



**North Sonoma Valley Municipal Advisory Council**  
 Notice of Meeting and Agenda  
**July 21, 2021**



**PLEASE NOTE:** This meeting will be conducted entirely by teleconference pursuant to the provisions of the Governor’s Executive Orders N-29-20 and N-35-20, suspending certain requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act. Members of the public will be recognized at the appropriate time via Zoom’s Raise Hand tool.

**Join Zoom Conference Meeting:**

<https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/98176030246?pwd=c0c5dEF0dnBuWdNHxIHTENFMdI0dz09>

**Meeting ID:** 981 7603 0246

**Passcode:** 685918

**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. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call-5:35 pm**

- Present: Dawson, Doss, Newhouser, Cooper, Eagles, Dickey Nardo-Morgan (arrived 5:59), Handron (arrived 6:05)
- Absent: none after late arrivals

**2. Approval of June 16, 2021 minutes**

Resolution

- Dawson mentioned in 2 and 7, and 6, newhouser, Jed brown should be Nick Brown; clarification on bullet in Supervisor Gorin
- Motion (approve with amendments): Eagles
- Second: Doss
- Vote: 5-0-0

**3. Public Comment**

Receive

(Limited to items not appearing on the agenda)

- **Alice Horowitz:** SDC specific plan alternatives coming out soon, and increased development around town, would like a comprehensive website that details all of the projects, developments being built, housing requirements. This would be helpful when considering the SDC alternatives. Would be good for the PAT, and the public. If this doesn’t exist, why not, and can it?
- **Jay Gamel:** have some great speakers, requests to list powerpoints in agenda packet. Requests videos. There is great content. Are there videos available, and can you provide the powerpoints?
- **Larry Davis:** would like to go back to the minutes, misquoted Larry Davis as Supervisor Gorin, in Larry’s comment he asked about funding the fire department to do community education on fire issues. Agrees with Alice about community education about planning, cumulative impacts.
- **Katie Christ:** Adding on the Alice’s question, looked at County website as far as what exactly is considered “affordable housing”, would be helpful to be pointed in that direction.

**Councilmember Response**

- **Chair Dawson:** will add public comment on approval of minutes, make the change Larry suggested
- **Newhouser:** agree with the comprehensive website, would like to see numbers, generally numbers are driven by ABAG, but does not take into account carrying capacity of land
- **Arielle:** clarifies that minutes, powerpoints, etc are available on the website
- **Chair Dawson:** Agrees with Alice’s suggestion on the “dashboard” website

#### 4. Supervisor Gorin Update

Receive

- Long board meeting yesterday
  - fire districts—gave fire districts funding, including Kenwood, for consolidation, and will be developing a Fire Tax—not sure what it will look like. We need to increase funding for fire services, we are changing from all volunteer to paid fire services. County wants to get out of the CSA 40 business, of managing volunteer fire departments. Bodega Bay Fire has a high parcel tax, and still is not sustainable, so consolidation is the way forward.

**(Councilmember Nardo-Morgan joins at 5:59)**

**(Councilmember Handron joins at 6:01; gone at 6:03; returns at 6:05)**

- Drone ordinance: not allowed in parks, in emergencies, near commercial airspace.
- Vacation rental workshop: this will be coming for community workshops around the county, recommends going on BOS site to see materials
- Redistricting committee: appointed Soccoro Shiels, Karen Weeks, Ray Willet (SMAC), Veronica Vences (La Luz). You will want to pay attention to this process, because it will change the supervisorial district boundaries. Back of the napkin calculations is that the Sonoma Valley has lost population.
- Might be good to have someone from Sustainable Sonoma to the MAC, to talk about housing, and the needs. Jobs/housing imbalance; the jobs we have here are hospitality sector, which is low paying, so folks can't live here, and commute long distances
- Meeting with Caltrans and TPW re: Arnold Drive and 12: everyone sees the need to realign. CalTrans looks at the accident data and doesn't see the problem. Trying to figure out a way forward. Would need a long turn lane, so they would have to purchase land, there are wetlands, etc. Supervisor Gorin trying to work with County, Caltrans, and Land Trust (who owns the land) to get this done
- Approved contract to design the bike lanes on Arnold Drive, would like to have this finished ASAP—before leaving office in 2024.

#### Councilmember Questions/Comments

- **Vice Chair Doss:** thank you for your continued pressure on fire district consolidation. Issues are salaries and staffing. Also are on the board of the Housing Land Trust in Sonoma County, have 150 homes for working folks, would like to bring information about this to the MAC. Most of their work is on the 101 corridor. Would like to expand into the Sonoma Valley
- **Supervisor Gorin:** Also think you should bring in Dave Kiff, former City Manager of Sonoma, and current Interim Director of the CDC, and Betzy Chavez, CDC Committee appointee, to talk about housing and homelessness and funding.
- **Councilmember Newhouser:** Thank you for bringing up wages and unaffordability. Many of those who have bought here were just lucky, and got in early. Concerned about speculation for Vacation Rentals. Our communities should not have to rely on nonprofits to maintain affordability; we need a paradigm shift in how we view real estate.
- **Supervisor Gorin:** that is why I worked so hard to create the exclusion zones, 10 in D1. Up for discussion is the lifting of the temporary moratorium for the fire zones, and expanding those
- **Councilmember Newhouser:** maybe the discussion should be if we should have them at all. Maybe they should be correlated with rental housing availability.

#### Public Comments

- **Jay Gamel:** CSA 40—will there be future discussions of Kenwood at the BOS, and is there a 30 day period to move forward? **Supervisor Gorin Response:** we are trying to encourage consolidation for as many folks as possible, 180k to Kenwood is ongoing; please reach out to me Jay for a private chat if necessary

#### 5. Permit Sonoma Update

Receive

*Scott Orr, Deputy Director, Permit Sonoma*

- Update on Permit Sonoma projects in MAC Area

- How to get project information, and how to give input on projects
- Scott Orr (SO): going to do a demo of the online resources, going to use a Glen Ellen project as an example, and going to preview something we're working on, which is a master map of every project in the county with comment ability
- (SO Shares Screen)
- Question of "what is affordable" is designated by the CDC, as far as Permit Sonoma, only take the lowest categories
- Demo 1: Permit History Search
  - Google Permit Sonoma, click on the first link
  - Blue banner with icons, Permit History Search, and Interactive Maps
  - Permit History Search, parcel number, pulls up Glen Ellen Inn site
    - i. List of all permits ever applied for, with most recent at the top
    - ii. Permit number is what matters the most; PLP21 means it's a 2021 project
    - iii. Clicking on the Permit number brings up a detailed timeline
    - iv. There is also a documents tab with everything ever scanned on a given parcel
- General Process that something goes through:
  - Applicant submits an application after some conversations with planning staff
  - 30 days to tell them everything they're missing; common to see the status of a project as "incomplete"; there are so many standards at the County/state/environmental etc
  - Project is assigned a planner (each planner has between 50 and 200 projects)
  - Planner shepherds project through the process
  - Generally much of the time is spent on environmental analysis
  - SO is encouraging planners to communicate updates; as this process takes time
  - During this phase, referral phase:
    - i. "early neighborhood notification" phase, between 300-1000 feet from the project, and get feedback from neighbors
    - ii. SVCAC
    - iii. Preliminary Design Review, etc
    - iv. Send to Public Works, Grading and Stormwater specialists, Environmental Health, etc during this time as well
    - v. Goal is to get it through the process and be transparent with the applicant while doing all the necessary analysis
- Map improvement coming:
  - Getting really close to having active permitting projects showing up on a map, clickable permit record, and comment on the project, automatically append to the record
- Demo 2: Interactive Maps
  - Zoning and Land Use map:
    - Shows every parcel in the County and zoning
    - Layer tab, can add other layers (fire perimeter, urban service areas, etc)
    - Can measure on the measure tab
    - This map is still being improved, please send thoughts on what should be included
    - The data on this map is what Permit Sonoma uses internally

### Councilmember Comments

- **Newhouser:** What is the public comment process? Is public comment restricted to certain types of projects? Limited to zoning areas? There have been situations where there is not public comment
- **SO:** County at large vs Coastal Zone, setting aside. The way the zoning code is broken down, there are certain things that you can do "by right". Example: residential lot, residential build, ministerial (over the counter) permit, as long as you meet the requirements. Discretionary involves a use permit, which requires an open public process and public comment. Ministerial permits can still be commented on, but it is essentially a check list from the State. Example: accessory dwelling units—state law changed, it is just a building permit. Ministerial,

60 days from payment to approval. Brought an updated ADU ordinance to Planning Commission, coming before the Board in September, minor changes. State laws are often city focused, so we amend and localize ordinances.

- **Newhouser:** totally understand, but this is not helpful for residents who may just be surprised by a very large project next door; maybe something that public policy could address in getting the info out
- **Supervisor Gorin:** totally understand, particularly with Hill Road house, which has been an issue here. Is it helpful, Scott, to have public comment when doing your review?
- **SO:** yes, particularly when we have administrative design review. We are not debating whether or not they can build a house, but what kind of house they can build, and how it looks. With the improvements with the map, may build in a feature to flag properties of interest to get a notice when something is applied for.
- **Chair Dawson:** I am in that situation, have an empty lot next door, can I do that?
- **DO:** Doesn't exist yet, but am working on.
- **Dickey:** Overlays: is there an overlay for vacation rentals?
- **SO:** there is a layer for exclusion zones. Going to make a note of it, where they are allowed, and add to the map.
- **Dickey:** will you be able to identify a vacation rental, in the future?
- **SO:** one of the things being discussed in the Vacation Rental update is changing it to a business license, and improving enforcement
- **Dickey:** Sonoma Valley has the most per capita wineries, and vacation rentals
- **Eagles:** you showed us granular, detailed look into individual processes, what is the process for understanding for how all the things going on now aggregate toward the general plan housing and other requirements, is there a mechanism that website assists with, or completely separate mechanism that tallies and assesses against goals?
- **SO:** right now it's separate. Earlier ABAG, MTC mentioned, they come out with regional housing needs assessment, what state uses to decide if we get money for certain programs. If not meeting affordable housing requirements, get less money. I think by end of 2023 need to update general plan housing elements. Things come up today going to be expanded, at this point with this housing update, much better GIS and other resources, functional website, this cycle, much more narrative experience, what is being required, what we can feasibly meet, things might be necessary to foster great levels of affordability, possible code changes to incentivize creation of housing for the missing middle, people who don't qualify for assistance but can't afford to live in Sonoma County.
- **Nardo-Morgan:** Thank you for helping our neighborhood, stop someone trying to stabilize the creek and doing damage
- **Newhouser:** What we are hoping is to be able to view how much affordable housing there is; would like that to be accessible. ABAG requirements vs how much we have. Are the objectives we are pursuing in affordable housing numbers for the whole county, or is it broken down by district/subregion.
- **SO:** stems from general plan: some parts of the general plan are divided, but generally housing goals are county wide. But hard to split off an area and say "this area does not need to prioritize housing". Sonoma County has actually done really well as far as housing creation from the last cycle. But new things built right now do not count for our next cycle of housing. Still navigating the process.

## Public Comment

- **Larry Davis:** can you direct me to who can talk about the next level up, not parcel level, but cumulative effect of specific plans, general plans, GSA, SDC, etc. Who and how do we get a handle on cumulative impacts?
- **Katie Christ:** Thank you for the presentation and the information about accessing information. Projects in Glen Ellen that fall outside of the Glen Ellen Design Guidelines area do not require neighbor notification; and onus is on the property owners. Santa Rosa notices within 300 ft for ministerial; is that possible for the County?
- **Alice Horowitz:** Why are we chasing the ABAG numbers; Permit Sonoma universe, and 'on the ground' disaster/flood/drought universe are not talking to one another? How do we gain confidence that the big picture is considered?
- **Deborah Nitasaka:** (could not unmute; advise to e-mail her comment. Public comment was received via email and distributed to MAC councilmembers)

- **(SO) response:** Cumulative impacts: SDC/Springs Specific Plan environmental review process does take into account cumulative impacts. Best time to consider that is the General Plan Update—hope to begin that next year. This is when we decide what is allowed by right, what needs a closer look. We are eager to get to the General Plan Update—it’s what we studied for. Disasters: Permit Sonoma staff often staffs the EOC in an emergency; so they can’t work on their long range planning. Sonoma County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan going through the process now. Ministerial Process Noticing: all about balancing resources. Santa Rosa is much smaller than the size of the County as a whole. Ok to keep being a squeaky wheel on that; I will be here for a long time.

## 6. MAC Funding Overview & Letters of Support – Continued from 5/19/21

Receive

- Overview of MAC Funding, Request Forms, Intended Uses, Letters of Support
- Ad Hoc Formation and Activities
- **Arielle Kubu-Jones (AKJ):** Overview of how MACs are funded, through Measure L, voter approved measure from 2016, raised transient occupancy tax. Percentage goes to tourism impact funds, allocated proportionately to each district. First district receives second most, relative to amount of tourism in district, fifth district receives most.
- How we are able to fund MAC. Outlined in the measure how these funds can be allocated. How else these funds used in past year: Parking enforcement in Springs. Sonoma Valley School District gardens. Charla Comunitaria. Food for All. KSVY antenna.
- Specific process to allocate TOT funds. \$10,000 per fiscal year for NSV MAC. For ongoing expenses and special projects. Special projects need to be approved by Supervisor Gorin and MAC.
  - \$4,500 allocated to emergency preparedness ad hoc last fiscal year, \$300 to Neighborfest
  - 21/22 anticipated expenses: minute taker. Potential expense: interpretation, currently used by Springs MAC.
  - Remainder of overall funding: with interpretation, \$7,000, without, \$3,000.
  - Novel requests that are not ongoing expenses, last month we should consider these before the MAC in fiscal year is April, so item can get through the board.
- As a government agency, would need nonprofit partner if pursuing grant funds.
- Beyond the MAC’s budget, other funding out there. Community Investment Funds. Allocated to full Board of Supervisors. Each district allocated same amount, fixed, \$70,000 per year. Generally distributed to nonprofits, smaller grants, generally \$500-\$5,000. Managed by Arielle in Supervisor Gorin’s office, can at times go faster than TIF fund projects which got through County Administrators Office. Examples: Art Escape, volunteer firefights, Glen Ellen Forum - Bridge Lighting. Not something the MAC can access, but resource to be aware of.
- MAC funds should not be granted out to other organizations, but can partner with them. Examples: could write letter as the MAC to express support for effort in the community. Could encourage an organization to apply for CIF or TIF funds. CIF more flexible than TIF. Could also write letter of support as MAC for organization to include in an application. Reminder: all MAC letters need to be brought before full MAC
- Information on MAC ad hocs, can look at bylaws. Bylaws state what ad hocs are for, how established, etc. Always good to go back to bylaws.
- By creating ad hoc, MAC by definition supports efforts of the ad hoc. Ad hoc should provide regular updates. Ad hoc last one year. MAC writing a letter is an action, and actions need to be approved by MAC
- Recent items on MAC agenda, was there an ask to write a letter? If there is a letter, that is what needs to be voted on. Can share with staff 2 weeks in advance, we can notice with agenda. For preparedness ad hoc - more of a resolution than a letter of support. Resolution supporting work of the ad hoc kind of inherent in the creation of ad hoc
  - If have letter, send to us 2 weeks in advance. If not 2 weeks in advance, could share with us later as long as we have time to notice and put on website. If in person, would print letter and bring copies.
  - If urgent (not able to work within 2 week time frame), could have special meeting
- If MAC wants to draft policy, staff can work with outreach committee (for example, when logo can be used). Not required, but an option.
- Reminder that potential large projects, and funding for them, don’t necessarily have to come out of the MAC’s limited budget. Could be funded through Supervisor Gorin’s other TIF/CIF funds. Don’t necessarily

need to shy away from larger project.

**Councilmember Comments:**

- **Dawson:** council member Handron and I intend to meet in next few weeks to develop protocol for sending out letters from the MAC, likely have next meeting.
- **Newhouser:** thank you Arielle, for building in flexibility for how this can be achieved in future. Don't always have 6 weeks in advance to draft letter and get approval from MAC. Workaround was that got letter from Supervisor Gorin. Would be good in future to have letter from MAC.
- **AKJ:** one option is to have template letter where language would stay fairly stable, could be approved in advance for use in future situation where time frame is smaller.
- **Newhouser:** looking for support for specific project, hoping that gist of the letter could be approved by MAC, could plug and play depending on specifics of the title of the proposal, recipient agency.
- **Dawson:** you want ministerial letter.
- **Newhouser:** we may not have this situation again, anyways it worked out. Did not get funding from the county. Do not know if word back from Cal Fire yet, we'll see. May submit again. Groups applying this year had applied in previous years and been rejected. Hopeful for future. Did get generous funding from MAC budget, but if don't have funding from granting agency, hard. Will be more clear in request in future.
- **Dawson:** we'll support you and ad hoc in any way we can.

**7. Reports and Announcements from Councilmembers and Ad Hocs (3 minutes or less) Receive**

- SVCAC
- Glen Ellen Forum
- Communications Ad Hoc
- Preparedness Ad Hoc
- Traffic and Safety Ad Hoc
- Others as Appropriate
- Skip until next month

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

- Vacation Rental Ordinance Update Listening Session – Permit Sonoma
- Fire Agency Update—SVFRA, Kenwood Fire
- Bike paths – Regional Parks
  
- Housing land trust
- Appointments
- Letters of Support
- SDC Ad Hoc as alternatives are coming out soon (?)
- Councilmember Dickey: this was a very long meeting with not many items—we should

**9. Adjourn Resolution**

- Motion: Nardo-Morgan
- Second: Handron
- Vote: 7-0-0

*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/>