, but land trust say they might be able to help us hire a planner. So, we're thinking about getting a professional and I totally agree. We're all amateurs here, we got lots of ideas and we need a professional to help us pull it together.

**Debbie Lammers:** Looking forward to the discussions about the trust opportunity. I've not heard a discussion about a model such as Habitat for Humanity. It's a very popular and well respected, affordable ownership model habitat for humanity would come in as the developer. Long term prospects are very healthy for families to have affordable homeownership.

**Supervisor Gorin:** There are a couple of projects in Santa Rosa. I've heard that recently, they have dissolved in Sonoma County because they have financial difficulties, but it doesn't mean that it couldn't be considered for here, but they need a donation of land.

**Bean Anderson:** I've talked with Wayne Kleinfeld who's the head of Habitat for Humanity in Santa Rosa. He said he's very interested in participating and seeing how they can help with this, so that was a positive sign. People mentioned the Fetters Apartments as an example of good affordable housing. 20 acres would give you 600 units w/ 2 and 3story affordable units, you can provide a lot of housing, w/ very little disruption in terms of the actual amount of open spaces used.

**Mark Newhouser:** How much can we restrict the land use to specific classes of affordability and where the housing would go? People really support the nonprofit's but what if some for-profit organization got the winning bid, how restrictive can the zoning be to protect the public's vision?

**Susan Gorin:** All is going to be important. The land trust and Ecology Center will really put some guardrails around the corridors and preservation and suggested protections for the wildlife corridor. The kind of development you're talking about, especially you Mark, looking at the village homes, for example, emphasize a permeability on the site, rather than the grid kind of development patterns that are present in the alternatives that also can enhance the wildlife capacity and protections on the site. That's the point of the zoning. Could adaptive reuse w/ retail on the bottom offices and apartments on the top. We know that many people might want to start businesses on the site, and they might want to own business on site. Where should that be, what kind of businesses do you think are appropriate, perhaps existing buildings? This is where creativity comes in. Integrate an element of affordable housing plus duplexes. Financing of affordable housing is very specific and market rate and affordable housing doesn't always mix, but we have Susan on this MAC, she's an architect.

**Oldroyd:** I can't argue we had talked about having our own or 90% affordable housing at a low density. I can't really support that. I don't know if I can say, but it's not going to pay for it. I'm a realist and I've studied all the things that have been said and I'm very pragmatic about it, I want to reach a positive solution that can be built. That's always my goal as an architect.

**Newhouser:** Council would override. Do you feel that it's just not possible to do intermixed at all?

**Oldroyd:** Kind of makes this possible.

**Newhouser:** You think it is?

**Oldroyd:** Yea, but not 90%. Not 90% affordable.

**Newhouser:** What do you see?

**Oldroyd:** Not a numbers person.

**Newhouser:** You're just thinking being able to finance, be economically feasible?

**Oldroyd:** No, I want the best solution possible that is economically feasible.

**Newhouser:** Rightt, and so you think it would have to be probably a higher proportion of market rate?

**Oldroyd:** Yes.

**Newhouser:** But you're not comfortable putting a number on it? So that's something we need to figure out because even if we do rely heavily on creative financing through subsidies. Specialized developers like Burbank somehow need to come up w/ what would work, and we don't want to propose something that's unworkable right?

**Supervisor Gorin:** I don't think it's the job of the MAC to try a pencil something out, that's the job of the professional planners. And they're going to do what they're going to do to pencil it out. It is the job of the MAC to dream and to figure out what works within the context of GE and SV. Dream about that let the professional number crunchers figure out if it will work or not.

**Vice Chair Handron:** I think it's important that we define in our letter what we mean by certain things like affordable housing. I know that they have specific definitions, and I don't know if we are thinking of the same definition when we speak of affordable housing. In the report, the alternatives all included 3 different types of affordable housing, there was low-income housing workforce housing, and I can't remember the third type. But I think it's important that we define

what we mean by affordable housing and to me that incorporates different levels of income levels of housing, maybe low-income housing, workforce housing, mid-rate housing that's all integrated. Would be helpful if we had some common definition, so that we all knew exactly what we were talking about when we use certain words.

**Oldroyd:** That information is included in the alternatives.

**Eagles:** I want to be realistic here because we're not going to have the time to do all these things, so I want to be clear with all of us on the MAC here and our community on what we can and can't do. I think we're setting ourselves a very high bar and we have brown act limitations. I'm not optimistic about writing a good letter, but I think it can't do everything, and we need to be super clear on this. I really appreciate all the community feedback, but now we have to figure out what this means and that's going to be a challenge and I don't want to minimize that challenge. Quick question for Supervisor Gorin because earlier, you had mentioned the end of the year. And I think at one point we were thinking it was 2022, but I think I thought you meant there's something going to be published by the end of this year. Is that correct and can you clarify that for us?

**Supervisor Gorin:** Yes, the county has a practice of publishing materials in advance that are of significant interest, they really have been crunching through to prepare the substantive reports and to get to an alternative, a preferred alternative that has some detail for the community to read through and comment on. And it's my understanding that it will be published on Permit Sonoma's website under SDC by the end of the year. I would assume in the next week or so, you might keep checking for the website to see when it is published. Let me just say the timeline for the approval process is unclear. I have faith in the county process that it takes forever to schedule something and get it on the calendar for the CAC and the planning commission and then the board. It's going to take a while to get through those processes. We will have time to think through a lot but I'm going to reiterate, I'm encouraging you to dream and to come up with something specific about what you want to see on the site.

**Dickey:** When we develop this ladder we will use standard definitions, because they've already been developed, and they've been expressed to the community. They're used within the construction industry, the development industry. We will use those definitions, so that there's no miscommunication about what our intent is. Question for Susan Oldroyd, you were earlier speaking about your discomfort with density and whether it could be achieved at 90%. And I wonder if you were considering any of the adaptive reuse or even proof of concept, for instance, for any of the existing buildings to increase the density in certain areas and decrease it in others?

**Oldroyd:** I was not speaking of density. Density is the amount of units per acre. I was talking about the percentage. I don't want this group to put numbers on it. I think it's up to the people that develop it. Use descriptive terminology that does not touch on the parts that are going to be worked out in the future in the way that they have to. I've written so many documents that try to craft all these words into a way that says what we're trying to see, not trying to give a solution. You're talking about the process and what you want, but you don't want to solve the problem.

**Dickey:** However, we are discussing the nexus of politics and policy now and if part of our vision as a community is that the predominant part of this development in terms of residency is to be affordable housing, wouldn't we want to express that in our document? Will we find 400 units acceptable, but our vision of that is that 75% of them be affordable and then we break down what affordable means to us as a community based on the presentations that have been made to us. We want affordable housing. Most of us have children or nephews or nieces and they want to live here, and this is one of the ways that we can achieve that is by increasing the percentages of affordable housing and these types of developments.

**Supervisor Gorin:** If you want that many units or percentage of affordable housing, you recognize that subsidized housing is not going to help to pencil out the infrastructure needs, therefore, the state will need to contribute a significant amount of funds to upgrade the infrastructure to allow affordable housing on the site, which is a primary goal.

**Dickey:** Doesn't it make sense that they say to us well we can't really help you build affordable housing. You know that's up to the developer, but they can be responsible for the cleanup of the infrastructure that reduces the overhead costs. And, by virtue of that, they can increase the percentage of affordable housing.

**Susan Gorin:** I'd be very specific in linking those two things together. A goal of the state is housing, affordable housing to accomplish that on the site, which we support. State will need to make significant contributions to helping upgrade the infrastructure.

**Newhouser:** We have a very limited amount of time to produce a reasonable request in the form of this letter and I'm wondering, can we do some of this offline if not just editing or submitting comments to a draft document in the interim, without violating some brown act restriction? I'd like for us to explore that as a potential for us to be able to work on this, especially since it's going to be mostly over the holidays as well and we're hoping to have a draft that would have everyone's input prior to Jan 5th.

**Susan Gorin:** It's a good suggestion. You do have an SDC subcommittee and a suggestion that you might consider is taking a couple of minutes going around to all the MAC members and saying what it is that you want to include in the comments and have the SDC committee or a new committee, plus the Chair or something. Then take those comments, develop a draft, and bring it forward to the MAC members in January for further comment revision & approval. I would encourage you to take the opportunity right now to say what are the five things you want to see incorporated in the comments. This has been recorded so you'll be able to review that, and the transcriber will capture that. Develop the comments, you have some weeks and then bring it back to the MAC for review at your next meeting.

and without any preparation, be able to comment on exactly what we want, as a part of this letter? I don't know if that's going to capture everything that many of us have expressed in multiple letters to the planning department.

**Kate Eagles:** I'm under the impression you know I've looked at a lot of the comments, just read through it a lot, and we have the survey now. That we are obviously community members but we're also taking community input, so this is my struggle here. We have a lot of Community input that we can start putting into the letter. I just want to be very clear on our intent here.

**Nardo-Morgan:** I thought the whole idea was for us to be the voice of the community, it's not about what we want, it's about reflecting the community's vision. I'm not sure why we need to go around in a circle and do that.

**Supervisor Gorin:** Worry about your emailed comments, the Brown Act, which is why I said synthesize your comments now while you're in public and then those comments will be captured as well as using the additional source information of comments submitted by the community.

**Chair Dawson:** I feel like I support the results of the poll— affordable housing is a priority. Open spaces are a priority. I do like some of the other ideas, like a tech school. Maybe there could be a construction school that could construct the houses and train people into those trades. I really do feel like the number of people does impact the character of my community, so I do feel like 400-450 dwelling units is an important cut off to preserve the character.

**Oldroyd:** I want to put specific requirements. I also want to see the integration of the low income with the market rates. I'm also passionate about the deer and animals being able to go through the houses, you know the lake at the presidio with no fences and would want to say that there has to be EV charging and limitations of cars.

**Chair Dawson:** Yeah, I find it hard, there's so many good ideas. I do like clustered integrated affordability. I think there's a lot of advantage to that, but there's an electric microgrid, all that stuff and so much more.

**Daymon Doss:** I really want to keep focus on the land, trust and the housing land trust and affordability and definitions of affordability as Matthew brought up. Also, the wildlife corridor is very important. It's an incredibly beautiful area and I want to make sure that it's maintained. And I'm curious about the community center. I need to know more.

**Vicki Handron:** Predominantly affordable housing, integrated affordable housing constructed in a way that enhances the permit permeability, so the wildlife is free to roam through and there's lots of open space. Maintaining the open space that's already there. I think the comments/feedback that we've received has been the feedback we've had has been great and helpful in coming up with a vision. If I can help in any way in writing a letter, please let me know.

**Dickey:** I think the pole represented most of what I envision for the site. I will have the opportunity to help with the definitions of things which I think are important again that that nexus of policy and politics and as a community that's what we hope we're going to try and define these terms as clearly as we can for ourselves.

**Mark Newhouser:** It's not just about submitting comments about what we as individuals may want or foresee. It's it's about getting to the specificity needed to make land use decisions and unfortunately most of the visioning and even the housing numbers and the affordability have not been addressed quantitatively and there's certain things that we need to put numbers on. We need to define, need to imply quantitative elements, the number of homes right to keep the rural character, the emphasis on the affordability and the mixture. I suggested earlier that we follow the percentages that are needed that the county has identified as being a deficit as in very low & moderate. The creeks, and this is the input I've gotten from biologists, we should have 100-foot setbacks, we should respect the fact that there are designs in place for putting in floodplain restoration projects. The way the alternatives are drawn they don't show proper setbacks even right now they're 50 feet, but even within the 50-foot zone we're showing parks, and these are the green spaces that are identified for parks, for the subdivisions that were proposed. That's just unacceptable. If we really want to respect wildlife corridors, we need to have a full 100-foot setback. If you take into account wildfire protections, then you need another 100 feet between the edge of the corridor and any built home. These are all things that need to be described very quantitatively if we're going to actually have effective protection of our conservation of natural resources. We have to get real, and I don't know how we're going to do that, except for giving specific numbers. To me it all boils down to the density of the population and the direct result of having a lot of people on this property that are going to impact the conservation elements. I vote for under the 400 units, higher proportions of affordability classes. Evacuation safety and traffic. Fencing, that's something that we haven't really addressed, and I've heard it come up 3-4 times tonight.

**Eagles:** You know I don't think I have much that hasn't been said by you all, the community so yeah, I have no great words of wisdom.

## **8. Consideration of items for future agenda**

Receive

**Chair Dawson:** We are going to have our special meeting on January 5 to review this letter and the draft, and also to see if he's available, we'll hear from Joe McCall. Those are the two items that I can see happening on January 5th, anybody have any other thoughts?

**Supervisor Gorin:** Arthur I want to thank you for providing the leadership to move this effort forward. All of you are taking responsibility very seriously to reflect the passions and the attitudes of the community. This is exactly the function of the MAC and it is not easy. We would have loved to have had a professional team develop a concept and a vision that we could immediately say yes. We like that we'll just tweak it a little bit, but I hope that this process will help us achieve something that will be very special for the SDC. I want to wish you all a warm and safe holiday season. Thank you to Hannah and the transcriber Alondra for the effort tonight.

**Chair Dawson:** Thank you Susan and Happy holidays everybody. Thanks for hanging in there, this is a lot of work but it's important, so I appreciate all the effort and engagement that everyone is showing, and that includes all the community members.

## **9. Adjourn**

Resolution

Motion: Dawson

Second: Eagles

Vote: 7-0

## Meeting adjourned at 9:59 pm

*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/>