

**CONCURRENT REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE  
SONOMA CITY COUNCIL  
&  
SONOMA CITY COUNCIL AS THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE  
DISSOLVED SONOMA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

*Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West  
Sonoma CA 95476*



**Monday, December 16, 2013  
6:00 p.m.  
\*\*\*\*  
MINUTES**

City Council  
Tom Rouse, Mayor  
David Cook, Mayor Pro Tem  
Steve Barbose  
Ken Brown  
Laurie Gallian

**OPENING**

Mayor Rouse called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Francisco Chavez led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Rouse and Councilmembers Barbose, Brown, Cook and Gallian  
ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: City Manager Giovanatto, City Clerk/Assistant to the City Manager Johann, City Attorney Walter, Development Services Director Wirick, Public Works Director Takasugi, Associate Planner Atkins and Planning Director Goodison.

**1. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Wendy Peterson and Janice Snyder announced that Eminent Design was the winner of the Visitor Bureau-sponsored Holiday Window Contest.

**2. COUNCILMEMBERS' COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Item 2A: Councilmembers' Comments and Announcements**

Mayor Rouse and Councilmembers commented on the passing of Council-watcher Herb Golenpaul and dedicated the meeting in his memory.

**3. CITY MANAGER COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS INCLUDING ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM SUCCESSOR AGENCY STAFF**

There were no comments or announcements.

**4. PRESENTATIONS**

**Item 4A: Recognition of Francisco Chavez - Boys & Girls Club of Sonoma Valley 2013 Youth of the Year**

Mayor Rouse congratulated Francisco Chavez and presented him a certificate of recognition.

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR/AGENDA ORDER – CITY COUNCIL**

**Item 5A: Waive Further reading and Authorize Introduction and/or Adoption of Ordinances by Title Only.**

**Item 5B: Approval of Successor Employment Agreement between the City of Sonoma and Carol Giovanatto as City Manager.**

**Item 5C: Adopt resolution approving the Declaration of Covenants Agreement, and Final Map for the 4-lot Subdivision at 20144 Fifth Street East known as Parcel Map No. 154. (Res. No. 51-2013)**

**Item 5D: Council approval of an 18-month lease with the Valley of the Moon Nursery School for the premises at 136 Mission Terrace (Youth Center Building).  
Removed from Consent, see below.**

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR/AGENDA ORDER – CITY COUNCIL, Continued**

**Item 5E:** Award of contract for consultant assistance for the preparation of updates to the Housing and Circulation Elements of the General Plan and the preparation of a downtown parking study. Council authorized staff to enter into a consultant agreement with M-Group/W-Trans.

**Item 5F:** Approval of the annual assignment of Councilmembers to various Boards and Committees.

Mayor Rouse invited comments from the public. Robyn Lely, Valley of the Moon Nursery School Treasurer, stated that they had concerns about the proposed lease and asked that it be removed from the Consent Calendar. He stated they would prefer a five-year lease instead of eighteen months.

It was moved by Clm. Barbose, seconded by Clm. Gallian, to approve the Consent Calendar except for Item 5D. The motion carried unanimously.

**Item 5D:** Council approval of an 18-month lease with the Valley of the Moon Nursery School for the premises at 136 Mission Terrace (Youth Center Building).

Development Services Director Wirick reported that the lease had been prepared pursuant to the November 18, 2013 direction given by Council. Clm. Barbose stated that it was his recollection that the City was facing quite a large investment in the property for accessibility and other improvements and the only way to possibly justify the expenditure would if you went back to day one and compared the amount of rent received against the amount spent on the facility. He felt the eighteen month extension, with no increase in the rent, was a fair compromise and one that would provide the City time to consider its options.

Mayor Rouse invited comments from the public. Katy Giller, Laura Monterosso, Steve Cameron, Michael George, John McMillan, Colleen Lawson, and Jeremy Lawson expressed their support for the Nursery School and urged a five-year lease. Rosemary Lely stated that a newspaper article stating that the school was on borrowed time had hurt their enrollment prospects.

Mayor Rouse stated that Council's extension of the current lease for eighteen months was offered in good faith and was a compromise that he thought the Lelys felt was adequate. This would provide time for the school to look at their business model and the City to explore its alternatives. Mayor Rouse stated that the City was not in the nursery school business.

Clm. Gallian stated that the integrity or worth of the school was not in question; it was a business decision that was being explored. Clm. Cook stated the City should not be in the landlord business.

Robyn Lely stated that the eighteen-month lease seemed like a good idea when suggested but then they began to wonder what would happen at the end of the eighteen months.

It was moved by Clm. Gallian, seconded by Clm. Cook, to approve an eighteen month lease with Valley of the Moon Nursery School for the premises at 136 Mission Terrace. The motion carried unanimously.

**6. CONSENT CALENDAR/AGENDA ORDER – CITY COUNCIL AS SUCCESSOR AGENCY**

There were no Successor Agency consent calendar items at the time agenda was prepared.

**7. PUBLIC HEARING**

**Item 7A:** Discussion, consideration and possible action on an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to approve the application of AT&T for a Use permit to install a wireless telecommunication facility on the Sebastiani Winery site (389 Fourth Street East), including an 80-foot tall redwood monopine tower and fenced equipment shelter.

Associate Planner Atkins reported that the property was a four-acre parcel that was one of several that made up the Sebastiani Winery complex. It was largely undeveloped property on the north side of the winery, adjoining Lovall Valley Road. The land had a General Plan designation and zoning designation of "Agriculture" and the project site lay outside the Historic

**Item 7A: AT&T Wireless Facility, continued**

Overlay Zone. The project involved installing and operating a wireless telecommunications facility consisting of an 80-foot tall redwood monopine tree tower and associated antenna and equipment building. The initial application for a ninety-seven foot tower was considered by the Planning Commission in June 2013. Seven residents spoke in opposition to the project citing concerns with visual impacts and the lack of any relationship between the function of the winery site and the proposed facility. Some expressed the view that the tower was unnecessary as cell coverage in the area was adequate in their view. Following the close of the public hearing the Planning Commission agreed that additional information was necessary in order to fully evaluate the proposal. They asked the applicant to come back with a map of all wireless facilities within and adjacent to City limits, an analysis of the coverage provided by a ninety-seven foot tall tower and of reduced tower heights, analysis of other candidate sites including options for colocations, and additional information regarding Electromagnetic Frequency (EMF) levels and exposures resulting from the application.

Atkins stated that in response to the concerns identified at the hearing and a neighborhood outreach meeting conducted by the applicants, the applicants modified the project by reducing the height of the tower to eighty feet and provided the Planning Commission with the additional information that had been requested. The Planning Commission reviewed the project again at their October meeting at which six residents spoke in opposition to the project mainly citing concerns with potential health impacts associated with EMF emissions. One resident spoke in support of the application and the Planning Commission approved the Use Permit for the revised proposal. On October 17, 2013 Linda McGarr, Elizabeth and Cameron Stuckey, Patricia McTaggart, and Jennifer and Michael Palladini filed an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision. They assert that there are health hazards associated with the project, the location is inappropriate and that letters in support of the project were accepted from non-Sonoma residents.

Atkins reported, in response to the health concerns, that an EMF study was prepared to verify that the facility would comply with appropriate guidelines limiting human exposure to radio frequency EMFs. The maximum calculated level for a person on the ground or in a two-story residential structure was .79% of the public exposure limit. The proposed facility would operate well below radio frequency exposure standards and would not cause a significant impact on the environment or pose a threat to public health. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 stated that "No local government may regulate the placement of a wireless facility on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions when they comply with the regulations."

Atkins, in response to the appellants concern about the appropriateness of the location, reported that under the City's telecommunication ordinance, telecommunication facilities could be located in all zoning districts. The Planning Commission also requested additional analysis addressing colocation options. The analysis provided indicated that colocation options on other sites would not provide the desired coverage. The proposed facility was designed to facilitate potential colocation options in the future. Regarding the issue of correspondence, it was received from residents both inside and outside the City limits. There were no municipal code limitations restricting those from outside of the City from commenting on projects. Atkins stated that the appellants were requesting that the City Council deny the project. In accordance with standard practice, staff recommended that the City Council uphold the decision of the Planning Commission. Based on Council direction, a resolution would be prepared implementing Council's decision, and brought back a Consent Calendar item on the January 6, 2014 Council agenda.

City Attorney Walter advised Council that the Telecommunications Act was the overarching piece of legislation that controlled the Council's discretion on this matter and it essentially has preempted the field of telecommunications and the siting of wireless facilities. One of the bases that could not be relied upon in judging location were EMFs, the transmission of electromagnetic forces of some kind because as long as those EMFs met the standards set by the Federal Government they could not be a basis for a decision to deny this or to force a different location for this proposal. That meant that EMFs were not an issue and that Council's decision could not be effected by EMFs. The law does, although it is preemptive, carve out the right of cities and local government agencies throughout the country to make decisions regarding the placement, construction and modification of wireless service facilities provided that those decisions do not have the effect of prohibiting coverage. This means then that it is up to the applicant to show that there is a lack of coverage, a coverage gap and that the proposal is the least intrusive means of addressing that gap, that there are no other alternatives that are less intrusive that address the coverage gap that has been determined to exist by the cellular service provider. The City Council has basically two hurdles it must overcome if it wishes to deny this application. The first is you have your own set of standards which are outlined in the staff

**Item 7A: AT&T Wireless Facility, continued**

report, the Use Permit findings which deal with compatibility with neighborhoods and aesthetics; those are all justifiable just and valid basis, upon which to address the compliance of this proposal with local zoning provision. You have that power and there are a number of cases that have upheld Cities and councils that have denied a cellular site or cellular antenna based upon negative aesthetic impacts as long as there is evidence in the record to show that; however, there is a second hurdle that the Council must also overcome. As long as the applicant has submitted evidence that there is a significant gap in coverage and that there are no other alternatives that are feasible or available thus this particular proposal is the least intrusive manner of addressing the coverage gap then the Council cannot deny this application unless there is contrary evidence that has been developed to show that those claims, those evidentiary claims by the applicant, are not founded. So, for example, if the applicant came forward and as it has and shows eight potential other sites where antennas could be located and this is totally hypothetical, and one of them is a school building and the applicant contended that the superintendent of public instruction wrote a letter to the applicant saying that that building is not available for an antenna, that you had evidence that showed that was not true that the school was very eager to have an antenna there because of the revenue generation of such a site then you would be able to establish through factual evidence in the record that the showing made by the applicant was not meritorious. Without that evidence though it is very difficult for the Council to make findings that are contrary to the showing made by the applicant, if the applicant again, has shown that there is a significant gap in coverage and that this is the least intrusive means of addressing it, this being the project before you tonight primarily through a comparative analysis of other potential sites.

CIm. Barbose inquired about the least intrusive prong of this consideration and asked if he was correct in thinking that it meant they would have to show that all the other locations would have a more intrusive impact on the neighborhood than would this one for us to be forced to choose this despite reservations about neighborhood impact. Attorney Walter stated that was one way of looking at it, the other would be that they typically say as they have here that the other sites simply do not work that they do not provide the kind of coverage to satisfy the gap that they have identified as this particular proposal. The other options have to be not only effective but they have to be less intrusive for the Council to point to them and say it is a less intrusive option, it does provide the coverage you need, you should locate it there and not here. CIm. Barbose confirmed that it was the appellant's burden to show that there was a less intrusive option. Attorney Walter added that the alternative site would have to be effective, technologically feasible and available.

Mayor Rouse asked if it was the appellant's responsibility to prove that AT&T has another option that is less intrusive than the option approved by the Planning Commission. Attorney Walter stated he was not sure whose burden it was to prove that but that evidence must be before the Council in order for the Council to deny this application. He added that the first threshold that the applicant must establish is that there was a gap in service and that it was significant, one or two isolated pockets of non-coverage was not a significant gap in coverage.

Mayor Rouse announced that the appellant would be allowed ten minutes as the primary speaker and three other speakers would have three minutes and then the applicant would have ten minutes, followed by the general public as a whole.

Jennifer Palladini spoke as a scientist and a resident and mother of two children who would live within three hundred feet of the proposed tower. She explained that she was a scientist with a PhD in Organismal Biology and that upon hearing of the proposal she researched what biological effects had been observed by scientists for those living within proximity to these towers. She stated she was aware that the permit could not be denied based on EMF concerns but that she wanted to lend a voice to residents who also were concerned. She researched a database called Web of Knowledge. She stated that contrary to AT&T claims that hundreds to thousands of studies documenting the safety of this type of radiation there had been no more than four hundred peer review published studies regarding the biological effects of this type of radiation. The claim of safety was based on outdated research that was conducted decades ago. She said there were a growing number of studies that documented biological effects of exposure including genetic, growth and reproductive consequences that have manifested at or below those levels that would be experienced by residents living within two hundred to five hundred feet of the tower. She went on to describe other effects and health consequences that had been observed in studies. She said she was worried about the potential exposure for multiple hours per day for decades. Ms. Palladini asked Council to protect its citizens by denying the permit and said there were concerns that had been legally upheld by the California Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals as legal grounds for denial of tower installations. She said she

**Item 7A: AT&T Wireless Facility, continued**

was not opposed to towers but they needed to be placed in such a manner to minimize harm to views, historic integrity, property values and health.

Mike Palladini stated he was not anti-technology or anti cell tower; however, the proposed project on the Sebastiani property was extremely inappropriate for a number of reasons. It was incompatible with existing land uses and would impair architectural integrity and character of the zoning district. He said that for four hours yesterday he interacted with well over one hundred walkers, runners and cyclists illustrating how popular and scenic this historic neighborhood was. Over ninety percent of those people, one hundred and five people, voiced firm opposition to the tower and signed their petition against it. He said the photos simulations of the installation included in the Planning packet were clearly cherry picked by AT&T to downplay the significant aesthetic impacts to the maximum extent possible. The tower would actually be an eighty-foot tall blatantly obvious industrial eyesore which would significantly impact the experience of thousands of tourists and residents that seek the neighborhood out for its scenic and historic values. It would be highly visible from a two thousand foot section along Lovall Valley Road as well as the neighborhood to the north with no mature trees or structures to obscure it from view. He stated the Sebastiani Winery was within the Historic Overlay Zone and the tower would degrade historic values. He said there was a legal precedent for local governments' denying telecommunication tower permits consistent with the Federal Communications Act based on historic, aesthetic and property value impacts. He requested Council to join the vast majority of local residents in opposing the project.

Alice May stated her opposition to the cell tower being constructed within the residential area. She stated that she worked as a residential California real estate professional in the Bay Area for many years. For various reasons a residential property located close to a cell tower would not be a desirable location. Some of the causes for this were aesthetics. Cell towers become an eyesore and tarnish cherished views. She said AT&T were deceiving the public by submitting images of a redwood tree instead of a cell tower. Other concerns were public safety, noise issues, fire and fall concerns, and health risks whether real or imagined. She cited a report by the Appraisal Institute, which spotlighted the issue of cell towers and the fair market value of a home and stated that cell towers should cause a decrease in home value.

Cameron Stuckey urged the Council to consider the future ramifications from their decision. He said telecommunications companies usually win because City Councils do not stand up to them. He asked the Council to stand up for its citizens and cited Article 1 of the California Constitution.

Rhuenette Alums, AT&T, stated she had worked as the area director for external affairs for AT&T for over thirty years in various capacities engaged in technology. She stated that it has always been the experience where communities want more and improved services and AT&T tried to respond as quickly as it could. AT&T invests in technology because the demand is so strong and they recognize that the demand will continue. She said they hear from local public safety agencies, community activists, educators, local governments, business enterprises. When they make a decision about placement of a tower, it was not done arbitrarily. They take input from individuals who complain about the lack of coverage; they have engineers studying where the gaps in coverage are. The first element considered is based on coverage and then they look at all the associated elements: what is the least intrusive, what's the most important, what will give the greatest coverage in terms of what the community has asked us for and then they ensure that they will meet all the regulatory requirements that are necessary to be in compliance. In terms of being the least intrusive; the manufacturers were developing stealth designs and the tower proposed did look like a tree and most people will begin to realize they do not know what the tower looks like because it is stealth. She said she did not know if staff would show some of the coverage objectives that had been met or some of the alternative sites that had been looked at. She said they looked at quite a few alternative sites as directed by the Planning Commission; they went out and did a wider search so they could come back and say out of all the particular locations that were available, this was the one that was determined to be the least intrusive and provided the coverage that people had requested. It was not an issue of someone wins, someone loses, the job was how can AT&T best serve the communities' business, education, and local activists the best way with the best level of technology as quickly as efficiently as they can. She said a lot of great care had gone into the process they had exercised. Given the requirements that the Planning Commission imposed which they had addressed very clearly to the point where they approved the application, she would hope the Council would uphold their decision.

Jason Osborne, AT&T, stated he was there to respond to questions. Mayor Rouse asked why the alternative sites away from residential areas were not suitable in the eyes of AT&T. Osborne stated they were looking for coverage for downtown and looked at eight locations. The

**Item 7A: AT&T Wireless Facility, continued**

majority of the sites had residential around them and were very low. They found that by adding this one site in this one location met their current and future needs, versus the other locations which would have to continue to be supplemented. Clm. Gallian inquired about the reason site number two was rejected. Osborne stated he did not know what "The proposed site better meets AT&T's capacity needs" meant and perhaps it was a typo. He said the reason the site did not work was because the building was only thirty-five feet tall. They would have to put a similar structure right in that neighborhood and put an eighty-foot tower on it. Gallian stated that one of the findings Council needed to make was that the coverage gap was significant. Clm. Barbose confirmed that 276 East Napa Street was the Sonoma Community Center. He asked if someone had determined that the eight alternative locations were the only acceptable sites that would meet the coverage gap. Osborne stated he drove the entire town and had been here plenty of times; they chose the locations as the best ideal candidates and looked at each one from a feasibility standpoint. There were more buildings in the city but these were the best of the worst and those which would meet the coverage objective of downtown. Clm. Barbose asked what area they were trying to provide coverage for. Osborne pointed to page 205 of the packet and stated that it was essentially the downtown area they were trying to cover and since this was an agricultural use, it proved to be the best candidate. Barbose inquired if it helped to triangulate them. Osborne stated yes, it increased the offloading capacity of existing sites. Barbose asked if willingness of a property owner to enter into a lease was one of the factors used to choose the eight sites. Osborne stated it could be but not always. Barbose asked why they could not move further up the hill, for instance to Brazil Street.

Peter Maushardt, AT&T, stated you have to have a willing landlord, a zonable piece of property, and a site that operates for the network. The two issues with wireless was capacity and coverage objectives and this site met both. He said he had agreed with the Planning Commission initially that the presentation was inadequate and because he lived here in town he wanted to make sure it was the right site and the best way to go forward. AT&T went back, did their research and provide the Planning Commission with the information on the alternative sites, lowered the site from ninety-five to eighty feet to address the visual concerns. He stated there was a demand for their services and they proved that to the Planning Commission. The site was well designed and was a long time in coming and he asked the Council to deny the appeal and approve the project.

Rajat Mathur, Hammet & Edison, Inc. Consulting Engineers, stated they were an independent engineering firm that evaluated sites like these for compliance with the FCC radio frequency exposure standard. Their evaluation of this site found that it did comply. The maximum exposure was 1.2% of the FCC limit, or more than eighty times below that limit. He said there were about 2,900 studies in the database maintained by the World Health Organization, which was the basis for the FCC standard. He said there were similar standards in almost every other developed country and this site would comply in all those countries.

Lynn Freed stated she used AT&T in the downtown area and never had a reception problem. She stated she lived in San Francisco near the Sutro Tower for twenty years and her husband died of lymphoma and she had breast cancer. The incidence of breast cancer around the tower was enormous. She asked Council not to allow the tower.

Michael George stated in analyzing issues you always need to follow the money and Council should table the issue so they could do that. He also asked Council to consider honeybees and questioned why the tower was proposed for an agricultural zone. Towers use the same frequency that honeybees use to navigate and survive. Data shows that interruption from cell phones and cell towers contribute to colony collapse in honeybees. He said it did not make sense to place the tower in an agricultural zone.

Lizzy Stuckey stated that the coverage gap was not that large and the size of the tower was not justified. She believed there were other alternative locations.

Linda McGarr stated her opposition because the tower would be an eyesore and because of the harmful effects of the radiation, her daughter would not be able to visit her.

Mary Carrillo and Erin McTaggart also spoke against the project citing concerns about declining property values and aesthetics.

Jon Dunning stated he served as a radiation safety officer for twenty-nine years and felt it was highly unlikely that the tower would cause cancer. He supported placement of the cell tower at the proposed site.

**Item 7A: AT&T Wireless Facility, continued**

Clm. Brown inquired if approved, could features be added to the tower. Planning Director Goodison stated that the City's code encouraged co-location.

Clm. Barbose displayed two pictures of other towers in Sonoma, one behind the veterinary clinic and one on the high school property. He stated that the cell towers shown in the photographs demonstrate the unsightly appearance of the type of tower proposed.

Clm. Barbose cited finding numbers three and four which the Planning Commission had to make " 3) *The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity; and 4) The proposed use will not impair the architectural integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located.*" He said he could not make the finding that the tower being proposed was compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity. He said the tower was an eyesore, that this was a special area of the town and he believed property values would suffer. He also did not believe AT&T had shown a significant gap in coverage; what he heard about was a desire to meet demands of an ever-growing market. He noted that two AT&T customers live around there and they did not have problems with their coverage. There also had not been a showing that this was the least intrusive way of closing that gap.

Clm. Cook agreed with Barbose. He asked if it was typical to look at eight locations. Mr. Maushardt responded that they provided a solid alternative analysis and this was the least intrusive site to serve the area. He added that the Planning Commission agreed with them seven to nothing. They proved this was the least intrusive located site to serve the area.

Clm. Gallian stated she did not feel they had proven this was the least intrusive location and that this was the only alternative plausible.

It was moved by Clm. Barbose, seconded by Clm. Brown, to uphold the appeal and deny the Use Permit. Mayor Rouse stated he did not feel the Council had any legal right to uphold the appellant's request. It was all based on aesthetics because Council was not allowed to base anything on the health issues. He said they had studied this for a couple of weeks and he had heard from residents but the problem he had in voting in favor of the appellant was that the City had a Planning Commission that Council put their trust in to vet issues like this. When it is seven to nothing he believed at that point that they had done their homework. He said he would not be supporting the appellant for that reason. Clm. Gallian stated that sometimes all of the information may not have been available to the Planning Commission and some citizens may not have been able to attend the meeting. The motion carried four to one, Mayor Rouse dissented.

**RECESS:** The meeting recessed from 8:10 to 8:15 p.m.

<b>8. REGULAR CALENDAR – CITY COUNCIL</b>
---

**Item 8A: Discussion, consideration and possible action selecting the 2014 City of Sonoma Alcalde.**

City Manager Giovanatto reported that, pursuant to the Alcalde Selection Policy, nominations from members of the community were solicited and received by the stated deadline. Per the policy, Alcalde nominees should embody several of the following criteria: A broad spectrum of voluntary community service to Sonoma Valley; Service in a leadership role in at least one non-profit organization; Has spearheaded at least one community-serving project without compensation; Is well-known for consistent behind-the-scenes good deeds; Does not seek public accolades or recognition for work done; and Adheres to a high standard of moral and ethical values.

Giovanatto stated that the nominating committee comprised of outgoing Mayor Brown, current and immediate Past Alcaldes Les & Judy Vadasz (2013), Whitney Evans (2012), Mary Evelyn Arnold (2011) and City Manager Carol Giovanatto met on December 4 and reviewed the nomination letters received. They have forwarded the names of all eight nominees for the Mayor's consideration as a recognition of all their many contributions to the community. The nominees were Suzanne Brangham, Harriet Derwingson, Gary Edwards, Pam Gibson, Carole & Bob Nicholas, Wayne Schake, Jackie Stubbs, and Marcie Waldron.

The public comment period was opened and closed with none received. Mayor Rouse nominated Suzanne Brangham as the 2014 Alcaldessa. By unanimous consent, the Council ratified the nomination. Mayor Rouse then placed a phone call to Mrs. Brangham to inform her of the news.

**9. REGULAR CALENDAR – CITY COUNCIL AS THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY**

There were no items at the time agenda was prepared.

**10. COUNCILMEMBERS' REPORTS AND FINAL REMARKS**

**Item 10A: Reports Regarding Committee Activities.**

Clm. Brown reported on the Economic Development Steering Committee meeting.

Clm. Gallian reported on the Climate 2020 workshop and the Wreaths Across America ceremony.

Clm. Cook reported on the Sonoma Valley Library Advisory Committee meeting.

**Item 10B: Final Councilmembers' Remarks.**

Clm. Brown stated his pleasure to have the renewed contract with City Manager Giovanatto in place.

**11. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Chuck Binginham introduced himself as a Press Democrat staff member and editor of the Sonoma Page.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m. in the memory of Herb Golenpaul.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Sonoma City Council on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of February 2013.

---

Gay Johann  
Assistant City Manager / City Clerk