



North Sonoma Valley Municipal Advisory Council



Notice of Special Meeting and Agenda

January 5, 2022

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

Join Zoom Conference Meeting:

<https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/98418929925?pwd=VOVha3lFNFAzZE9zcXJqOG5HQ2tFUT09>

Meeting ID: 984 1892 9925

Passcode: 930912

Join by Phone: 1 (669) 900-9128

5:30 p.m.

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

1. Call to Order 5:31

Roll Call: Vice Chair Handron

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

Absent: None

2. Public Comment

(No public comments).

Chair Dawson: I want to express my appreciation to the Ad Hoc committee, incredible job with the letter. It’s articulate, brief, and well thought out. One of the challenges was organizing. The appendix provided extra detail. Also want to thank Shannon Lee who ran the poll to back up the statements about what the public wants to see at the SDC. We’ll first take comments from councilmembers. Is anything missing from the letter? We’re trying to express community opinion in the letter. I request comments to be kept at 3 mins. Then, we’ll take public comments/ideas for edits. We will live edit the letter as a public, then vote to finalize the letter to send it out to the supervisors.

3. Review Letter to Board of Supervisors: Sonoma Developmental Center

LETTER REVIEW

Chair Dawson: Great detail & summary. I don’t think anything is missing or needs to be done. I would vote for the letter, even in this form as a draft letter.

Vice Chair Handron: I will echo your sentiment. I am grateful for Ad Hoc committee, I think everything was covered & there’s nothing that I think should be taken out, so thank you.

Nardo-Morgan: Having been part of writing letter, I know it was challenging. Thank you to Kate. There was a lot debated about what to put in. Of course, my vote is a yes, I don’t think we need to add or take anything out.

Dickey: I agree, I am satisfied with the result for sure. I got to command Kate. It was a group effort for sure. There's always somebody that lends more energy, more organizational skill, and more leadership than another, so thanks Kate very much for everything you contributed to this effort.

Eagles: It was a good process, I really thank my team. I have nothing to add.

Oldroyd: Good job. I was amazed on how you took all the information from this mass database of comments and put it into 9 pages. I really valued community benefits in each section, and I am wondering if that can be brought to a more prominent place in the appendix?

Doss: The two areas I focused on were affordable housing and fire safety/climate resiliency. I thought they were both excellent. I don't know if we can get closer into the percentage of what we would recommend versus what was recommended in the alternatives, but I found both of those excellent and the rest of the other sections were very well written so I'm very comfortable with the letter as it is.

Supervisor Gorin: Great job. I haven't gone through the letter in detail. Great team effort, it is amazing. I hope you can be the role model for the CAC. I'm only going to be with you for a short time because the Springs MAC meeting is tonight. We'll see what they do with their discussion. In a conversation with Denise, they're still working on some significant revisions on a preferred alternative. I hope we will be pleased. We'll know when that info is put on the website.

Newhouser: The consistency of the sections on the appendix... I think that having the different sections be comparable with community benefits, potential funding sources. I have introduced a document that I sent to Hannah with edits, I am also suggesting adding a section with recommended actions and constraints that we can include in the appendix. We can review that when we get to that point.

Chair Dawson: Vice Chair Handron and I met w/ Maite Iturri. She shared their draft. It is very short, 8-10 bullet points. We shared the draft letter. We all agreed, there's pretty good alignment, which is good to know. We are tight in the line w/ what Springs MAC is talking about. Dale from the Ecology Center said he will support the draft letter.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Patricia Chadwick: I think the letter looks great. Considering the history of the site there should be an emphasis on disability inclusion in terms of housing accessibility of the facilities. Reimagine how people w/ disabilities can be integrated in this community, including possible group homes for people with developmental disabilities and job creation. Doing things at a slower basis and not rushed. Having a trust.

Chair Dawson: Emailed public comments from Jesset: would like to see dedicated shuttle and decentralized water systems. Nancy Cohen: expressed deepest gratitude. Jody Falkenor: offer the OPAL community land trust as a model and gave us a website that's up in Washington that looks very exciting. David R: ask supervisors or state to extend deadline to a year. He'd like to see advisory committees be reconstituted, I'm not sure exactly what that would mean but to include quote on community and affordable housing input. He'd like to have full open and transparent hearing and decision making, would like to have the state pay for the cleanup and the last one is affordable housing quote with densities and approvals pre guaranteed, and public input limited to design review. Teri Shore: urges a yes vote, she thinks the entire property should be retained as a public or nonprofit entity like the Marin Headlands, don't urbanize the site that reverses decades of city centered growth and increases development pressure on the surrounding rural areas.

Teri Shore: I support the letter, it was very well done. I urge to send it to the supervisors and copy legislators. Also consider sending it to local, regional, and statewide media. This is a property of interest in California. I think it can be

made into a briefing paper to share with others. I have my own opinions about what I want to see, I lean on the side of more conservation.

Linda: Where can this letter be read?

Hannah: It is on the NSV MAC website.

Linda: I agree that the letter should be shared w/ the media.

Meg: I think the letter is fab, I read it several times. My additions are minimal. Thinking about the 30x30 rules, the letter is a heads up to the supervisors. Climate resiliency is addressed several times, I appreciate that. Other suggestion, w/ the fire safety/climate resiliency, we can add the valley. Otherwise, congratulations to the Ad Hoc and NSV MAC for their leadership.

Alice Horowitz: I think the letter is spot on, I appreciate the effort that went into it. Appreciate the repeated emphasis of holding the property in a trust. Public trust in this process has been eroded as time has proceeded. In light of most recent missteps w/ the property, the idea of turning this spectacular property over to a developer, and then trusting them through the years to do what they're supposed to do and do it right, I just like the idea of a trust.

David Eichar: I see you looking at copying state senator McGuire. I think also copying Cecilia Aguiar-Curry. That would be good in terms of funding and federal entity structure, investment, and jobs. Funding the BIPOB is good, there's money in that infrastructure bill for the sewer treatment and water recycling. The letter mentions affordable housing, but think should include all income levels because in a recent Sonoma City Council meeting, planning staff acknowledged that moderate income level rent paid is basically the same as market rate. Make sure all income levels are included. Letter and appendix are great, I support sending that out.

Deborah Nitasaka: I submitted a letter to you also, I specifically focused on built environment and went into great detail about the need for a tech training center for people who want to learn the trades. I feel strongly that we need to look at this property as a potential to improve lives of people living in this county now and in the future. Protect space and use built space to maximize potential for folks growing up here. People don't have many opportunities to train for things outside of working in vineyards, or in the hospitality sector. I really think that needs to be improved, so I hope you will give some thought to how we might look at that existing campus as a training center for people who are interested in going into the trades and for people who want to go into teaching. As you know, we currently have a drastic shortage and as a training center for people with developmental and physical disabilities, I think there's some magnificent things that could be done with that campus to enrich the lives of everyone, thank you.

Josette Brose-Eichar: I agree, the letter is great and covers everything. I think releasing it to the media and sending it to our legislators so that they are aware about what we are doing and what the community thinks. There's a lot of chatter...social media and local media have a perception that there's a false equivalency of nimbyism as it relates to how we're concerned about environmental impacts, and I think in anything that you release it would be great to mention we are in favor of creating something for the community and affordable housing. Improved transportation for those who live/work at the site should be added.

Norman Gilroy: Excellent letter. Strong supporter of the village concept. I believe there's a way to make it a human-oriented site, provide education and all things proposed. That is core, also a central hub. The cost problems, making best use of existing resources. 8th street plant: make it an alternative to be considered. If include completely new plan on site, large cost. Suggest small streamlining of that section to make it less challenging.

Charlie: I wrote a letter. One of the commentors mentioned using the facility for training, especially the trades. I wrote letter to the building trades council to see if they would like to bid or acquire how to use these workshops and warehouses to train people. Does this committee have meetings or has met w/ elected senators to pitch for them to sponsor a bill? I don't think the SDC can be self-sustaining. We have to sell it to some developer; I think that is criminal. We have to go to our elected representatives and pitch for what we want, to sponsor a bill and work it out and get momentum behind it.

Gregg Montgomery: historic preservation: there's additional language we can add. People want to know why the museum is so important. Define legacy of care. A couple old buildings don't tell a story. Many families have worked there. For the sake of community and people who have worked there for so long, the museum is so important because it will tell a story. The legacy is the stories. The Historical Society, we have it all documented. We need a museum, a library, and a visitors center.

Elisa Stancil: I'm really supportive of all the comments. Desire to use existing structures with trade emphasis. The CCC can come in to learn skills of remediation to cure/heal the land. I applaud the training. Not sure if timing was mentioned. Agree w/ resiliency and concern, we don't want people to think we don't want people here. We certainly do want people here, but we want to be able to drive on the street and have access to free/safe escape during fires. I do agree in having the valley as part of the area.

Ed Lieberman: I agree w/ Greg about having a museum, something that establishes/maintains the legacy. Thousands who lived and were treated or sometimes mistreated at SDC. My main concern about the property is I know that the land developers have been looking at this property since I went to work there in 1961 or so. We're going to fight a lot of money/power to do the things we want like in the lower part of the facility. My main concern is the West and East side of the facility and I'm thinking that should go into nature conservancy or something. That's habitat for all kinds of animals- deer, lions, and cougar.

Nancy Kirwan: Making sure we include the valley and not just the immediate community. Agree w/ Teri about state/federal outreach. Should include OPAL trust, ran by the community for affordable housing. Bill Dodd will be holding a community meeting in 1-2 weeks, perhaps we should introduce what we're trying to do here.

Bonny: about affordable housing specifications: it's understood it's usually 30-60% MAI (median affordable income). The meeting is January 11th at 6:00 pm, if you go to Senator Dodd's website, it'll be there and will also be on the radio. The person from housing authority in CA and the state treasurer will be there too. Demolition of buildings and building new buildings is a huge contributor of emissions. If anyone wants to support, they can visit: www.sdccampusproject.com. I also support job training, artwork studios, creative affordable housing and affordable housing that is also for home ownership.

Chair Dawson: Ways to be involved: community meeting this Saturday, Jan 8th at 8:00. I think its 8-12, with the Historical Society and John McCall. Next NSV MAC meeting will be on January 19th. The supervisors meeting will be on January 25th, they will be discussing alternatives for the SDC and it will be a good opportunity to put in a comment in support of this letter. That info is on the county website. You may contact Hannah Withman at the county, and she can point you in the right direction: hannah.whitman@sonoma-county.org

Eagles: If you go to www.eldridgeforall.org, there's a pop up when you log on to this weekend's workshop if that's of interest to folks.

LETTER EDITING

Eagles: lots of comments about community and what that meant. In the 2nd paragraph we do say Sonoma Valley community survey. If anyone looked at that survey that was done by Shannon Lee, a lot of respondents were from the broader Valley, that was the intention.

Nardo-Morgan: several times it was brought up to contact representatives and the media. That is also something we thought we should do.

Chair Dawson: We'll go paragraph by paragraph. Any edits on 1st paragraph? I'll give ppl 5 seconds to respond.

Newhouser: on the 1st paragraph, "at the direction of Supervisor Gorin" I am wondering if we can change to under the authority of?

Supervisor Gorin: I want to be clear that the letter is from you, not me. I must remain biased. I think it is a good letter, it expresses what you and the community want.

Newhouser: what language are you comfortable with?

Supervisor Gorin: The North Sonoma Valley MAC has prepared this letter for consideration and just eliminate reference to me.

Eagles: I thought that it was a specific. We worked hard on this, it's awkward because it was requested, and I feel fairly strongly that we can't lose that language.

Nardo-Morgan: I want to agree with that, I also heard that it was a request that we write this letter. It's not something that we kind of decided on our own to take up, so I guess we could clarify that a little bit.

Chair Dawson: I had the same impression.

Supervisor Gorin: At the direction, this is coming from you not me.

Newhouser: Maybe at the suggestion of, under the authority of?

Supervisor Gorin: The NSV MAC has the authority to comment on items within its jurisdiction and so that's the authority, it's not necessarily the authority for me.

Nardo-Morgan: What about at the request?

Chair Dawson: Should we have a vote?

Vice Chair Handron: The direction was to prepare the letter, I think that's how the sentence reads.

Supervisor Gorin: In my conversations with your chair, I suggested that you work together to prepare/comment letter, so I didn't say it is your responsibility.

Chair Dawson: I'm fine using the word suggestion.

Newhouser: I'm fine w/ leaving it out. We are the advisory council, we have the authority. I think it is stronger if we say the NSV MAC has prepared this letter. I am trying to make it clear that this is coming from us not you.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote to start the letter with the NSV MAC). That passes so we will make that edit. Any other comments on that 1st paragraph? Any comments/edits on 2nd paragraph?

Newhouser: the bolded section states to study a preferred alternative. Might be stronger to say reevaluate the planning process and develop a preferred alternative that truly reflects the community vision. I don't know if we want them to study it, we want them to do it.

Chair Dawson: what if we just say to develop a preferred alternative that truly reflects the community vision and that's what we want to develop? Revising the whole planning process is wordy and it sounds way more complicated, I mean maybe it is no matter what.

Newhouser: unless we want them to reengage w/ the community. I'm fine w/ your edit.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Raise hand if we want to change study to develop. Ok, we will make that change. Any other edits on the second paragraph?

Oldroyd: I have one. I feel that the bolded part should either get its own paragraph or be put in front of the rest of this paragraph, because I feel this is the most important part of the letter myself.

Newhouser: So you're suggesting just make it a separate paragraph and have that separate paragraph proceed the sentence that says this letter?

Oldroyd: Yeah.

Chair Dawson: this is trying to get into minor points here, but if we create a separate paragraph, we're pushing the whole letter under the 4th page, and it'd be great to keep it down to 3 pages. (Initiates vote). We'll leave it where it is.

Oldroyd: I'm sensitive to that.

Chair Dawson: I'd be in favor of moving bolded section to the beginning at the paragraph and just keeping it there. How do you feel about that?

Eagles: it was bolded so that it stood out.

Nardo-Morgan: I don't really think you need to move it.

Chair Dawson: I do want to caution us about the line editing, we don't get too deep into the weeds. I guess we can just leave it. (2 people raised hand to vote). We'll leave it. Moving to the 3rd paragraph.

Eagles: I have an easy one. Shannon did comment we have her title slightly incorrect; she is Biology Department Faculty. This appears in the appendix. It's always called SSU, it doesn't have to have the formal name, so, at Sonoma State University. That was her correction.

Chair Dawson: thumbs up if agree. (Correction to Shannon's title was made). Let's move on to bolded paragraphs below that, request for community driven process. Any edits to that? Excellent, we're making progress.

Newhouser: I think we should say "until after a new alternative reflective of site constraints."

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Raise hand if in favor of adding after until after a new alternative, raise your hand if you're in favor of that. So, add after. Any edits to last paragraph of the 1st page?

Newhouser: there is more than 1 wildlife corridor, so I would just say eliminate the and just make corridors plural. The last sentence.

Chair Dawson: anybody opposed to that minor change? Let's go ahead and make the change, thank you Hannah. Now moving on to community priorities, any edits under open space?

Newhouser: In the last sentence of the 1st paragraph, I would eliminate the have in "highest priority."

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Anybody opposed raise your hand. Ok, we will eliminate the have.

Eagles: There was a community comment about being consistent with the state's 30x30 goals. Again, we don't want to get this too long, we want to make sure all points are considered in the appendix.

Newhouser: I have suggested a change for that. I had put a comma after highest priority. I put comma, consistent w/ the state's housing goals.

Eagles: housing or 30x30?

Newhouser: Maybe you need to explain what the 30x30 is, it is a housing goal isn't it?

Nardo-Morgan: it is not a housing goal at all. It has to do w/ conservation. 30 % of natural resources preserved by 2030, that's what 30x30 means.

Newhouser: Okay, I misinterpreted that I'm sorry. Maybe to say states conservation goals?

Chair Dawson: I can see putting that in the appendix, but we could fit it in here if we said after highest priority, give that a comma and say consistent with the state's 30x30 goals.

Eagles: we could do a semi colon.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). if anyone disagree with us, please raise hand. Let's move down on housing density, any edits?

Eagles: there was a comment by community, to imply all affordable housing levels.

Chair Dawson: I think my inclination would be in the next category under affordable housing. We've moved down to affordable housing.

Nardo-Morgan: David Arce did request that there's something in there for all levels of affordable housing.

Chair Dawson: in order to not add to the letter, what if we say please see appendix for more information?

Eagles: the reason we didn't get too far into this is because this is complex, right? And we're not planners. We didn't feel we had the knowledge and time to get specific. I'm a little worried about getting too descriptive.

Dickey: from a planning perspective, they're very clear definitions. Under affordable housing, there's a whole criteria of them characterized by formulas related to income. So, from a planning perspective, affordable housing is very clearly defined, and you know, rather than recreate definitions that we are not qualified to create for a general population, I think we stick with what we have produced.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Everyone in favor w/ sticking to what we have? Looks like that passed. For adaptive reuse, any comments/edits on that one? We'll move on to utility infrastructure.

Newhouser: I have some concerns about the sewage treatment facility and if we do make changes to that we may want to revisit this in the letter if we make changes to the appendix.

Chair Dawson: I don't want to get into wordsmithing too much. Let's move on to fire safety / climate resiliency, any edits?

Eagles: This is potentially one area where instead of community, we could put valley.

Dickey: how about the Sonoma Valley community?

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Ok, that passed. Moving on to historical preservation, any edits?

Newhouser: Part of the last sentence, all of which would be continuous to the cemetery. It's a little confusing and not fully correct, I suggest deleting it.

Chair Dawson: we should probably mention the cemetery.

Nardo-Morgan: It may be confusing, but the idea is that, where these buildings are situated, they are situated in a line that goes up to and is continuous with the historic cemetery up to the open space into Jack London Park. It is a line that is created contiguous with this area. That was the idea behind it, it's a specific spot. That is going to be created as a historic district and visitor center that is linked with the history of the historic cemetery, the historic orchard, the Jack London Park. It's all one connected area.

Chair Dawson: I think I understand but I think it might be confusing to include open space there if we're talking about historical preservation.

Dickey: what about using the word linked? All of which would be linked with the cemetery.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Ok, we'll change the word to linked. I noticed a comment I wrote down from Craig about the importance of museum, I think we can put that on the appendix. I did like the perspective on that. Do we need to add training?

Nardo-Morgan: training was brought up at least 3 different times by people, that they would like to see that in there.

Dickey: I would say that vocational training and leave it and we should do it in the appendix.

Newhouser: I think school vocationally covers vocational training, so I think that as an example it's fine and also, if you add vocational training, you're going to push yourself into a 5th line that will make your letter longer.

Nardo-Morgan: another thing that was brought up several times, was disability inclusion. To have a job section, to have housing. I don't know where we might put that, we can put it in the appendix, but it was brought up several times.

Eagles: we have some of that in the appendix.

Newhouser: I have set specific recommendation for that in the appendix.

Chair Dawson: we can change related to inclusive, under commercial space/job creation. We're good, we can make the change. Moving down to site governance and financing...

Eagles: just want to acknowledge a couple of mentions of the OPAL trust, but maybe we can look at that as an example in the appendix.

Chair Dawson: I would support putting it in the appendix.

Newhouser: I want to commend you on the language, she is very diplomatically putting the failed infrastructure and the unfairness of this economic imposition on the site so kudos to the author.

Chair Dawson: I think we can move on to conclusions. There are only 2 more paragraphs, we'll take comments & edits on this. Can we change the community to the Sonoma Valley community? I give permission to Hannah to mess with the lines, for the body of the letter to keep it to 3 pages.

Hannah: formatting concerns we can figure out after the vote tonight.

Newhouser: question regarding the signature, we discussed this in a previous meeting.

Hannah: if I remember correctly, it is chair and vice chair.

Chair Dawson: if we go to 4 pages it's not the end of the world.

Newhouser: comments on who else should be cc'd?

Dickey: everybody.

Chair Dawson: this is going to be a public letter, so if we forget someone this can be seen & sent out by a citizen.

Eagles: it was suggested we send it to Cecilia Aguiar-Curry.

Chair Dawson: my impression is it should go to the whole city council.

Dickey: do we want to include the Springs MAC and the ACAC?

Chair Dawson: I would include Permit Sonoma. Anyone opposed to that? I think we're done w/ the body of the letter.

Newhouser: one other question related to the appendix; I suggest we change open space to natural habitat or natural environment.

Chair Dawson: that just made me think to CC the Open Space District and the Sonoma County Historical Society. Re appendix, we had suggestions on various things. Possibly we can add 1 more category w/ potential body and resources. Then we can incorporate a lot of what was mentioned.

Dickey: on some of these sections we indicated potential funding resources, I wouldn't add more categories.

Chair Dawson: I don't want to complicate this document more. We can change Dr. Shannon Lee's title to "Biology Department Faculty at SSU." Any other edits on this 1st intro paragraphs? Let's move to open space.

Newhouser: I just want to mention I sent what I wrote to Hannah, to view my suggestions.

Chair Dawson: let's go ahead and look at Mark's document.

Newhouser: I mentioned earlier to have consistency in sections and add in where there's missing potential funding sources. In the 1st paragraph I suggest additions under community support, that we include a land trust, in addition to regional/state parks. I'm also suggesting were not looking at continued access, we want to plan that access in the wildlife corridor. I also added streams. I think it's important to mention these other elements because they weren't

included and they're important to inclusion. One thing I feel strongly about is that we mentioned in the introductory letter that we were going to include performance measures and site constraints and they were not included.

Eagles: Can you say more?

Newhouser: I'm looking for consistency, I feel strongly that having specific recommendations is important. As Susan and planners have mentioned, to say what we want.

Dickey: I disagree w/ that very strongly. We are not planners. You are dictating terms, none of us are set up to do that. It takes staff time, drawing & enormous amounts of time to do that.

Newhouser: but do you disagree with that and time constraints?

Eagles: before we go there, I think the idea of the letter was that we didn't know all these things yet and we didn't have time to explore them and so I think we'll have other chances to comment, so I think we have to sort of determine what's important right now to get across. I just don't know were quite ready to go this far and if we can go this far.

Newhouser: I feel we're failing to include the comments that were made, which include specific site constraints and performance measures. What was not included were referenced from Sonoma Ecology Center, I think it's an oversight to not include those things that have been specifically mentioned. Constraints and performance measure that were mentioned by community members. The requested site constraints and or performance measures that have been recommended by specific community members and that's what I'm trying to capture here.

Dickey: you developed these changes here and we don't know who those community members are, they're not referenced. There's no reference to community members. For all we know you just decided which things... you just determined on your own what to include & what not. I would propose we have a quorum of people here and we can figure out how to vote on what we're going to do here because this is way beyond the scope of what we were asked to provide, as has been indicated by Kate. There is going to be ample opportunity to make sure that anything that is a site constraint is followed, but we don't get to determine that, it's developed. A lot of these things are developed by code, you know, we were not in a position to determine building code or planning code, we cannot do that, and I would argue that it pushes up against the envelope as to what the MAC is actually allowed to do.

Chair Dawson: I agree with your thoughts. I've never been through this process before but when you set up the EIR you have to mention what they're supposed to study right? And so you know at that time, perhaps we could write a letter, a 2nd second letter that just says here's what we want to see covered. One would scientifically support setbacks. We're looking for partners and people to support this letter and if we get too specific, I think we may lose some of that support.

Oldroyd: I agree with Councilmember Dickey, and I do this for a living.

Nardo-Morgan: I appreciate your attention to detail Mark, but we can't go into this much detail. We did look through public comments. I agree with Matt, maybe put it in a vote.

Newhouser: I was fully expecting to have some pushback on adding another section to this. And I'm not attached to having recommended actions but I do think at some stage that does need to be developed and if they're not part of what the community states that they'll never get it and the property won't be protected, we won't get the setbacks, we won't get the protection of the corridor, and I think that at some point we need to do that.

Dickey: please, that is a projection

Newhouser: I am not making this up, this has come from many community members. I am very sorry you are projecting that this is not relevant.

Chair Dawson: I'm concerned about the wildlife corridor. I also know that the land trust is working really hard to protect, particularly that aspect of the property. It's not just us, there's a lot of other people working on all these different issues. They've talked about looking at performance standards and they want to study those. I'm with Susan, I think we should leave this piece for later on. We don't really have land use authority. Ultimately, probably the CAC is going to be more involved than they have been. I appreciate Matt's engagement.

Newhouser: I'm not going to fight back, I'm fine if people don't want to have recommended actions. I would like considerations of the language within the other sections that are included.

Chair Dawson: Are people ok if we move down to the next section on Mark's document? Mark, I'd like to request if there's something that really stands out in the original document, I want to make sure we cover those. How does that sound?

Newhouser: my edits stand as a request, you can either submit them or not. I submit to you the edits that are highlighted. Whether or not you want to add potential funding sources. I would trust the ad hoc committee to decide whether they want to add in the other language for consistency, like the potential funding sources & benefits. I think that it would benefit from having that in each section. This is probably the most extensive edit, just in the community support paragraph under open space. I do have some questions on some other sections, but they're relatively minor comparatively.

Dickey: let's go to those.

Eagles: Most of these are word improvements. I really don't know much about the potential to transfer this to a land trust, so I can't really speak to that right now. We weren't consistent w/ funding sources for some of those things like open space because they didn't seem as pertinent but if anyone has an objection... I don't have an objection to putting in grants and developer funds. I just don't know that it adds a lot, so I'm open to that.

Chair Dawson: I'd be fine w/ adding benefits... reduce density, reduces most impacts that cannot be feasible indicated by design. I'd hate to word smith this too much, I feel like it was well done. Like the real character, I think that was mentioned in the letter. I appreciate all the work you've put into this; I am wondering if maybe you can take these ideas and put them on a separate document? Maybe this is something for when the EIR comes along? We want density and numbers reduced, that will alleviate a lot of concerns about this project, there's a lot of ways these messages can be conveyed.

Dickey: Though we're examining this particular highlighted area, I don't see that it adds much to the document. I'm not sure that it's necessary and we should just keep moving on here. You're trying to be kind Arthur, and we're trying to appreciate Mark's efforts. I'm not trying to be cruel here or anything I'm just speaking my mind.

Newhouser: it is kind of cruel though, because basically you're saying I'm hijacking the process and I'm contributing to the process & requesting consideration of the language that I've proposed and I have yet to have a vote on a single word on this document and it's process.

Nardo-Morgan: Can we hear from other councilmembers on their thoughts on this?

Chair Dawson: we are really trying to avoid line editing. I feel like a lot of what you have is line editing. I would be open to going through the rest of your document and consider adding something that is not a line edit.

Vice Chair Handron: we really put our trust in the committee to develop this letter. I think they've done a great job in conveying the public's comments, I am happy with what they have developed.

Doss: I think, several people on the group tonight have expressed that this is stage 2 or 3. I think we have the amount of detail in the appendix now. And I'm not saying any of the words Mark said are not appropriate, especially in that opening paragraph. But it's overwhelming, the amount of changes and the detail that he wants to go through tonight and so from my view, I think that we were already almost there and we should limit changes and move on.

Newhouser: I am not suggesting many changes. If we eliminate all of the sections on recommended actions, there's not many changes. I have questions, maybe we can skip to the sewer treatment water recycling section because that's the most troubling one I see.

Dickey: We have other members of the community. Any others want to comment?

Chair Dawson: I really agree. A lot of this stuff looks like phase 2 or 3, which we're not there yet. We're trying to get this out to the supervisors to express their communities' opinions and vision. This stuff will eventually be looked at much more in detail. I don't think going to this level of detail right now is serving us on several levels.

Newhouser: do we really want to propose they put a sewer water treatment on SDC? I don't remember the public commenting on that, this looks like holy new novel information here and I'm questioning the accuracy of this. I've done my homework and done some research on this, and I have my questions. I'm sorry if the ad hoc committee doesn't want to discuss it or accept any changes to this document, that's troubling to me.

Eagles: I'd like to look at that section Mark. I know we had community comment there. I think that's reasonable to look at that section and other sections too.

Nardo-Morgan: we did have community comments on that tonight.

Dickey: we're looking at Mark's edits and not the original.

Mark: the blue is comments, yellow is language. Currently from the sanitation district, I move that from the benefits section because it's not really a benefit, it's more of an explanation of background general information and accurately it's called the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District. And I think that the effluent is actually being discharged into the creek, so I think that needs to be corrected. I don't disagree w/ the problems w/ this. I think what's a little disturbing is saying the development is going to make it worse. Also, there's a lot of information about sewer replacement of which the county could argue will then handle any further development. There are also new developments that are going on South of Sonoma where they're putting in whole new infrastructure. I'm just wondering if we can make these claims, it's sort of like what one of the commenters said tonight. Basically, a hatchet job on the 8th St water treatment plant. I just don't know if we can make that claim, based on the improvements that are underway. So, I don't oppose the ideas that none of the plants that I've seen included... a treatment plant on the facility and I don't know how the public is going to feel about adding that. I was just wondering where that came from, and whether or not we can make these claims.

Nardo-Morgan: it was Norman who made that comment, he did say to actually try to streamline that section, rather than add more to it and to consider making it an alternative site connecting with the 8th St East rather than to make it a new plant.

Dickey: here's my observation, it has a great deal to do with water conversation. When we started the public comment period for this SDC project back in 2016, we weren't faced w/ the water drought. Water recycling, wetlands & fire resiliency are all tied together. It's not really a separate thing from fire resiliency, from wetlands, from water recycling...it's all integrated and the reason you need that plant is because then you have access to all those things rather than 13 miles down the Sonoma Valley. That water recycled will never make it to GE. Water sustainability project now being examined by local community is saying water level is increasing, how do you increase that sewage water as we increase the number of houses that are going to need to make use of a sewage system that likely won't be functional in 15-20 years because of the water, the saltwater intrusion into the aqua fires? We can do whatever we want here but we're trying to look to the future, we're trying to look 100 years to the future or 30 but don't look to the present.

Newhouser: I'm with you on that. I think it's a great idea, I just don't know if it's actually been vetted in the community enough to support at this point, and whether or not the county would actually acknowledge the failing systems or the vulnerability of the systems. So I'm just asking the question here, and also to basically say that this development will actually cause more frequent overflow problems, I just don't know if we actually have that evidence.

Chair Dawson: The way I look at this document, these are ideas for the county to look at. Maybe Mark's idea of having recycled water, that all makes sense to me. This is still very much an outline we want the county to consider.

Newhouser: well then let's move on. In the next section, there was just one other that I think needed to be moved...the infrastructure requirements. In the paragraph under potential funding sources, I would just move that up into community benefits.

Chair Dawson: I have no problem w/ that. (Initiates vote, passed).

Hannah: Is everyone ok if I return to the original document to make the change?

Newhouser: It's on page 5, it starts with currently the sanitation pays a fine.

Eagles: that bullet moves up to general information.

Newhouser: Yup, it moves up under general information. The other treatment plan may actually discharge into Sonoma Nathanson.

Dickey: The reason that I use the Nathanson Creek system is because, again, I think of them as being tied together. Ultimately, these waterways are not all singular waterways.

Newhouser: but it's called the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District, it's in the 2nd or 3rd bullet under community benefits. One other suggestion in site I had, under community benefits, you're saying

a sewage treatment facility would be cited on the SDC site. It sounds like a recommendation. I'm not quite sure why it's written that way.

Eagles: I agree.

Dickey: Me too.

Newhouser: It gets moved up to the section above that, community benefits.

Chair Dawson: Mark, would you be willing if we consider 3-5 more changes and then we can move on? You can decide which ones you want to work on?

Newhouser: If that's sections, yea. Why don't we do fire safety/fire resiliency on page 7?

Hannah: is it ok to work on this document to make changes?

Newhouser: I can just verbally say... under general information, I'd like included there stream and wildlife corridor. You have in there, water treatment. Under the 1st bullet, I don't really understand how water treatment provides fire protection.

Chair Dawson: Matthew, you want to answer that?

Dickey: When energy grids fail, gravity for water pressure is important and so having a water source up valley for this whether it's treated or untreated. I just think of it as being an additional fire resiliency layer. All these things are tied together, it's a web of relationships...fire resiliency, infrastructure development, micro grids, wildlife corridors. All are tied together, they're not individual items. When we talk about water treatment as a fire resiliency item you now have a source of water that's up valley. That can be used to fight fires and it's not reliant on an energy grid that may have been compromised by any number of things and we talked about fire, but we forget that we live in an earthquake zone.

Newhouser: I had a concern on the evacuation bullet, 3rd bullet.... the formatting is not right.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote to add a 3rd bullet: passed).

Newhouser: My suggestion for this one is that the road roadway preparedness is vague and I think it has to do with the evacuation and roadway capacity.

Chair Dawson: Mark, I want to avoid getting into the weeds. It is my understanding that others will address these issues, do you disagree with that?

Newhouser: I don't disagree, it's just probably one of the biggest issues the community had. That was actually quantified by the county as being a problem...the traffic standards and the repeated questions we got about having inadequate ability to evacuated with heavy traffic.

Chair Dawson: can we add a sentence about the questions, can we just add that?

Newhouser: however you want to word it, I just think the roadway preparedness was too vague.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). If you agree with the roadway emergency preparedness raise your hand. Anything else?

Newhouser: under community, you have adaptive reuse of an existing building, under funding sources. You may want to just move that somewhere else or define how that is s funding source.

Dickey: I sort of thought it was pertinent there because, rather than having to build & design for new construction, we can take advantage of a building that's existing and make use of it, rather than design build & identify space for it. It is a money saver.

Newhouser: how about adding cost-saving measure? The last section is really the 1st section, which was under open space. I still feel we should include a land trust. In a lot of the suggestions that were made there was an acknowledgement that much of the land had already been transferred to the regional & state parks, but that the remaining land was about having that be under the control of a land trust, rather than the parks. I have not gotten the impression that any of the parks were willing to take the remaining 700 acres, so I thought that we should include the land trust in there, as one of the possibilities for being the recipient of these lands.

Eagles: the property has not been transferred yet, so let's be clear on that.

Dickey: And we did try to address that under governance, which is near the end.

Eagles: I think that trust can be considered, but I just want to be very clear, because that was pointed out by Tracy Salcedo last meeting.

Newhouser: I'm talking about what has happened already, the upper orchards and the lower part of the property that has been transferred already. The orchards were transferred to Jack London State Park many years ago.

Dickey: that is not my understanding.

Chair Dawson: the orchard at Jack London was transferred.

Newhouser: it's just that strip along Highway 12 that was transferred by regional parks years ago... the additional ones? The 700 acres?

Dickey: Yes.

Chair Dawson: I think we're getting a little too much into the weeds. It's not going to be a perfect document. We're trying to get a general idea.

Newhouser: so, you don't want to add open space district or a land trust as one of the potential recipients?

Chair Dawson: (suggests wording edits and confirms the edit).

Newhouser: Are people open to adding, on the second bullet, adding protecting the streams and wildlife corridor?

Nardo-Morgan: Well Mark, the wildlife corridor is an area of habitat, and that habitat includes the streams because it's connecting wildlife populations that are separated by human activities, so anything that runs, walks, swims is part of that wildlife corridor.

Chair Dawson: I think we're getting into the weeds again.

Newhouser: I'm also being talked down to. Most people don't think of the streams as wildlife corridors. In fact, according to the planning documents and all of the 3 alternatives, those stream quarters have been encroached upon and not even taking into consideration. I understand that distinction, but I don't think most people do, I think most people think of the streams.

Vice Chair Handron: In the letter we corrected the wildlife corridor to wildlife corridors and maybe expanding it to multiple corridors could imply the inclusive of strings.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote) All in favor? Ok, change that to corridors.

Vice Chair Handron: it would have to be in the 2nd bullet point too.

Newhouser: my other suggestion in that same bullet point is to add the word natural, it's not really clear what resources we're referring to.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Raise your hand if you agree with adding natural.

Doss: Mr. Chairman, we offered changes, but we are going piece by piece through the whole damn thing. The point is to understand what the valley wants to see happen. We're back to where we were 30 mins ago. I would like to move along.

Chair Dawson: All in favor of moving along? Yes.

Eagles: Can we think for a minute about public comments? Where do we want to put the OPAL trust?

Nardo-Morgan: trust and Marin Headlands were also mentioned.

Chair Dawson: (initiates vote to add those under governance). And then we wanted to add in the federal infrastructure investment and jobs act.

Nardo-Morgan: that might be a space to add vocational training center.

Chair Dawson: legislative job training bill?

Eagles: to Mark's point, we don't have a funding section to the housing piece.

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote). Anyone disagree to adding a funding section under housing? Ok, let go ahead and add that.

Nardo-Morgan: Do we include anything about disability? And someone else mentioned the 30x30.

Eagles: and it's in the main letter.

Chair Dawson: let's go down to climate resiliency and see if we want to add it there. Can we add a bullet point, that it aligns w/ 30x30 goals?

Nardo-Morgan: it's the states' but also the nations.

Chair Dawson: Norman Gilroy mentioned the village concept, I'm not familiar with that but maybe under housing?

Nardo-Morgan: or community?

Chair Dawson: Craig Montgomery from the historical society mentioned the museum... we might want to add the community supports a museum.

Nardo-Morgan: can we add linked with on that section Hannah?

Chair Dawson: Is that it? Do we have a motion to approve the letter?

Newhouser: I have a request, under the water treatment section there's a reference to a specific development. I'd like that specific reference removed. It's under potential funding sources, bullet #3, and I would change that language. I would remove the specific reference.

Chair Dawson: I agree with that, anyone does not agree with that?

Dickey: may I suggest, just put a period at the end of systems, and that's it.

Newhouser: that's even better. Even though I know you don't want to spend any extra time on making my changes, I do want to offer what I've written as a record of this work and in case you want to use any of the other sections, feel free to use them.

Chair Dawson: I think that a good idea, let's save that for down the road. We want to vote on the letter tonight.

Eagles: Mark, I would really value having that all that work that you did, and I thank you for that, because like we've identified tonight, this is a process, right? And we're going to have much more time.

Doss: I move that we approve the letter.

Chair Dawson: Alright, do I have a 2nd motion?

Vice Chair Handron: (seconded).

Chair Dawson: (Initiates vote to approve the letter, letter approved).

Doss: Thank you. You know what's amazing is that a year and a half ago, when we started, I could have never imagined that we would have put together such a document in such detail and be so important to the valley, it's just amazing the work and the maturity of this organization & the number of people who come to our meetings now, 60-70, it's amazing to me. When we started out nobody came to our meetings, so it's very impressive and clearly the SDC and the future of the SDC means so much to all the valley, including Kenwood.

Dickey: Just an observation as well that this group, this committee is now the leadership committee for a vision for the Sonoma Valley community for SDC. There is not another public presentation or public entity that offered this vision.

Chair Dawson: we'll see each other on the 19th. If you can come to the supervisors meeting, I'll be there and let them know I'm the head of the MAC. Public comments can be sent to Hannah Withman at: hannah.whitman@sonoma-county.org.

4. Adjournment 8:30

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/>