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

Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West, Sonoma CA

Monday, October 3, 2016
6:00 p.m. Regular Meeting
****
AGENDA

City Council
Laurie Gallian, Mayor
Madolyn Agrimonti, MPT
David Cook,
Gary Edwards
Rachel Hundley

Be Courteous - **TURN OFF** your cell phones and pagers while the meeting is in session.

5:30 P.M. – SPECIAL MEETING - CLOSED SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Mayor will open the meeting and take public testimony on closed session items only. The Council will then recess into closed session.

2. CLOSED SESSION

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT – PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54957

Title: City Manager

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT – PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54957

Title: City Manager

6:00 P.M. – REGULAR MEETING

RECONVENE, CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ROLL CALL (Hundley, Cook, Agrimonti, Edwards, Gallian)
REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

1. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

At this time, members of the public may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda. It is recommended that you keep your comments to three minutes or less. Under State Law, matters presented under this item cannot be discussed or acted upon by the City Council at this time. For items appearing on the agenda, the public will be invited to make comments at the time the item comes up for Council consideration. Upon being acknowledged by the Mayor, please step to the podium and speak into the microphone. Begin by stating and spelling your name.

2. MEETING DEDICATIONS

3. PRESENTATIONS

4. CONSENT CALENDAR/AGENDA ORDER – CITY COUNCIL

All items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by a single motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless members of the Council, staff, or public request specific items to be removed for separate action. At this time Council may decide to change the order of the agenda.

Item 4A: **Waive further reading and Authorize Introduction and/or Adoption of Ordinances by Title Only.** (Standard procedural action - no backup information provided)

Item 4B: **Adopt a Resolution authorizing an application for grant funds from the Habitat Conservation Fund Program for the rehabilitation and enhancement of the Sonoma Overlook Trail (Planning Director)**
Staff Recommendation: Adopt the attached resolution authorizing an application for grant funds from the Habitat Conservation Fund Program for the rehabilitation and enhancement of the Sonoma Overlook Trail

Item 4C: **Authorization to execute and file a Notice of Completion for the Valley of the Moon Nursery School ADA & Maintenance Improvement Project and direct the Finance Director to include a Budget Amendment for said Project for Council Consideration during its Mid-Year Budget Review (Development Services Director / Building Official)**
Staff Recommendation: Authorize the City's Development Services Director to execute and file a Notice of Completion (attached) for the project. Direct the Finance Director to include a budget amendment for said project for Council consideration during its mid-year budget review process.

Item 4D: **Approval of the Minutes of the September 9, 2016 City Council Meeting (City Clerk)**
Staff Recommendation: Approve the Minutes

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

All items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by a single motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless members of the Council, staff, or public request specific items to be removed for separate action. At this time Council may decide to change the order of the agenda.

Item 5A: **Approval of the Portions of the Minutes of the September 19, 2016 City Council Meeting Pertaining to the Successor Agency (City Clerk)**
Staff Recommendation: Approve the Minutes

6. PUBLIC HEARING

Item 6A: **Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action on an Appeal of the Design Review and Historic Preservation Commission's Decision to Approve the Application of Studio 101 Designs for Design Review of Two Commercial Buildings and a Trash Enclosure at 19366 and 19370 Sonoma Highway (Planning Director)**
Staff Recommendation: Deny the appeal, thereby upholding the decision of the Design Review and Historic Preservation Commission.

7. REGULAR CALENDAR – CITY COUNCIL

(Matters requiring discussion and/or action by the City Council)

Item 7A: **Discussion, Consideration, and Possible Action on the Changes to the Regulation Concerning Vacation Rentals, Including Consideration of Whether an Interim Moratorium Ordinance should be Implemented (Planning Director)**
Staff Recommendation: Provide direction to staff as to whether the City Council wishes to change the regulations pertaining to applications for vacation rentals, including whether there is interest in adopting an interim ordinance.

Item 7B: **Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action to Approve Transfer of City Sonoma Clean Power (SCP) Electrical Accounts to 100% Evergreen (City Manager)**
Staff Recommendation: Approve the conversion of City electrical accounts through Sonoma Clean Power from the Clean Start Program to the Evergreen 100% renewable energy program.

Item 7C: **Discussion and Consideration of Input Received During Public Testimony on the Recruitment of the City Manager for the City of Sonoma (City Manager)**
Staff Recommendation: Receive public testimony.

8. REGULAR CALENDAR – CITY COUNCIL AS THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY

(Matters requiring discussion and/or action by the Council as the Successor Agency)

9. COUNCILMEMBERS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS

10. CITY MANAGER COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS INCLUDING ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM SUCCESSOR AGENCY STAFF

11. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

At this time, members of the public may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda

12. ADJOURNMENT

I do hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing agenda was posted on the City Hall bulletin board on September 29, 2016. Rebekah Barr, MMC, City Clerk/Executive Assistant.

Copies of all staff reports and documents subject to disclosure that relate to any item of business referred to on the agenda are normally available for public inspection the Wednesday before each regularly scheduled meeting at City Hall, located at No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma CA. Any documents subject to disclosure that are provided to all, or a majority of all, of the members of the City Council regarding any item on this agenda after the agenda has been distributed will be made available for inspection at the City Clerk's office, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma CA during regular business hours.

If you challenge the action of the City Council in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described on the agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the City Clerk, at or prior to the public hearing.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk (707) 933-2216. Notification 48-hours before the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

City of Sonoma
City Council
Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item: **4B**

Meeting Date: **10/03/16**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Planning and Community Services	David Goodison, Planning Director

Agenda Item Title

Resolution authorizing an application for grant funds from the Habitat Conservation Fund Program for the rehabilitation and enhancement of the Sonoma Overlook Trail.

Summary

The Sonoma Overlook Trail, located on the upper Mountain Cemetery property was constructed in 1999. The planning, design, and maintenance of the trail has relied heavily on volunteer efforts, led by the Sonoma Overlook Stewards. In recent years the Stewards have become increasingly concerned that segments of the trail are eroding, which leads to a number of problems including increased maintenance, safety concerns, and the creation of rogue trails as hikers attempt to avoid the eroded segments. To asses this issue, the Stewards commissioned an assessment of the trail by Don Beers, a highly respected trail designer, formerly with State Parks, who designed the Montini Trail. This assessment makes a number of recommendations for corrective maintenance. However, some portions of the trail have become unsustainable, necessitating the construction of new trail segments and the closure and rehabilitation of the eroded areas. These findings were reported to the City Council in a summary manner as part of the review of the 2016-17 Budget review, as the Planning Department requested and the City Council approved an $8,000 allocation to fund the environmental review of the rehabilitation plan.

Quite recently, the Stewards identified a grant opportunity from the Habitat Conservation Fund that would help fund a significant portion of the rehabilitation program. The Stewards would like to apply for a grant in the amount of $55,113 that they would match through in-kind contributions and their own fundraising efforts. Except for assisting with the environmental review, the funding for which has already been allocated, the Stewards are not seeking additional funding from the City. Because the Overlook Trail is a City-owned facility located on City property, Council approval is needed to authorize the grant application.

Recommended Council Action

Adopt the attached resolution authorizing an application for grant funds from the Habitat Conservation Fund Program for the rehabilitation and enhancement of the Sonoma Overlook Trail.

Alternative Actions

Council discretion.

Financial Impact

In the 2016-17 Budget, the City Council approved a $8,000 allocation to conduct the environmental reviews needed to move forward with the trail rehabilitation program. No additional funding is requested as part of the grant application, as the Sonoma Overlook Stewards have committed to providing the remaining matching funds through fundraising and in-kind contributions.

Environmental Review

- ☐ Environmental Impact Report
- ☐ Negative Declaration
- ☒ Exempt
- ☐ Not Applicable

Status

- ☒ Approved/Certified
- ☐ No Action Required
- ☐ Action Requested

Alignment with Council Goals

Providing support for this grant application, including the funding for environmental review, is consistent with the City Council's goals related to Fiscal Management, Infrastructure, and Public Service and Community Resources, as it leverages City funds to maintain an important recreational resource in cooperation with community volunteers.

Compliance with Climate Action 2020 Target Goals:

N.A.

Attachments:

1. Draft Resolution
2. Project Summary
2. Letter from Sonoma Overlook Stewards

cc: Joanna Kemper

Mary Nesbitt

CITY OF SONOMA

RESOLUTION NO. XX - 2016

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SONOMA APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS FROM THE HABITAT CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM FOR THE REHABILITATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE SONOMA OVERLOOK TRAIL

WHEREAS, the people of the State of California have enacted the California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990, which provides funds to the State of California for grants to local agencies to acquire, enhance, restore or develop facilities for public recreation and fish and wildlife habitat protection purposes; and

WHEREAS, the State Department of Parks and Recreation has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of the HCF Program, setting up necessary procedures governing project application under the HCF Program; and

WHEREAS, said procedures established by the State Department of Parks and Recreation require the applicant to certify by resolution the approval of application(s) before submission of said application(s) to the State; and

WHEREAS, the applicant will enter into a contract with the State of California to complete the project(s);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Sonoma hereby:

1. Approves the filing of an application for the Habitat Conservation Fund Program; and

2. Certifies that said applicant has or will have available, prior to commencement of any work on the project included in this application, the required match and sufficient funds to complete the project; and

3. Certifies that the applicant has or will have sufficient funds to operate and maintain the project(s), and

4. Certifies that the applicant has reviewed, understands, and agrees to the provisions contained in the contract shown in the grant administration guide; and

5. Delegates the authority to the City Manager to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents, including, but not limited to applications, agreements, amendments, payment requests and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the project.

6. Agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules, regulations and guidelines.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 3rd day of October 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

_____
Laurie Gallian, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Rebekah Barr, City Clerk

SUMMARY of Sonoma Overlook Trail Reroute and Rehabilitation, Phase 1

The City of Sonoma plans to rehabilitate Sonoma Overlook Trail, located in a 44-acre, publicly-owned, undeveloped natural area in the hills that form the backdrop to the city and provide valuable wildlife habitat. Segments of the 8,709 linear feet walking and hiking trail have become seriously degraded from high use and erosion over the years. The trail, open daily year-round, drew about 5,000 annual visits after construction in 1999 and now has about 50,000 visits annually.

Overlook has three access points and is close to residential neighborhoods, the historic Plaza, business districts and schools. There are many regular and repeat walkers and runners from the City and nearby communities, with a wide range of demographics. Overlook provides spectacular views of the city, Sonoma Valley and San Pablo Bay and draws numerous out-of-town visitors. Volunteer docents lead tours through Overlook's oak woodlands and savanna grasslands that support dozens of species of mammals, birds, insects, amphibians and wildflowers. Local and regional users appreciate the recent linkage with Montini Open Space Preserve which results in several miles of connected trail through tranquil forest and meadows. There are several hillside and hilltop observation points that provide varied vistas.

A professional evaluation of Overlook Trail in March 2016 identified several unsustainable segments that also have potential safety issues. Errors in the original layout caused disruption to natural hydraulic flow patterns, scoured the trail and exposed bedrock. To avoid problem areas, some users create bypasses and rogue trails. Consultant Don Beers of Terra Trails recommended design and construction solutions based on sustainable principles and goals. The project will not adversely affect natural and cultural resources or natural hydraulic flow patterns; will withstand the impact of 25-100 year storms; will improve user experience and deter creation of off-trail detours; and will require only routine cyclic maintenance.

The City plans a phased approach over several years to remedy trail issues. Phase 1 will address the lower Overlook trail (3,950 linear feet) at a total cost of $110,226. HCF funding of $55,113 is sought in this application. The trail will be rerouted to avoid a badly degraded segment with switchbacks and abrupt elevation changes. The new segment (795 linear feet) will follow land contours in terrain that can better support a trail. Maximum grade sustainability is 8-10%. The old segment will be removed and the land restored to natural conditions. The remainder of the lower trail will be rehabilitated to improve tread, encourage natural sheet flow during rain events, and transition grade changes in a more sustainable and safer way.

Work will be performed by a conservation corps trail crew and local volunteers. Overlook has a strong history of citizen involvement and volunteerism. Money to build the original trail was raised by local citizens, businesses and service clubs. A volunteer group performs routine maintenance, stocks a visitor information kiosk that it built at the main trailhead, raises money for the trail, and leads educational tours. The city has a successful history of working with such groups to care for natural, environmentally-significant public areas in the city. Construction will be completed in three months, in a March-May or August-October window.

Sonoma Overlook Trail

September 29th, 2016

Dear Mayor Gallian and Council Members David Cook, Madolyn Agrimonti, Rachel Hundley and Gary Edwards,

The Sonoma Overlook Trail (SOT) Stewards seek council's authorization to apply for a grant from the Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF) Program for rehabilitation of the trail.

SOT was largely built by volunteers and funded by community donations. Stewards and other volunteers have performed routine annual maintenance for the past 16 years, provided docent-led tours and raised funds through local donations and events to support routine upkeep and provide amenities such as the kiosk at the main trailhead.

There has been significant wear and tear on SOT in several places that need rehabilitation to address safety and trail sustainability issues. If the grant application succeeds, the HCF program, administered by the State, would cover 50% of the cost.

The grant request is for $55,113. The SOT Stewards will match this amount through in-kind contributions to the work and local fundraising efforts.

As the trail is on city-owned property, HCF requires council's approval to seek the grant. We would greatly appreciate your support.

Sincerely,
Joanna Kemper, Chair, Sonoma Overlook Stewards

Stewards 2016

Board Chair
Joanna Kemper
Trail Maintenance Chair
Fred Allebach
Finance Manager
Linda Felt
Development Chair
Laurie Friedeman
Docents Chair
Rosemarie Marks
Kiosk Manager
Rich Gibson
Grant Writer
Mary Nesbitt
Lynn Clary
Karen Collins
John Donnelly
Jaye Hays
Laurell Meredith
Maggie Salenger
Lisa Summers
Jackie Steuer
Sally Stone
Roy Tennant
Bill Wilson

Partners: City of Sonoma and Sonoma Ecology Center

Sonoma Overlook Trail
c/o Sonoma Ecology Center
P.O. Box 1486
Eldridge, CA 95431

The trail was built largely by volunteers and continues to be maintained by a group of volunteer stewards knowledgeable in native plants and habitat restoration.

The trail is funded by individuals, civic groups, and local businesses.

Today, a hike on the trail offers an opportunity for all Sonomans, their guests, and visitors to our city to experience the area and enjoy views comparable to those seen by the original inhabitants and early settlers of the incredible Sonoma Valley and beyond.

The Sonoma Overlook Trail is fiscally sponsored by the Sonoma Ecology Center, non-profit 501(c)(3) organization EIN # 94-3136500. This collaborative project partners the Overlook Trail Stewards with the Sonoma Ecology Center and the City of Sonoma.

City of Sonoma

City Council

Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item: **4C**

Meeting Date: **10/3/16**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Building	Wayne Wirick, Development Services Director / Building Official

Agenda Item Title

Authorization to execute and file a Notice of Completion for the Valley of the Moon Nursery School ADA & Maintenance Improvement Project and direct the Finance Director to include a budget amendment for said project for Council consideration during its mid-year budget review.

Summary

Gregory Equipment, Inc. of Redding, California has satisfactorily completed the work of the Valley of the Moon Nursery School ADA & Maintenance Improvement Project. The City should now record a Notice of Completion for the project so the 35-day time frame by which stop-notices can be filed on the project can begin. Following the 35-day stop-notice period, the City may release the retention and make final payment to the contractor.

The total cost for the project has not yet been fully tabulated but is anticipated to be approximately $16,895 over budget. The extra costs are a result of a higher than anticipated base bid as well as unforeseen project expenses including the need for immediate replacement of porch support columns due to termite damage, replacement of improper plumbing for a drinking fountain and the replacement of termite damaged and incorrect floor framing in a restroom.

Recommended Council Action

Authorize the City's Development Services Director to execute and file a Notice of Completion (attached) for the project. Direct the Finance Director to include a budget amendment for said project for Council consideration during its mid-year budget review process.

Alternative Actions

None proposed

Financial Impact

The Council approved project budget for the project was $133,400. The final project costs have not been fully determined, however the anticipated total costs for the project is expected to be approximately $150,295 (i.e. $16,895 over budget). The funding source for the project is the Long-Term Building Maintenance Fund.

Environmental Review	**Status**
☐ Environmental Impact Report	☐ Approved/Certified
☐ Negative Declaration	☒ No Action Required
☐ Exempt	☐ Action Requested
☒ Not Applicable	

Attachments:

- Draft Notice of Completion

Alignment with Council Goals:

Infrastructure - *Maintain the high level of service and reliability of city facilities.*

cc:

Recorded at Request of and
When Recorded Return to:

CITY OF SONOMA
No. 1 – The Plaza
Sonoma, CA 95476
ATTN: Wayne Wirick, Jr.

This document is exempt from Recording Fees pursuant to Government Code Section 6103 and 27383

NOTICE OF COMPLETION

(Civil Code Section 3093)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT:

1. On September 23, 2016, the work of improvement described as the **Valley of the Moon Nursery School ADA & Maintenance Improvement Project** was substantially completed.

2. The full name and address of the undersigned owner is the City of Sonoma, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma, CA 95476

3. The City of Sonoma is the sole owner in fee simple absolute of the real property described below.

4. The real property herein referred to is situated in the City of Sonoma, County of Sonoma, State of California, and located at **136 Mission Terrace, Sonoma, California**.

5. The name of the original contractor for the work of improvement **was Gregory Equipment, Inc.**

6. The work performed under the **Valley of the Moon Nursery School ADA & Maintenance Improvement Project** included, but was not limited to, the following work in accordance with the contract documents:

   Furnished all labor, materials, equipment, transportation, supervision and permits required to safely and legally perform the work including, but not limited to:

   1. Provide new ADA parking and path of travel.
   2. Interior ADA modifications.
   3. Removal and replacement of concrete walks and ramps
   4. Cleaning and caulking of existing exterior cracks.
   5. Removal and replacement of exterior shed roof.
   6. Interior and exterior painting.
   7. Casework cleaning all existing exterior stucco and specified existing metal surfaces

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

City of Sonoma

By: _____ Dated: _____

Wayne Wirick, Jr.
Development Services Director / Building Official

_____

Attest Rebekah Barr, City Clerk

PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CITY OF SONOMA
City Council
Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item: **4D**

Meeting Date: **10/03/2016**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Administration	Rebekah Barr, MMC City Clerk/Executive Assistant to City Manager

Agenda Item Title

Approval of the minutes of the September 7, 2016 City Council Meeting.

Summary

The minutes have been prepared for Council review and approval.

Recommended Council Action

Approve the minutes.

Alternative Actions

Correct or amend the minutes prior to approval.

Financial Impact

N/A

Environmental Review	**Status**
☐ Environmental Impact Report	☐ Approved/Certified
☐ Negative Declaration	☐ No Action Required
☐ Exempt	☐ Action Requested
☒ Not Applicable	

Attachments:

Minutes

Alignment with Council Goals: N/A

cc: N/A

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

Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West, Sonoma CA

Wednesday, September 7, 2016
5:30 p.m. Closed Session (Special Meeting)
6:00 p.m. Regular Meeting
****
MINUTES

City Council
Laurie Gallian, Mayor
Madolyn Agrimonti, MPT
David Cook,
Gary Edwards
Rachel Hundley

5:30 P.M. – SPECIAL MEETING - CLOSED SESSION

Mayor Gallian called the meeting to order at 5:30p.m. No one from the public was present to provide public testimony on the closed session item. The Council recessed into closed session with all members present. City Manager Giovanatto and City Attorney Walter were also present.

6:00 P.M. – REGULAR MEETING

RECONVENE, CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Gallian called the meeting to order at 6:05pm.

Maclain Goertzen, Boy Scouts Troop #222, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

CITY COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Edwards, Hundley, Cook, Agrimonti and Mayor Gallian
ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: City Manager Giovanatto, Assistant City Manager Johann, City Clerk Barr, City Attorney Walter, Planning Director Goodison, Finance Director Hilbrants, Public Works Director Takasugi

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION
Mayor Gallian noted that the Council gave direction to Special Counsel.

1. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Caitlin Childs, Social Advocates for Youth, thanked the Council for its funding of their grief services program. Ms. Childs then announced that they were looking for a new location for that program because the current location had become prohibitively expensive. She noted that they are in need of an office space of approximately 2200-2500 sq. ft.

Caitlin Cornwall, Sonoma Ecology, & Tom Conlon, Transition Sonoma Valley, read a statement into the record regarding the Sonoma County Climate Action 2020 Plan. They encouraged the Council to re-agendize the plan, regardless of the lawsuit to at least move forward with the initial measures along with the eight additional measures proposed by Staff.

Terry Shore, Greenbelt Alliance, stated that she supported the comments of the previous speakers on the Climate Action Plan. She gave an update on Measure K, which protects the Community separators which are the open space and farmlands between the cities and towns.

Fred Allebach expressed his support of Caitlin Cornwall and Tom Conlon. He also requested that the Public be able to have some input during the City Manager recruitment.

Marilyn Good spoke regarding traffic and the need for environmental changes and encouraged the Council to take a stand on the Climate Action Plan.

Howard Egerbovei requested that the City consider funding the 4th of July Parade.

2. MEETING DEDICATIONS

Councilmember Hundley requested that the meeting be dedicated to Kathy Barnett who recently passed away. Ms. Barnett was born and raised in Sonoma and graduated from Sonoma High School. She was a local business owner and actively involved in the Community.

3. PRESENTATIONS

Item 3A: Proclamation honoring Congregation Shir Shalom on the Occasion of its 20th Anniversary Year

Mayor Gallian and the Council Members presented the proclamation.

Avrum Goldman accepted the proclamation on behalf of Congregation Shir Shalom.

Item 3B: Recognition of the Service of Gay Johann on her Retirement and Introduction of New City Clerk Rebekah Barr

Mayor Gallian presented Ms. Johann with a plaque in recognition of her service. Each Council Member spoke in recognition of Ms. Johann, who spoke in response.

City Manager Giovanatto introduced the new City Clerk Rebekah Barr, who also said a few words.

Item 3C: Recognition of the Service of George McKale, City Historian

Mayor Gallian presented the Certificate of Recognition to Mr. McKale for his dedicated service. Mr. McKale thanked the Council for the recognition.

Item 3D: Presentation by the Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County

Planning Director Goodison gave the staff presentation. He explained how a land trust model worked and noted that staff was presenting this item in order to gain the City Council's support to work with the Sonoma Land Trust on a pilot program and explore the cost and feasibility of bringing existing inclusionary units into the land trust model. He introduced Dev Goetschius, Executive Director, Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County.

Director Goetschius reviewed the program more in depth. She went on to describe what the program would look like here in the City of Sonoma, incorporating a power point presentation (a copy of which is on file in the City Clerk's Office).

Council Member Hundley inquired what would happen if the Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County were to go away. Director Goetschius stated that it is written into the regulatory agreements that if something were to happen to the Land Trust then the City would administer the ground lease without disturbing the families that were sitting on that land. She also noted that the City has the option to either administer it in-house or assign it to another non-profit organization.

Council Member Edwards inquired how large the Sonoma Land Trust Board was. Director stated that there were six people on the Board and that all but one were local to Sonoma.

Mayor Gallian thanked Director Goetschius for making the presentation to the Council.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR/AGENDA ORDER – CITY COUNCIL

Item 4A: **Waive further reading and Authorize Introduction and/or Adoption of Ordinances by Title Only.** (Standard procedural action - no backup information provided)

Item 4B: **Adopt Resolution Updating Signatories for the City of Sonoma's Financial Institution Accounts (Finance Director)**

Item 4C: **Consideration of a Resolution Upholding the Appeal of Ron Albert, thereby denying the Site Design and Architectural Review of a New Single-Family Residence, Additional Residence, and Accessory Structures Located at 314-424 Second Street East (implementing the City Council action of August 15, 2016) (Planning Director)**

Item 4D: **Consideration of a Resolution Amending the City of Sonoma Conflict of Interest Code (City Clerk)**

Item 4E: **Acceptance of the 2016 Local Agency Biennial Notice for the Oversight Board to the Dissolved Sonoma Community Development Agency (City Clerk)**

Item 4F: **Approval of the Minutes of the August 15, 2016 City Council Meeting (City Clerk)**

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti, seconded by Council Member Edwards, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented including Resolution #26-2016, #27-2016, and #28-2016 with no public comment. Motion carried unanimously.

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

Item 5A: **Approval of the Portions of the Minutes of the August 15, 2016 City Council Meeting Pertaining to the Successor Agency (City Clerk)**
Staff Recommendation: Approve the Minutes

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti, seconded by Council Member Cook, to approve the Successor Agency Consent Calendar as presented with no public comment. Motion carried unanimously.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

Item 6A: **Discussion, consideration and possible action on an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to approve a Use Permit to convert a second-floor space**

into a vacation rental unit within the Sonoma Court Shops complex at 11 East Napa Street, Unit #1

Council Member Edwards recused himself for reason of proximity and left the Council Chambers at 7:08pm.

Planning Director Goodison presented the history of the item. Planning Director Goodison noted that if the Planning Commission's decision was upheld then the two vacation rental units would fulfill the allowable number per parcel.

City Attorney Walter clarified that the items listed on the agenda as 6A and 6B would be considered as separate items since this was how the Planning Commission acted upon them.

Terence Redmond, on behalf of Sonoma Court Shops, spoke in favor of the Planning Commission's decision being upheld. Mr. Redmond acknowledged that he had misunderstood the appeal and apologized to Councilmember Hundley for any discomfort he may have caused with the letter that he had submitted. He stated that he was still puzzled by an appeal of either of the units. Mr. Redmond noted that there were 5,645 housing units in the City of Sonoma and 54 legal vacation rentals - less than .1% percent of recognized housing stock. He stated that he wanted to ensure that the City Council had a clear idea of what the facts were regarding housing stock in the city and what percentage is impacted by vacation rentals. Mr. Redmond gave a brief history of the two units.

Mayor Gallian opened the public hearing at 7:30pm.

Fred Allebach stated that the Plaza rents in general are extremely high, due to the shops on the Plaza making it so that residents cannot shop locally. He also stated that he felt if the units under discussion could be rented to locals and if the price was too high they should sit empty until someone could pay for them or rent them as businesses.

Jack Wagner stated that he did not approve of any new vacation rental applications in the City. He noted that if the units sit empty at the asking rate then it may require a lowered rate. He felt that it did take potential housing stock as it was taking it off the market. He noted that parking is also a constant issue. Mr. Wagner said he supported the appeal and thanked Councilmember Hundley for bringing it up.

Amy Harrington stated that this was a very important issue and the question was about one or two vacation rentals or that the City's focus was on ensuring that there was sufficient housing. She noted that she hoped the Council would support Councilmember Hundley's appeal.

Mayor Gallian closed the public hearing at 7:34pm.

Council Member Hundley stated that she had had the opportunity to speak to Ms. Melissa Redmond and had visited the properties in question. She drew attention to the fact that the original Planning Commission decision was a 3-2 vote with two of the long-term commissioners absent. She said that she wanted to discuss if this decision was consistent with the City's general housing policy.

Council Member Hundley noted that there was a housing crisis in the City of Sonoma, particularly around rental housing. She said that the units in question would be ideal housing for the "young professional" or a young married couple, or anyone who wanted to stay plugged in to the community. Council Member Hundley stated that vacation rentals may only be .1% of the current market, however, if everyone started to ask for it there would be a large shift in the market. She stated that the appeal was to define what the City's policy was and to ensure that the Planning Commission's decisions were in line with that. Council Member Hundley noted that she had been informed that the

units under consideration had not been used as residences for twenty years because of the noise and turn-over rate. However, the housing market had changed drastically and the young professional of today expected that those urban center residences would come with those things. She noted that the letter that had been distributed by Mr. Redmond had suggested the appeal was connected to campaign funds she received. Council Member Hundley stated that she had been talking about housing since the very beginning and there was no connection. She noted that if there was a decision made out of the Planning Commission that does not seem to be in line with the Council's policies it was her duty to bring it to their attention.

Planning Director Goodison stated that 11 E Napa Street was part of the original Sonoma Court Shops development and when it was approved by the Planning Commission there was no requirement for a housing component. When it was presented the idea was that those units in Building A would be used as apartments. The Live/Work allowance came at a later date in a subsequent application. He noted that 11 E Napa had never been used as an apartment.

Planning Director Goodison then stated that 533 First Street was built at a later date and was not part of the original Sonoma Court Shops project. He noted that it had been used briefly as an apartment but had been predominantly commercial use.

City Attorney Walter confirmed with Planning Director Goodison that 11 E Napa Street was originally permitted to be used as both an office and/or an apartment. Planning Director Goodison concurred.

Mayor Gallian inquired as to what the process would be if the Planning Commission's decision was upheld and the vacation rental use was initiated.

Planning Director Goodison stated that it was a different situation that would occur in a residential zone, as there was already a use permit that allowed for the development of Sonoma Court Shops. He noted that the action would be an amendment to the existing use permit which would allow the vacation rental option within the two particular units. If the Planning Commission's decision was upheld the decision would be limited to only those two units and would be an allowance. If circumstances changed, the option would remain for them to be used as an apartment or Live/Work, or as an office. Planning Director Goodison said this was the consistent process.

Mayor Gallian inquired if there would be four available uses for those units. Planning Director Goodison answered that was correct – there would be four use allowances, however, only one could occur at a time. He stated that this was not uncommon.

Council Member Hundley stated that she was aware that the unit had been used as an apartment because she had seen newspaper ads for the unit in question from over twenty years ago advertising it as such.

The public hearing was reopened at 7:47pm.

Terence Redmond stated that the unit in question had been used as an office since its inception and that the advertisement that Council Member Hundley was referring too was an advertisement for a back unit, not the property that was under consideration.

The public hearing was closed at 7:48pm.

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that she did not feel the housing issue would be solved by the unit in question. In regards to the three Planning Commissioners that were in attendance when the appealed action was taken and who voted in approval, Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that she had interviewed Commissioner Sek, and, though Commissioner Sek was new to the Planning

Commission, she was not new to the business. She noted that in the City Council Goals it said, *"However, the general statement of intent set forth in the goals does not in and of itself provide a legal basis for any particular action on this appeal."* Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that she knew affordable housing was very important and that there were steps being taken to address the issue.

Council Member Cook stated that he had visited the site and agreed with Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti's comment that the housing problem in Sonoma was not going to be solved by this one action. He did not want individuals to feel that his voting no on the appeal meant he was in favor of vacation rentals. Council Member Cook stated that he was against illegal vacation rentals and hoped the enforcement on those would stay strong. He also stated that there was talk going on at all levels of the government regarding the housing crisis, however, the item that was being considered was not part of that. It was about a room that was very noisy. Council Member Cook noted that the City had areas designated for vacation rentals and the unit under discussion was located in one of them.

Mayor Gallian drew attention to the use permit approval, under "findings". She stated that she felt there was some ambiguity, and asked for clarification. She noted that she found the term *"future land issues in the vicinity"* to be somewhat undetermined considering the action that could be coming forward to the Council in the future in regards to housing options.

Planning Director Goodison stated that the unit in question was part of a larger commercial complex and the adjoining uses were predominantly commercial though there were upper floor apartment units behind it in Building A. Sonoma Court Shops was owned by one group that did not necessarily own the other units. He noted that there were multiple options as to how to regulate vacation rentals in the future and any action taken by the Council in the future would not affect the units in question as those units would have already been acted upon. If the Council were to maintain the status quo of allowing vacation rentals within the downtown and within the commercial district, then other commercial properties could file an application for a vacation rental as long as they were not part of Sonoma Court Shops. The property that was the subject of the application must have a use compatible to its surroundings. A vacation rental was quasi-residential. Since apartments were allowed in the Downtown as a compatible use then it would make sense that a vacation rental would be compatible.

Council Member Hundley stated that she felt unit in question designated as an apartment was more in line with the City's written policies than a vacation rental would be.

Mayor Gallian inquired what would be the result of a tie-vote. Planning Director Goodison responded that an action cannot be taken without a majority vote, so if there were a tie-vote, then the action of the Planning Commission would stand.

City Attorney Walter asked Planning Director Goodison if this was addressed by the Municipal Code. Planning Director Goodison responded that it had consistently been the practice, but he could not supply a code citation.

Mayor Gallian stated that she would not be in support of the vote because she felt that the uses already afforded for the unit were meeting the City's needs in that particular complex. She also felt that if that unit was an apartment it would fit into the residential component. Mayor Gallian noted that unit was of substantial size and the noise was not an issue for her. She stated she felt that the commercial use had been successful and she did not want to disturb the City's housing stock as there were major decisions around that housing stock in the near future.

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti, seconded by Council Member Cook to support the Planning Commission's decision and to deny the appeal. The motion failed with Council Member Hundley and Mayor Gallian voting NO, Council Member Cook and Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti voting YES, and Council Member Edwards absent. It was noted that a tie vote by the

city council resulted in the affirmation of the decision of the Planning Commission, per SMC 19.84.040.

<u>Item 6B:</u> **Discussion, consideration and possible action on an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to approve a Use Permit to convert a second-floor space into a vacation rental unit within the Sonoma Court Shops complex at 533 First Street East.**

Planning Director Goodison presented the staff report on this item, noting that the facts of Item 6B were very much the same as the previous item. He noted that the development history was slightly different and it was clear the unit in question had been used briefly as an apartment before being used as a commercial space. Another difference from the previous item, was that there would be no parking exception necessary because it was a one bedroom unit, therefore, only required one parking space.

Council Member Cook clarified that the Planning Commission considered both Item 6A and 6B separately. Planning Director Goodison said that this was correct because one of units required a parking exception which was a separate action.

Council Member Hundley inquired if the property was explicitly designated as "Live/Work". Planning Director Goodison responded that it was approved as a flexible space with allowance for either commercial offices, a Live/Work unit, or residential use.

Council Member Hundley inquired if "Live/Work" was a distinct designation. Planning Director Goodison responded that Live/Work was a distinct category and required use permit approval. He noted that if the Planning Commission had approved it as commercial and residential, then Live/Work would not be an authorized use.

Mayor Gallian opened the public hearing at 8:11pm.

Terence Redmond addressed the item. He stated that when he had made the statement that there were 54 legal vacation units, he had wanted to emphasize how few there were. The unit under discussion was a one bedroom unit that was being proposed as a legal vacation rental and qualified for that use, which is what had been asked for.

Fred Allebach inquired how many vacation rentals there were around the Plaza and what was there cumulative effect. He thought that the Council could approve one and deny one. Mr. Allebach inquired if the comment regarding the Planning Commission decision standing in the case of a tie-vote was actually a rule.

Jack Wagner stated that he was again recording that he did not support any new vacation rentals. The action on one or two units would not solve the housing crisis. He noted that, even though this was the case, every single unit mattered and every single decision mattered - the item under consideration was one more chance to hold on to one more unit in the housing stock. Mr. Wagner used the analogy of the Climate 2020 Action Plan stating that any one of the initiatives alone would not solve the environmental issues however each one had to be considered to be effective. Mr. Wagner said that revenue could be gained from other places including TOT.

Council Member Hundley stated that she was incorporating her comments from the previous item. She stated that she appreciated Mr. Wagner's Climate 2020 Action Plan analogy – that every little thing on its own is not impactful necessarily, however as whole it is a different matter. Council Member Hundley noted that the Council needed to take every opportunity presented to them to address each item.

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that the collection of her thoughts were around traffic and she did not mind a limited amount of vacation rentals. She felt that there were other ways to tackle the issue of housing. Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that she appreciated Council Member Hundley's differentiation between market rate homes and affordable housing.

Mayor Gallian stated that she had reviewed the analysis of legal vacation rentals that had been updated on February 3, 2016 and noticed that 49 of the 54 vacation rentals were within the historical overlay zone. Planning Director Goodison addressed the different ways in which a vacation rental could be approved within the historical overlay zone.

Council Member Cook stated that he felt there was a balance between city character and tourism. He noted that he was not saying he wanted vacation rentals all over the City of Sonoma, however, there was a place for them. He said he had visited both of the units being considered and they were office space that was now vacant. The two units would add to the character of Sonoma. Council Member Cook stated that the conversation that was being held was about a decision that was made by the Planning Commission. He stated that he believed that all of the Council Members understood that there was a housing crisis and that they were working to address that crisis.

Mayor Gallian stated that the discussion had been an exercise in understanding the importance of each type of housing currently available within City limits. When she looked at the issue in question, she noted that the unit under discussion as Item 6B had residential there for 2-3 years. Mr. Redmond confirmed that this was accurate.

Mayor Gallian stated that she did see the proposed use as a possibility. She had visited the site and heard the noise and witnessed the surrounding activity. However, she could see someone living in either unit or using either as an office space. She noted that she is not basing her decision on the item being considered based on future decisions. Mayor Gallian stated that she was not certain that the proposed use as a vacation rental was actually compatible, nor was she confident that it was a use she was willing to approve.

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti, seconded by Council Member Cook to support the Planning Commission's decision and to deny the appeal. The motion failed with Council Member Hundley and Mayor Gallian voting NO, Council Member Cook and Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti voting YES, and Council Member Edwards absent. It was noted that a tie vote by the city council resulted in the affirmation of the decision of the Planning Commission, per SMC 19.84.040.

City Attorney Walter stated that he wanted to acknowledge the new City Clerk as she had forwarded the citation on tie-votes from the Municipal Code. He noted that it was section 19.84.040 and read the citation into the record.

Council Member Edwards returned to the dais at 8:35pm.

7. REGULAR CALENDAR – CITY COUNCIL

<u>Item 7A:</u> **Discussion, Consideration, and Possible Action to Approve Construction of a Monument in Honor of the Chinese Contribution to the Wine Industry in Depot Park and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Maintenance Agreement with the Sonoma-Penglai Sister City Committee**

Public Works Director Takasugi gave the staff report on this item.

Peggy Phelan, Chair, Sonoma Penglai Sister City Committee, stated that the Committee was very excited to move forward, and though they had not seen a copy of the Maintenance Agreement they were aware of it. She said she was available to answer any questions.

Bill Boerum, former President, Sonoma Sister Cities Association, commended Ms. Phelan on her work. He noted that these types of monuments are typical of those across the United States among Sister Cities and really brought to life the heritage of the given country.

Fred Allebach stated that the Historical Society has an upcoming lecture on Chinese history and reviewed some of the history of the Chinese people in the City of Sonoma.

Jack Ding, Sister Cities Association acknowledged Ms. Phelan and the Board. He stated that he wanted to humbly thank the Council.

David Cassidy stated that the Committee had been promoting the project in the Bay Area and also in China and he had been informed that individuals in both San Francisco and China were planning to visit the monument and making donations.

Council Member Hundley commented that Sonoma was the most historically significant city in the State of California and she thought the monument was going to show how multi-faceted the City was.

Council Member Agrimonti said that she was very excited and was in support of it on behalf of Council Member Edwards.

Council Member Cook stated that he wanted to thank the Sister Cities for their work on the project and that he would be supporting the item

Council Member Edwards stated that he was in support of this item and that he would be making a donation to the project and hoped the other council members would do so as well.

Mayor Gallian stated that she and Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti had taken a group of 2nd and 3rd grade students on a tour of City Hall and went through how an item was acted upon by the Council. The item they used was the monument under discussion. She wanted to announce that there had been great support from the classroom students and they could not wait to visit it when it was constructed.

Motion by Hundley, seconded by Council member Edwards, to approve a Monument in Honor of the Chinese Contribution to the Wine Industry in Depot Park and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Maintenance Agreement with the Sonoma-Penglai Sister City Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

<u>Item 7B:</u> **Discussion, Consideration, and Possible Action to Adopt a Resolution Approving Settlement Agreement which resolves the Case Entitled Selma Blanusa v. City of Sonoma and Permits Construction of a Second Dwelling Unit on the Real Property described as 19725 Seventh St. East, Sonoma, CA and finding that said adoption is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

City Attorney Walter gave the staff report on this item. He noted that there had an amendment to the resolution

Jean Parisi inquired what the amendment to the Resolution was, and if it was different than what had been provided by Planning Director Goodison.

City Attorney Walter responded that the settlement agreement which was under consideration and had been published in the agenda packet, had the correct resolution attached as Exhibit D. He had inadvertently provided Staff with an earlier iteration.

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that the Council had to make their decisions based on the information that was available. She said that she was not pleased about it, but felt she like was in the corner on the item.

Council Member Cook stated that the item under discussion was something that had been ongoing for a long time and had been well vetted. He noted that if it appeared that there were not a lot of questions or comments by the Council it was because it had already been covered.

Motion by Council Member Cook, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti, to Adopt a Resolution Approving Settlement Agreement which resolves the Case Entitled Selma Blanusa v. City of Sonoma and Permits Construction of a Second Dwelling Unit on the Real Property described as 19725 Seventh St. East, Sonoma, CA and finding that said adoption is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Motion carried unanimously.

Item 7C: **Discussion, consideration and possible action to approve a Resolution in support Proposition 56 Ballot Measure (California Healthcare Research and Prevention Tobacco Tax Act of 2016) Requested by Mayor Gallian**

City Manager Giovanatto gave the presentation on this item.

Mayor Gallian stated that this item had been brought to her attention by the same individuals who were supporting the tobacco ordinance. She had personally endorsed it, and wanted to give the rest of the Council the opportunity to consider.

Council Member Agrimonti noted that she was in support of the item.

Council Member Edwards stated that he personally supported it but felt it was not necessary for the Council to take an action as a whole. Council Members Cook and Hundley concurred with Council Member Edwards.

Mayor Gallian noted that as there was not support for the item to be brought forward, there would be no further discussion or action.

Mayor Gallian called a short recess at 9:08pm.

The Council reconvened at 9:14pm.

Item 7D: **Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action to Approve Installation of Three (3) Taxi/Rideshare Parking Stalls Around the Sonoma Plaza**

Public Works Director Takasugi gave the presentation on this item.

Council Member Cook inquired how enforcement would be managed. Public Works Director Takasugi responded that as the time limit was only three minutes, Staff had felt that the parking places would not be used as a parking stall to take care of other business. He also noted that if someone did utilize the space for the short time period it would not be cause to take aggressive enforcement action.

Council Member Cook then asked if the signage would look different for the proposed stalls. Public Works Director Takasugi responded that there would be a sign placed at driver level at the head end of the parking stall as well as pavement marking at the entrance to the stall so that it is clearly visible.

Council Member Cook inquired what type of vehicles would be able to park in the proposed stalls. Public Works Director Takasugi stated that it was the hope that vehicles over 8 passengers would not use the stalls.

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that she was not in favor of Uber and Lyft. She then noted that in regards to the local taxi companies, she was concerned about the condition of the automobiles and if the drivers underwent background checks. Public Works Director Takasugi stated that regarding Uber and Lyft, they had been added into the definition of the Council's taxi goal as this was a means of reducing the vehicle parking load on the Plaza.

Council Member Edwards inquired what the fine was for parking over three minutes. Public Works Takasugi stated that he was not sure what the fine was, but may be comparable to a regular parking fine of $40, if it was enforceable.

Council Member Hundley stated that she believes this was a great start and felt that the placements were very good, especially for picking up passengers late at night.

Council Member Cook noted that this item was one of Council's goals. He commended Staff on their work.

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that she could not support the item as she had not received an answer to her question regarding automobile condition and background checks. City Manager Giovanatto responded that the City had a taxi ordinance and did require a permit and insurance, however, neither background checks nor inspections of taxis were done.

Mayor Gallian stated that she was in support of the item since it was moving forward towards the Council's climate action goals of reducing greenhouse gases.

Motion by Council Member Cook, seconded by Council Member Hundley, to approve Installation of Three (3) Taxi/Rideshare Parking Stalls around the Sonoma Plaza. Motion passed four to one with Council Member Agrimonti voting NO.

Item 7E: **Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action to Provide Direction to Councilmember Cook on Potential Voting Action by Sonoma Clean Power Board of Directors [Requested by Councilmember Cook]**

City Manager Giovanatto gave the presentation on this item.

Council Member Cook noted that the discussion on the amendment had been ongoing for approximately a year, so it might be difficult to explain every piece. He noted that there was the availability to request clarification from the legal staff at Sonoma Clean Power if necessary, then consider it at the October 3rd Council Meeting. Council Member Cook reviewed the proposed amendment which the change in language which would allow for the inclusion of Mendocino.

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti stated that she wanted to ensure that with the weighted voting, the City of Sonoma would not have a lack of a vote. Council Member Cook stated that by adding Mendocino it would take some percentage of its voting weight away from the City of Sonoma, however, every member of the JPA would be losing the same percentage.

Mayor Gallian inquired if the Board had voted to include Mendocino and if they had be given voting shares. Council Member Cook responded that is why the amendment was being done, to enable Mendocino to come into the JPA. The final decision would be acted upon at their October 13th meeting. He stated that it was his hope that the Council would grant him the authority to act, with Council Member Hundley's input as the alternate.

Mayor Gallian expressed concern about the addition of Mendocino and the loss of voting power. As a smaller City she wanted to ensure that how Council Member Cook would vote was fairly represented under small cities. Council Member Cook said that he shared that concern and that was why he was bringing the item forward for vetting by the Council.

Council Member Hundley requested clarification on what items would be weighted and what would be straight board voting. Council Member Cook stated that the changing of the JPA would be weighted voting. He stated that the recommendations were from Board Staff and may not be what the Board approved upon consideration. Because of this, he was requesting that the Council give him leeway to vote taking into consideration the Council's input.

Council Member Hundley stated that she supports Council Member Cook having the flexibility to vote as per the power that he was given as the representative to the board.

Mayor Gallian noted that she would like Council Member Cook to give regular reports on how this item is progressing.

Council Member Cook noted that Council Member Hundley was the alternate and he would seek her input if necessary.

Motion by Council Member Agrimonti, seconded by Council Member Edwards, to authorize Council Member Cook to vote on behalf of the Council after taking into consideration their comments made at the meeting and that Council Member Hundley as the alternate would have the same. Motion carried unanimously.

Item 7F: Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action Regarding Designation of the Voting Delegate for the 2016 League of California Cities Annual Conference

City Manager Giovanatto gave the staff report for this item.

Motion by Council Member Hundley, seconded by Council Member Cook, to designate Mayor Gallian as the voting delegate for the City of Sonoma at the 2016 League of California Cities Annual Conference.

8. REGULAR CALENDAR – CITY COUNCIL AS THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY

9. COUNCILMEMBERS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti reported on the Sonoma Valley Women's Club Centennial celebration, and that she and Council Member Cook were serving as mentors for a high school senior student, Bella Fanucchi. The student will be working on a Recreational website as her Senior Project. Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti asked that she be scheduled on the October 17th Council meeting to give a presentation. She also reported on a meeting with RISK that she had attended. RISK deals with opioids, alcohol, and other drugs in relation to the young people in Sonoma. She asked that Staff provide and update on 2nd Street East and stop signs.

City Manager Giovanatto responded that the 2nd Street East item was still at the level of the Traffic Safety Committee and under discussion.

Council Member Edwards announced the Rotary Club of Sonoma 3rd Annual Clean-up on Eighth Street.

Mayor Pro Tem Agrimonti announced that she was part of SVConnect at Larson Park and that Sonoma Splash would be having a dunk tank. Council Member Hundley noted that she will be in the dunk tank.

Council Member Cook reported that he had an upcoming Library Advisory Meeting and the Sonoma Clean Power Meeting in October.

Mayor Gallian reported on the Ag and Open Space Meeting and they had considered their matching grants and listed the projects. She stated that these projects would be forwarded to the County Board of Supervisor. She also reported that she and Council Member Cook had attended a meeting on groundwater management. Mayor Gallian stated that Mr. Evans was looking for a student to work on a project researching all Alcades from the past.

10. CITY MANAGER COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS INCLUDING ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM SUCCESSOR AGENCY STAFF

City Manager Giovanatto announced that the Cultural and Fine Arts Commission was accepting nominations for the Treasure Artist. She also announced that a page had been set up on the City's website with information on the three ballot measures. City Manager Giovanatto spoke about the street and recycled pipeline projects that were on-going in the City.

11. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

12. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 10:03pm in honor of Cathy Barnett.

CITY OF SONOMA
City Council/Successor Agency
Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item: **5A**

Meeting Date: **10/03/2016**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Administration	Rebekah Barr, MMC City Clerk/Executive Assistant to the City Manager

Agenda Item Title

Approval of the portions of the minutes of the September 7, 2016 City Council meeting pertaining to the Successor Agency.

Summary

The minutes have been prepared for Council review and approval.

Recommended Council Action

Approve the minutes.

Alternative Actions

Correct or amend the minutes prior to approval.

Financial Impact

N/A

Environmental Review

- ☐ Environmental Impact Report
- ☐ Negative Declaration
- ☐ Exempt
- ☒ Not Applicable

Status

- ☐ Approved/Certified
- ☐ No Action Required
- ☐ Action Requested

Attachments:

See agenda item 4D for the minutes

Alignment with Council Goals: N/A

cc: NA

PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CITY OF SONOMA
City Council
Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item:	**6A**
Meeting Date:	**10/03/2016**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Planning & Community Services	David Goodison, Planning Director

Agenda Item Title

Discussion and Consideration of Input Received During Public Testimony on the Recruitment of the City Manager for the City of Sonoma

THIS ITEM WILL BE SENT OUT AND UPLOADED TO THE WEBSITE UNDER SEPARATE COVER ON FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30TH

PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

City of Sonoma
City Council
Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item: **7A**

Meeting Date: **10/03/16**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Planning and Community Services	David Goodison, Planning Director

Agenda Item Title

Discussion, consideration and possible action on the changes to the regulations concerning vacation rentals, including consideration of whether an interim moratorium ordinance should be implemented.

Summary

As part of its ongoing discussion of housing issues, the City Council has requested a review and discussion of the City's vacation rental regulations. Although vacation rentals are already regulated and restricted within the city, the City Council has a number of options to modify the Development Code to change the regulation of future applications for vacation rentals, including the following:

- Change the permit requirement form a Use Permit to a license. Under the Use Permit process, once it is approved, the Use Permit runs with the land regardless of changes in ownership. In contrast, a license is a type of permit that is specific to the property and can be designed to expire (or be subject to a renewal requirement) upon a change in ownership.
- Within the Mixed Use zone and the Commercial zone, eliminate any allowance for converting a residential unit into a vacation rental.
- Eliminate vacation rentals as an allowed use altogether.

If the City Council is interested in pursuing changes to vacation rental regulations, it should also discuss whether the adoption of an interim moratorium ordinance would be appropriate. Under State law, an interim moratorium ordinance may be adopted based on anticipated changes in development policies arising from ongoing or anticipated planning studies, such as a zoning ordinance amendment. However, in order to adopt an interim moratorium ordinance, the local jurisdiction must find that the approval of new development would result in a "current and immediate threat to the public health, safety, or welfare." If consideration of an interim moratorium ordinance is requested, staff would develop a draft ordinance and bring it back to the City Council at an upcoming meeting for consideration.

Recommended Council Action

Provide direction to staff as to whether the City Council wishes to change the regulations pertaining to applications for vacation rentals, including whether there is interest in adopting an interim ordinance.

Alternative Actions

N.A.

Financial Impact

Vacation rentals generate TOT and restrictions on the creation of additional vacation rentals within the city would reduce potential income from that source. However, staff does not regard this as a significant financial impact.

Environmental Review

- ☐ Environmental Impact Report
- ☐ Negative Declaration
- ☒ Exempt
- ☐ Not Applicable

Status

- ☐ Approved/Certified
- ☒ No Action Required
- ☐ Action Requested

Alignment with Council Goals

The discussion of vacation rental regulations is responsive to the City Council's Housing goal: *"To analyze policy and programmatic tools suggested by the 2015 Housing Element update; implement strategies to facilitate creation of affordable rental and workforce housing; sustain or increase opportunities to continue the programs currently in place to maintain current affordable housing stock."*

Compliance with Climate Action 2020 Target Goals:

N.A.

Attachments:

1. Supplemental Report
2. List of existing vacation rentals
3. Memo from City Attorney's office

cc: Byron Jones

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Discussion, consideration and possible action on the changes to the regulations concerning vacation rentals, including consideration of whether an interim moratorium ordinance should be implemented

For the City Council Meeting of September 19, 2016

Background

As part of its ongoing discussion of housing issues, the City Council has requested a review and discussion of the City's vacation rental regulations. Under the Development Code, a vacation rental is defined as the rental or letting of up to two complete residential units, containing bedrooms, kitchens, and bathrooms, for a period of less than 30 consecutive days. Unlike bed and breakfasts, an on-site manager is not required for vacation rentals. Operators are required to maintain a business license and pay transient occupancy taxes to the City. This definition does not allow for the AirBnB type of rental of a room or rooms within an occupied residence. At this time, there are 55 recognized, legal vacation rental units within city limits. Of these, 28 were designated as legal-non-conforming units in the 1999 ordinance or otherwise grandfathered-in, while another 27 have been approved since that time. The distribution of units by zoning district is as follows:

R-L = Low Density Residential	10
R-M = Medium Density Residential	22
R-HS = Hillside Residential	1
C = Commercial	14
MX = Mixed Use	8
Total:	**55**

The attached spreadsheet provides additional information on these units. Note: this list does not include Bead and Breakfast Inns, which are separately defined with a requirement for an on-site manager.

Past and Current Regulations

For many years, the City did not address vacation rentals in its zoning regulations, but as a matter of practice they were treated as an allowed use in residential zoning districts, subject only to the issuance of a business license. However, in 1999, the City Council became concerned that an increasing number of vacation rentals were becoming established in residential neighborhoods throughout the city and were creating conflicts with long-term residences. In response, the City Council adopted Ordinance 1999-14, which established the following:

- Vacation rentals were defined as a land use type.
- Vacation rentals were allowed subject to conditional use permit in the Commercial zone and the Mixed Use zone, but prohibited in the Gateway Commercial zone.
- Vacation rentals were prohibited in residential zones, except as an adaptive reuse of a historic structure, subject to use permit review.

- A list of existing vacation rentals was recognized as "grand-fathered", meaning that they could continue to operate as a legal non-conforming use.

In 2003, the City Council adopted the Development Code, the comprehensive zoning regulations and guidelines that are currently used by the City. In general, the limitations on vacation rentals previously established by Ordinance 1999-14 were integrated into the Development Code. However, the Development Code also introduced specific standards for the adaptive reuse of historic structures, including eligibility criteria, allowable uses, and findings that the Planning Commission must make (in addition to those required for a Use Permit) in order to approve an adaptive reuse.

In 2009, the City Council amended the vacation rental regulations once again, this time tightening the adaptive re-use allowance. Two key changes were made. First, in order to be eligible to apply, the property had to be listed or eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Places. (To qualify for other types of adaptive reuse it is only necessary for a property to have local historic significance.) Second, in order for a property to be approved as an adaptive re-use, the Planning Commission must find that the use of the property as a vacation rental is necessary to:

Restore and rehabilitate a historic structure and/or property, excluding second units, which is listed or eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Places, that has fallen into such a level of disrepair that the economic benefits of adaptive reuse are necessary to stem further deterioration, correct deficient conditions, or avoid demolition as implemented in the conditions of project approval.

This is a high bar and since 2009 only two applications for vacation rental conversion have been approved under the current adaptive re-use provisions. Most recently, in April 2016, the City Council amended the Adaptive Re-use provisions to prohibit the conversion of second units into vacation rentals.

Currently, the main opportunities for vacation rental applications are on properties having a zoning of Mixed Use or Commercial, as they are treated as a regular Use Permit and are not subject to the special findings and restrictions that apply to applications for adaptive re-use. Over the past three years, the Planning Commission has approved nine Use Permit applications involving the conversion of commercial spaces to vacation rentals. In some instances, the application involved the conversion of a commercial tenant space. Another example is a small building on Broadway, originally built as a residence, that was converted to office use many years ago. Most recently, two tenant spaces within the Sonoma Court Shops development were approve for conversion to vacation rental use. These tenant spaces were unusual in that they already had use allowances for office, apartment, and live-work.

Enforcement

With the advent of AirBnB and similar on-line booking services, the City of Sonoma (and many, many other communities) began experiencing a proliferation of illegal short-term rentals. As a first step in addressing this problem, the City Council authorized the hiring of a consultant, MuniServices Financial, to review on-line services and identify potentially unauthorized vacation rentals and bed and breakfasts. This survey was quite effective and it identified many instances of potentially illegal vacation rentals or bed and breakfasts. However, the number of potentially

illegal vacation rentals identified through this process represented a significant increase in the code enforcement caseload, exceeding the ability of planning staff to effectively investigate, except for the most egregious examples. In order to improve the City's code enforcement capabilities overall, the City Council in February of 2016 approved a proposal by the City Manager to establish a part-time code enforcement position managed through the City Attorney's office. This additional staffing has already proven extremely successful in identifying and resolving illegal vacation rentals in a timely and efficient manner.

Options for Changes in Regulations

The City Attorney's office has evaluated the question of whether there is a legal method to compel owners of existing, legal vacation rentals to use their properties for long-term residential purposes and has concluded that this is not legally possible (see attached memo). However, the City Council has a number of options to modify the Development Code to change the regulation of future applications for vacation rentals, including the following:

- Change the permit requirement form a Use Permit to a License. Under the Use Permit process, once it is approved, the Use Permit runs with the land regardless of changes in ownership. In contrast, a license is a type of permit that is specific to the property and can be designed to expire (or be subject to a renewal requirement) upon a change in ownership.

- Within the Mixed Use zone and the Commercial zone, eliminate any allowance for converting a residential unit into a vacation rental.

- Eliminate vacation rentals as an allowed use altogether.

Clearly, the current number of vacation rentals represents only a small fraction of the City's housing stock. However, it is also the case that current opportunities for vacation rental conversions often involve units and tenant spaces that are or may be available for use as long-term rentals—a form of housing that is greatly needed in Sonoma—and from that perspective the Council may wish to impose further restrictions in this area.

Interim Moratorium Ordinance

If the City Council does wish to revise the regulations pertaining to vacation rentals, this will take time, and, thus, it should discuss whether the adoption of an ordinance imposing an interim moratorium on the approval of such rentals would be appropriate. Under State law, an interim ordinance may be adopted based on anticipated changes in development policies arising from ongoing or anticipated planning studies, including zoning ordinance amendments. The legal basis for adopting an interim ordinance is set forth in Government Code section 65858. This section vests local jurisdictions with the authority to place a temporary prohibition on the approval of specified, new development, but also sets limits on this authority. It is revealing that this code section is found in the Planning and Zoning title of the Government Code, under Chapter 4 "Zoning Regulations," because an interim moratorium ordinance is in essence a temporary zoning ordinance that supersedes current zoning regulations with the intent of protecting a community from uses that may conflict with a pending change in local development policies, such as an update of the zoning ordinance. By definition, an interim ordinance is temporary. Upon its initial adoption, for which a four-fifths vote is required, it is effective for only 45 days unless extended. While

different methods of extension are allowed, all require a four-fifths vote and the maximum period of an interim ordinance is limited to two years. (Note: the prospect of an interim ordinance is also addressed in the attached memo from the City Attorney's office.)

In order to adopt an interim moratorium ordinance, the local jurisdiction must find that the approval of new development would result in a "current and immediate threat to the public health, safety, or welfare." It is not uncommon for such a finding to be made in support of an interim moratorium, because if no moratorium is adopted while the Council studies changes in the City's vacation rental policies, by the time those policies are changed, a number of vacation rentals may be approved in the meantime, thus partially defeating the point of changing the policies in the first place. If consideration of an interim ordinance is requested, staff would prepare a draft ordinance and bring it back to the City Council at an upcoming meeting for consideration.

Recommendation

Provide direction to staff as to whether the City Council wishes to change the regulations pertaining to applications for vacation rentals, including whether there is interest in adopting an interim ordinance.

City of Sonoma - Legal Vacation Rentals (updated 9/14/16)

Operator/Property Name	APN	Site Address	Zoning	Number of Units	Approval Date	Type of Approval
Alexandra's Plaza Suite	018-222-023	440 Second Street East	R-L/H	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Casa De Carroll	018-442-019	965 West Spain Street	C	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Andrea's Hidden Cottage	018-171-009	138 East Spain Street	R-M/H	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Bungalows 313	018-162-025	313 First Street East	R-M/H	5	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Casa Chiquita Cottage	018-780-001	196 West Spain Street	R-M/H	2	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Blankfort/Martin	018-352-030	117 France Street	R-L/H	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Sonoma Farmhouse Town	018-201-003	446 Third Street West	R-L/H	2	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Huff	018-121-021	289 First Street West	R-M/H	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Mathis	018-121-020	287 First Street West	R-M/H	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Cecilia's Adobe	018-172-003	378 Second Street East	R-M/H	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Cortopassi	018-191-034	477 West Spain Street	R-L	3	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Cuneo Cottage	018-231-022	391 East Spain Street	R-L/H	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Susan's Guest Cottage	018-202-006	458 Second Street West	C/H	2	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Cooperage Inn	018-161-017	301 First Street West	R-M/H	3	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Caroline's Cottage	128-172-051	171 Newcomb Street	R-L	1	Grandfathered	Grandfathered
Bernard	018-201-008	270 West Napa Street, Unit 2R	C/H	1	4/13/2000	Use Permit
Cottage Sonoma	018-202-002	424 Second Street West	R-M/H	1	7/10/2003	Adaptive Reuse
Bungalow Sonoma	018-202-026	157 West Spain Street	R-M/H	1	7/10/2003	Adaptive Reuse
Tulsi Cottage	018-171-030	304 First Street East	R-M/H	1	6/9/2005	Adaptive Reuse
Casa Sebastiani	018-141-012	247 Fourth Street East	R-HS/H	1	9/14/2006	Adaptive Reuse
Inn Wine Country	018-352-052	758 Broadway	MX/H	1	1/10/2008	Use Permit
Auberge Sonoma	018-261-023	151 East Napa Street	R-M/H	2	5/20/2008	Adaptive Reuse
Mary Jean's Place	128-083-021	20073 Broadway	MX/H	1	12/11/2008	Use Permit
Sonoma Farmhouse Ranch	018-201-004	454 Third Street West	C/H	1	3/10/2011	Use Permit
Tillem-Fegan	018-412-032	854 Broadway	MX/H	1	12/11/2011	Use Permit
Jones-Morrison	128-083-009	20079 Broadway	MX/H	1	2/14/2012	Use Permit
Matt & Jan Mathews	018-201-007	284-294 West Napa Street, Units #2 and #3	C/H	2	4/11/2013	Use Permit
Sonoma Plaza 1889	018-201-039	464 Third Street West	C/H	1	4/11/2013	Use Permit
Marino	018-411-020	853 Broadway	MX/H	1	4/11/2013	Use Permit
O'Toole	018-221-020	180 East Napa Street	R-M/H	1	5/9/2013	Adaptive Reuse
Dambach-Argenziano	018-352-040	780 Broadway	MX/H	1	8/8/2013	Use Permit
Redmond	018-212-026	567 First Street East	C/H	1	10/10/2013	Use Permit
Marino	018-202-010	158 West Napa Street	C/H	1	3/13/2014	Use Permit
Marino	018-202-009	164 & 172 West Napa Street	C/H	2	3/13/2014	Use Permit
Tillem-Olsen	018-780-006	162-166 West Spain Street	R-M/H	2	11/3/2014	Adaptive Reuse
Martinez-Montague	018-251-020	515 First Street West	C/H	1	1/8/2015	Use Permit
Tillem-Fegan	018-412-032	846 Broadway	MX/H	1	4/9/2015	Use Permit
835 Broadway LLC	018-411-022	835 Broadway	MX/H	1	9/10/2015	Use Permit
Redmond	018-810-030	11 East Napa Street, Unit #1	C/H	1	6/9/2016	Use Permit
Redmond	018-810-042	533 First Street East	C/H	1	6/9/2016	Use Permit
			Total:	**55**		

Zoning Designations:

R-L = Low Density Residential	9
R-M = Medium Density Residential	22
R-HS = Hillside Residential	1
C = Commercial	15
MX = Mixed Use	8
/H = Historic Overlay Zone	50

MEMORANDUM

To: Carol Giovanatto, City Manager

From: John Abaci, Assistant City Attorney

Date: August 8, 2016

Re: Prohibiting or Restricting Conditional Uses for Vacation Rentals

BACKGROUND

You have asked our office to research and analyze the following potential options for limiting or prohibiting vacation rentals as a conditional use under the City's Municipal Code:

1) Phasing out conditional use permits for vacation rentals over time;
2) Adoption of a moratorium upon issuance of conditional use permits for vacation rentals;
3) Penalizing persons operating vacation rentals without being issued conditional use permits through some other method than payment of back taxes.

These three options are being considered as potential means for providing more affordable housing within the City.

SHORT ANSWER

Currently, vacation rentals are allowed with a conditional use permit within commercial and mixed use zoning districts. When a conditional use permit is issued the permit runs with the land and cannot be revoked or terminated without cause. A conditional use permit may only be revoked on the grounds of a permit violation or the operation of the rental in a manner that constitutes a public nuisance. Accordingly, a conditional use permit that has been issued cannot be eliminated, terminated, or phased out over time on the grounds that the law is being amended to no longer allow conditional use permits for vacation rentals. However, a moratorium or urgency ordinance that prevents the issuance of any new vacation rental permits can be adopted and extended pursuant to Government Code Section 65858(a) or (b), provided that the proper findings can be made.

The Municipal Code does authorize the City to penalize those who operate vacation rentals without a conditional use permit under civil or criminal proceedings. Penalties include civil, criminal, or administrative fines and/or imprisonment.

ANALYSIS

I. Conditional Use Permits Cannot Be Amortized Or Phased Out Over Time.

Vacation rentals are defined by SMC 19.92.020 as follows: "the rental or letting of up to two complete residential units, containing bedrooms, kitchens, and bathrooms, for a period of less than 30 days. Typically, no on-site manager is present." The Sonoma Municipal Code (SMC) permits vacation rentals within commercial and mixed use districts upon the terms and conditions of conditional use permits issued by the City. SMC 19.10.050 (Tables 2-2 and 2-3). A use permit for vacation rentals will continue in effect until action is taken by the City to revoke the permit.

"A conditional use permit is administrative permission for uses not allowed as a matter of right in a zone, but subject to approval." Sounhein v. City of San Dimas, 47 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1187-88 (1996). A conditional use permit regulates land, not individuals. Id. Conditional use permits run with the land and entitle all subsequent owners of the property to the same rights and benefits as the original permittee. Id. SMC 19.56.060 expresses this concept by stating that a conditional use permit will continue to be valid "upon a change of ownership of the site, business, service, use or structure."

A CUP is conditional by definition, and the violation of conditions attached to its grant may lead to revocation. Malibu Mountains Recreation, Inc. v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 67 Cal. App. 4th 359, 367 (1998). Otherwise, a conditional use permit may only be revoked on the basis of a compelling public necessity which occurs when the conduct of the business constitutes a nuisance. O'Hagen v. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment (1971) 19 Cal.App.3d 151, 158. Although SMC 19.90.090 provides various grounds for the revocation of a conditional use permit, the courts have established that a conditional use permit may only be revoked or terminated by the city if the terms of the permit have been violated or if the manner in which the activity is being operated constitutes a public nuisance. [1] The fact that a conditional use no longer complies with a change in the zoning of a property does not furnish a compelling public necessity or establish that the manner in which the use is being operated creates a nuisance. Id. at 159.

A somewhat anomalous consequence of granting a conditional use permit in most cities is that the holder of a conditional use permit will be entitled to more protection from changes in the law than would a business conducting a permitted use. A business can be phased out or amortized over time when it is engaged in a permitted use and the law later changes to prohibit or restrict that same use (i.e., legal nonconforming use).[2] On the other hand, when a conditional use permit has already been obtained, the use

[1] There is one other very limited basis for a conditional use permit to be terminated. That is, when the permittee has never actually commenced the conditional use the permit may be terminated without grounds.
[2] A legal nonconforming use is a use that was lawful when it was established but is no longer permitted to some degree or in total because of a change in the law after the date that it was established. Many cities afford businesses that become legal nonconforming uses a specified amortization period (usually 3 to 5 years) in order to protect the investment interest of the owner while ensuring that the use will be discontinued in time as contemplated under the new zoning scheme.

cannot be phased out or amortized at the time the law is changed to prohibit the use. Accordingly, the City cannot establish a time period in which a conditional use permit will be amortized or phased out over time, as it could with a business engaged in a legal nonconforming use.

II. The City May Adopt A Moratorium On The Issuance Of Conditional Use Permits For Vacation Rentals.

State law provides that cities may adopt "moratorium" or "urgency" ordinances that prevent the issuance of new conditional use permits while the city undergoes the process of considering a permanent ordinance that may ban, restrict, or otherwise limit the use that is the subject of the conditional use permit. The "urgency" ordinance is not required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission or have two readings, as other zoning ordinances must. However, the ordinance must include findings that "there is a current and immediate threat to the public health, safety or welfare, and that the approval of additional…use permits…would result in that threat to public health, safety, or welfare." Government Code Section 65858(c). Additionally, the ordinance may either be in effect for 10 months and 15 days and be subject to one extension of 1 year, or it may be in effect for 45 days and be subject to one extension of 22 months and 15 days. Under either option, the ordinance requires a 4/5 vote of the city council.

This statute allows cities to "classify, exclude, restrict, and limit what a land owner may do with his or her property, subject of course to certain constitutional constraints." Building Industry Legal Foundation v. Superior Court (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 1410, 1416. Permitting cities to establish such a moratorium "protect[s] and promote[s] the planning process by, among other things, prohibiting the introduction of potentially nonconforming land uses that could defeat a later adopted general plan or zoning ordinance. *Id.* at 1418. Therefore, provided that the City can make the proper findings under Government Code Section 65858(c), a moratorium ordinance which prevents the issuance of any new vacation rental conditional use permits during the period that the moratorium ordinance remains in effect can be adopted by the City.

As stated above, any such moratorium ordinance will be subject to "constitutional constraints." In the case of conditional use permits a moratorium ordinance will not operate to terminate, revoke, or limit any conditional use permit that has been issued and is in effect at the time of the adoption of the moratorium ordinance. All conditional use permits which have been issued prior to the moratorium being adopted will remain in effect while the moratorium is in place and will be unaffected by a permanent ordinance prohibiting such conditional use permits which may be adopted during the moratorium period.

III. The City Can Utilize Those Remedies That Are Available To It For Violations Of The Municipal Code When Redressing Vacation Rentals That Are Operated Without Conditional Use Permits.

Any violation of Title 19 (Development Code) of the Municipal Code can be

redressed through a civil or criminal penalty. Section 19.90.080 provides that any person who violates the provisions of Title 19 shall be liable for a civil penalty "in compliance with the council's fee resolution for each day that the violation continues to exist." In addition, the person shall be liable for the costs incurred and the "damages suffered by the city, its agents, and agencies as a direct result of the violations." That section also provides that any person violating Title 19 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor which is punishable by a maximum fine of $1,000 or imprisonment in the county jail for a maximum period of 6 months, or both.

Alternatively, Section 1.12.010 sets forth penalties for a violation of any section of the Municipal Code. Under that section a violation may be punishable as an infraction.[3] An infraction carries with it a maximum fine of $250 for a first violation and $500 for any additional violation within a one-year period. The City can also impose an administrative fine for a violation of the Municipal Code which is determined in accordance with a schedule of penalties established by resolution of the City Council. SMC 1.12.010(D) and SMC Chapter 1.30 (in general).

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 996-9690 if you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further.

[3] The same penalty for a misdemeanor as recited above is also established by this section. As such, the act of operating a vacation rental without a conditional use permit can be prosecuted as either a misdemeanor or infraction, in accordance with the City's desire.

PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CITY OF SONOMA
City Council
Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item:	**7B**
Meeting Date:	**10/03/2016**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Administration	Carol E. Giovanatto, City Manager

Agenda Item Title

Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action to Approve Conversion of City Sonoma Clean Power (SCP) Electrical Accounts to Evergreen Program

Summary

On July 15, 2013, the Council approved an Ordinance authorizing Sonoma Clean Power to implement a community choice aggregation program for residential and commercial accounts in the City of Sonoma including all City electric accounts. In May of 2014, the City received notification that City electrical accounts had become eligible to participate and that SCP service would start automatically with basic Clean Start service which constituted a 36% renewal energy rate. At that time, the City opted in to the Clean Start program. The City maintains 42 total electrical accounts for all City facilities.

With the City's focus on Climate Protection and the Council Goal to "Expand focus on elements of the Climate 2020 Plan Targets; lead by example with the Sonoma community", staff has been doing an evaluation of the conversion of City electric accounts from the Clean Start program to the Evergreen program. The Evergreen program is 100% local, renewable power. It's a premium of $0.025 per kilowatt-hour or about 11% over the cost of average Clean Start service.
Staff delayed the evaluation for a period of time due to the LED street light upgrade project as the largest consumer of energy is the street light accounts. The project has been completed and the energy bills are typical enough to allow for an estimated annual usage calculation. Staff contacted SCP staff to complete the data calculations necessary to evaluate the conversion and benefits to the City. In a random staff survey of other Sonoma County cities, it appears that should the City of Sonoma convert to the Evergreen 100% renewal power, it would be the first city to make this commitment.

Staff has completed an analysis for conversion to the SCP Evergreen 100% renewable energy program to support the Council goal on Climate Action.

Recommended Council Action

Staff recommends Council approve the conversion of City electrical accounts through Sonoma Clean Power from the Clean Start Program to the Evergreen 100% renewable energy program.

Alternative Actions

Council discretion; remain under the Clean Start Program.

Financial Impact

The total increased costs to the City to convert to 100% Evergreen renewal energy is estimated to be approximately $19,200 annually. This cost would be spread as follows: $6,500 (General Fund); $8,500 (Gas Tax Fund); $4,200 (Water Fund).

Environmental Review	**Status**
☐ Environmental Impact Report	☐ Approved/Certified
☐ Negative Declaration	☐ No Action Required
☐ Exempt	☐ Action Requested
☐ Not Applicable	

Attachments:

City Accounts Breakdown

Alignment with Council Goals:

POLICY & LEADERSHIP: Expand focus on elements of the Climate 2020 Plan Targets; lead by example with the Sonoma community

Compliance with Climate 2020 Action Plan Target Goals:

cc:

CITY OF SONOMA ELECTRIC ACCOUNTS
ANALYSIS OF CONVERSION TO SONOMA CLEAN POWER 100% EVERGREEN ENERGY

Service Account Name	SCP Account Number	Invoice Total (Annual $)	EverGreen Premium (Annual $)	EverGreen Customer Total (Annual $)	
Total for:	1283035002	$189.12	$65.33	$254.45	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035004	$4,377.71	$1,512.00	$5,889.71	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035008	$55.55	$19.20	$74.75	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035014	$16,036.36	$5,540.88	$21,577.24	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035037	$146.06	$50.45	$196.51	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035040	$.91	$.30	$1.21	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035060	$25.23	$8.70	$33.93	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035070	$2,009.52	$538.88	$2,548.40	510-62001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035110	$6,196.45	$2,012.00	$8,208.45	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035165	$3.65	$1.20	$4.85	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035175	$.24	$.10	$.34	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035202	$4.48	$1.56	$6.04	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035211	$6.03	$1.89	$7.92	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035220	$.90	$.28	$1.18	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035223	$1,904.50	$702.84	$2,607.34	510-62001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035240	$3,288.63	$923.05	$4,211.68	100-42101-401-40401
Total for:	1283035242	$2,548.49	$787.09	$3,335.58	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035254	$30.60	$10.55	$41.15	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035267	$508.44	$189.63	$698.07	510-62001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035302	$109.99	$42.21	$152.20	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035365	$11.20	$3.55	$14.75	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035367	$43.86	$16.90	$60.76	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035402	$14.97	$5.21	$20.18	510-62001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035407	$1,848.74	$586.15	$2,434.89	510-62001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035443	$2,727.19	$925.69	$3,652.88	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035444	$3,225.25	$955.40	$4,180.65	510-62001-401-40401

Total for:	1283035488	-	$.00	$.00	
Total for:	1283035530	$3.27	$1.03	$4.30	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035575	$2,684.55	$1,068.68	$3,753.23	510-62001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035583	$760.88	$254.94	$1,015.82	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035587	$356.82	$123.80	$480.62	510-62001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035617	$162.58	$56.18	$218.76	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035683	$123.07	$46.04	$169.11	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035728	$29.92	$11.20	$41.12	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035752	$.07	$.03	$.10	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035802	-	$.00	$.00	
Total for:	1283035808	$774.80	$432.83	$1,207.63	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035839	$26.65	$9.20	$35.85	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035848	$3,788.27	$1,308.43	$5,096.70	302-51001-401-40401
Total for:	1283035866	$108.19	$41.44	$149.63	100-43020-401-40401
Total for:	1283035887	$2,748.32	$857.27	$3,605.59	100-43200-401-40401
Total for:	1283035956	$12.72	$3.89	$16.61	510-62001-401-40401
Grand Total:		**$56,894.18**	**$19,115.95**	**$76,010.13**	

$6,438	**Fund 100**
$8,503	**Fund 302**
$4,174	**Fund 510**
$19,116	

CITY OF SONOMA
City Council
Agenda Item Summary

City Council Agenda Item: 7C

Meeting Date: 10/03/2016

Department	**Staff Contact**
Administration	Carol E. Giovanatto, City Manager

Agenda Item Title

Discussion and Consideration of Input Received During Public Testimony on the Recruitment of the City Manager for the City of Sonoma

Summary

Since the announcement of the current City Manager's pending retirement, the City Council has been preparing for the process of securing a new City Manager. Applications for the position closed the end of September and the interview schedule will begin in October.

Prior to interviewing final candidates and in an effort to gain an understanding of the qualities the Council should consider when filling the City Manager position, the Council is providing the public with an opportunity to speak directly to the Council and provide comment on the *"preferred attributes, characteristics and knowledge base needed for the new City Manager".* Personal information will not be included in the discussion. The public will be allowed 3 minutes to speak.

The City Manager position is governed by the City's Municipal code (Chapter 2.08) and the process is being managed under the direction of the Executive Search Firm of Peckham & McKenney. Although many of the recruitment procedures are held under confidentiality statutes, the engagement of the successful candidate is critical to the success of the City. The Council is seeking this open public forum to assist them in finding the most qualified individual to fill the position as City Manager.

Recommended Council Action

Receive public testimony.

Alternative Actions

Council discretion.

Financial Impact

N/A

Environmental Review	**Status**
☐ Environmental Impact Report	☐ Approved/Certified
☐ Negative Declaration	☐ No Action Required
☐ Exempt	☐ Action Requested
☐ Not Applicable	

Attachments:

Municipal Code Chapter 2.08

Alignment with Council Goals:

Compliance with Climate 2020 Action Plan Target Goals:

cc:

Chapter 2.08
CITY MANAGER*

Sections:

2.08.010 Office created.
2.08.020 Residence.
2.08.030 Bond.
2.08.040 Temporary manager.
2.08.050 Compensation.
2.08.060 Removal of city manager.
2.08.070 Limitations on removal.
2.08.080 Powers and duties generally.
2.08.090 Law enforcement.
2.08.100 Authority over employees.
2.08.110 Power of appointment.
2.08.120 Reorganization of offices.
2.08.130 Ordinances.
2.08.140 Attendance at council meetings.
2.08.150 Financial reports.
2.08.160 Budget.
2.08.170 Purchasing agent.
2.08.180 Investigations.
2.08.190 Public buildings and equipment.
2.08.200 Hours of employment.
2.08.210 Additional duties.
2.08.220 Council-manager relations.
2.08.230 Departmental cooperation.
2.08.240 Attendance at commission meetings.
2.08.250 Authority to sign contracts and conveyances.
2.08.260 City manager designated as director of finance.
2.08.270 Duties of director of finance.
2.08.280 Revocation of ordinances.

*Code reviser's note: Wherever in this code the term "city administrator" is used, it shall be held to mean the "city manager."

2.08.010 Office created.

The office of city manager is created and established. The city manager shall be appointed by the city council wholly on the basis of his administrative and executive ability and qualifications, and shall hold office for and during the pleasure of the city council. (Ord. 377 § 1, 1967).

2.08.020 Residence.
Residence within the Sonoma Valley Unified School District at the time of appointment shall not be required as a condition of appointment, but within 180 days thereafter the city manager shall become a resident of the district, or the city council shall declare the office of city manager vacant.

No person elected or appointed to membership on the city council shall, subsequent to such election or appointment, be eligible for appointment as city manager until one year has elapsed after he has ceased to be a member of the city council. (Ord. 97-9 § 1, 1997; Ord. 377 § 2, 1967).

2.08.030 Bond.
The city manager shall furnish a corporate surety bond, to be approved by the city council in such sum as may be determined by the city council, conditioned upon the faithful performance of the duties imposed upon the city manager as herein prescribed. Any premium for such bond shall be a proper charge against the city. (Ord. 377 § 3, 1967).

2.08.040 Temporary manager.
The city manager shall appoint, subject to approval of the city council, one of the other officers or department heads of the city to serve as manager pro tempore during any temporary absence or disability of the city manager. In case of the absence or disability of the city manager and his failure to so appoint a manager pro tempore, the city council may designate some qualified city employee to perform the duties of city manager during the period of absence or disability of the city manager, subject, however, to the person furnishing a corporate surety bond conditioned upon faithful performance of the duties required to be performed as set forth in SMC 2.08.030. (Ord. 377 § 4, 1967).

2.08.050 Compensation.
A. The city manager shall receive such compensation and expense allowance as the city council shall, from time to time, determine and fix by resolution, and the compensation and expenses shall be a proper charge against such funds of the city as the city council designates.

B. Pursuant to Government Code Section 37683, the city manager shall receive $1.00 annually for each cemetery plot cared for within the city of Sonoma, to be paid only from the income of the cemetery fund. All such cemetery compensation actually paid shall be deducted from the amount otherwise provided for in annual compensation of the city manager. In the event that the income of the fund is insufficient, the city

manager shall only receive from the fund the amount earned or $1.00 per cemetery plot cared for, whichever is less.

C. The city manager shall be reimbursed for all sums necessarily incurred or paid by him or her in the performance of his or her duties, or incurred in traveling on business pertaining to the city under direction of the city council; reimbursement shall only be made, however, upon a verified itemized claim, setting forth the sums expended, and approved by the city council. (Ord. 92-17 § 1, 1992; Ord. 377 § 5, 1967).

2.08.060 Removal of city manager.
The city council shall appoint the city manager for an indefinite term and may remove him by a four-fifths vote of the whole city council. In the case of his intended removal, the city manager shall be furnished with written notice of such intention to be removed, at least 30 days before the date of such intended removal. Within seven days after receipt of such notice, the city manager may, by written notice, request a public hearing before the council, and thereafter the council shall fix a time for the public hearing at its usual meeting place, but before the expiration of the 30-day period, at which time the manager may appear and be heard.

In removing the city manager, the city council shall use its discretion, and its action shall be final and shall not depend on any showing or degree of proof at the hearing, the purpose of which is for the city manager to publicly present to the city council his grounds for opposition to removal prior to its action. (Ord. 377 § 6, 1967).

2.08.070 Limitations on removal.
Notwithstanding other sections of this chapter, the city manager shall not be removed from office during a period of 60 days next preceding any general municipal election held in the city at which election a member of the city council is elected, nor shall the city manager be removed from office during or within a period of 90 days next succeeding any general election held in the city at which election a member of the city council is elected. The purpose of this provision is to allow newly elected members of the city council to observe the actions and abilities of the city manager in the performance of the powers and duties of his office. After the expiration of this 150-day period, the provisions of SMC 2.08.060 as to the removal of the city manager shall apply and be effective. (Ord. 377 § 7, 1967).

2.08.080 Powers and duties generally.
The city manager shall be the administrative head of the government of the city under the direction and control of the city council, except as otherwise provided in this chapter or state law. He or she shall be responsible for the efficient administration of all the affairs of the city which are under his or her control. In addition to his or her general powers as administrative head of the city and not as a limitation thereon, it shall be his or her duty, and he or she shall have the powers set forth in SMC 2.08.090 through 2.08.210. In addition, the city manager is appointed, pursuant to Government Code Section 37683, as cemetery fund administrator. (Ord. 92-17 § 2, 1992; Ord. 377 § 8, 1967).

2.08.090 Law enforcement.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to see that all laws and ordinances of the city are duly enforced, and that all franchises, contracts, permits and privileges granted by the city are faithfully observed. (Ord. 377 § 8(a), 1967).

2.08.100 Authority over employees.
It shall be the duty of the city manager, and he shall have the authority to control, order and give directions to all heads of departments and to subordinates, officers and employees of the city under his jurisdiction through their department heads. (Ord. 377 § 8(b), 1967).

2.08.110 Power of appointment.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to, and the city manager shall, appoint, remove, promote and demote any and all officers and employees of the city, except the city attorney, subject to personnel rules and regulations as adopted by the city council. (Ord. 05-2008 § 1, 2008; Ord. 377 § 8(c), 1967).

2.08.120 Reorganization of offices.
It shall be the duty and responsibility of the city manager to recommend to the city council such reorganization of offices, positions, departments or units under his direction as may be indicated in the interest of efficient, effective and economical conduct of the city's business. (Ord. 377 § 8(d), 1967).

2.08.130 Ordinances.
It shall be the duty of the city manager, and he shall recommend to the city council for adoption, such measures and ordinances as he deems necessary or expedient. (Ord. 377 § 8(e), 1967).

2.08.140 Attendance at council meetings.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to attend all meetings of the city council unless excused therefrom, upon his own request, by the mayor or the council, or unless excused therefrom when his own removal is under consideration. (Ord. 377 § 8(f), 1967).

2.08.150 Financial reports.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to keep the city council at all times fully advised as to the financial conditions and needs of the city. (Ord. 377 § 8(g), 1967).

2.08.160 Budget.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to cause to be prepared and submitted to him by each department, division or service of the city government itemized annual estimates of expenditures required by any of them for capital outlay, salaries, wages and miscellaneous operating costs; to tabulate the same into a preliminary consolidated municipal budget, and submit the same to the city council before May 30th of each year, with his recommendation as to such changes which he deems advisable. (Ord. 97-9 § 2, 1997; Ord. 377 § 8(h), 1967).

2.08.170 Purchasing agent.
It shall be the duty of the city manager, and he shall be responsible for, the purchase of all supplies for all departments or divisions of the city. No expenditures shall be submitted or recommended to the city council except on report and approval of the city manager. (Ord. 377 § 8(i), 1967).

2.08.180 Investigations.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to make investigations into the affairs of the city, and any department or division thereof, and any contract, or the proper performance of any obligations of the city. He shall investigate all complaints in relation to matters concerning the administration of the city government, and in regard to services maintained by public utilities in the city. (Ord. 377 § 8(j), 1967).

2.08.190 Public buildings and equipment.
It shall be the duty of the city manager, and he shall exercise general supervision over, all public buildings, public parks and all other public property which is under the control and jurisdiction of the city council.

It shall be the duty of the city manager, and he shall, compile and keep up to date a complete inventory of all property, real and personal, owned by the city, and to recommend to the city council the purchase of new machinery, equipment and supplies, whenever in his judgment the same can be obtained at the best advantage, taking into consideration trade-in value of machinery and equipment in use. (Ord. 377 § 8(k), 1967).

2.08.200 Hours of employment.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to devote his entire working time to the duties of his office in the interests of the city. (Ord. 377 § 8(1), 1967).

2.08.210 Additional duties.
It shall be the duty of the city manager to perform such other duties and exercise such other powers as may be delegated to him from time to time by ordinance or resolution or other action of the city council. (Ord. 377 § 8(m), 1967).

2.08.220 Council-manager relations.
The city council and its members shall deal with the administrative services of the city only through the city manager, except for purposes of inquiry, and neither the city council nor any member thereof shall give orders to any subordinates of the city manager. The city manager shall take his orders and instructions from the city council only when sitting in a duly held meeting of the city council, and no individual councilman shall give any orders or instructions to the city manager. No individual councilman shall in any manner attempt to influence the city manager in the making of any appointment or in the purchase of supplies. (Ord. 377 § 9, 1967).

2.08.230 Departmental cooperation.
It shall be the duty of all subordinate officers, and the city attorney, to assist the city manager in administering the affairs of the city efficiently, economically, and

harmoniously, so far as to be consistent with their duties as prescribed by law and ordinances of the city. (Ord. 05-2008 § 1, 2008; Ord. 377 § 10, 1967).

2.08.240 Attendance at commission meetings.
The city manager may attend any and all meetings of the planning commission, public utilities commission, and any other commission, boards or committees, hereafter created by the city council, upon his own volition or upon direction of the city council. At such meetings which the city manager attends, he shall be heard by such commission, boards or committees, as to all matters upon which he wishes to address the members thereof, and he shall inform the members as to the status of any matter being considered by the city council, and he shall cooperate to the fullest extent with the members of all commissions, boards or committees, appointed by the city council. (Ord. 377 § 11, 1967).

2.08.250 Authority to sign contracts and conveyances.
Pursuant to Government Code Section 40602, the city manager has the same authority as the mayor of the city to sign written contracts and conveyances made or entered into by the city when expressly authorized by appropriate resolution or motion of the city council in particular cases, and either may sign if so authorized. (Ord. 93-18 § 1, 1993).

2.08.260 City manager designated as director of finance.
The city manager or his/her designee is hereby designated as the director of finance of the city of Sonoma and shall assume all financial and accounting duties and responsibilities identified by the applicable portions of staff law and local ordinance. (Ord. 96-1 § 1, 1996).

2.08.270 Duties of director of finance.
The director of finance shall assume all duties and responsibilities concerning certification and approval of payrolls previously performed by the city clerk before the creation of the office of director of finance as referred to and provided for in California Government Code Section 37207, et seq., including the signing of city warrants. (Ord. 96-1 § 2, 1996).

2.08.280 Revocation of ordinances.
Any motion, resolution or ordinance to the contrary of SMC 2.08.260 is hereby revoked. (Ord. 96-1 § 3, 1996).

Mobile Version

CITY OF SONOMA
City Council
Agenda Item Summary

Agenda Item:	**9**
Meeting Date:	**10/03/2016**

Department	**Staff Contact**
Administration	Rebekah Barr, MMC City Clerk/Executive Assistant to the City Manager

Agenda Item Title

Councilmembers' Reports on Committee Activities.

Summary

Council members will report on activities, if any, of the various committees to which they are assigned.

MAYOR GALLIAN	MPT AGRIMONTI	CLM. COOK	CLM. EDWARDS	CLM. HUNDLEY
City Audit Committee	LOCC North Bay Division Liaison	ABAG Alternate	ABAG Delegate	Cittaslow Sonoma Valley Advisory Council, Alt.
Marin/Sonoma Mosquito & Vector Control District	North Bay Watershed Association	City Audit Committee	Cittaslow Sonoma Valley Advisory Council	LOCC North Bay Division Liaison, Alternate
Sonoma County Mayors & Clm. Assoc. BOD	Sonoma County Mayors & Clm. Assoc. BOD, Alt.	City Facilities Committee	City Facilities Committee	Sonoma Clean Power Alt.
Sonoma County Trans. Authority & Regional Climate Protection Authority	Sonoma County Trans. & Regional Climate Protection Authority, Alternate	Oversight Board to the Dissolved CDA	Oversight Board to the Dissolved CDA, Alt.	Sonoma County M & C Assoc. Legislative Committee
Sonoma Disaster Council	Sonoma County Waste Management Agency	Sonoma Clean Power	Sonoma County Health Action & SV Health Roundtable	S. V. Citizens Advisory Commission
Sonoma Housing Corporation	Sonoma Disaster Council, Alternate	S.V. Economic Vitality Partnership, Alt.	Sonoma County M & C Assoc. Legislative Committee, Alt.	S.V. Economic Vitality Partnership
S.V.C. Sanitation District BOD	Sonoma Housing Corporation	S. V. Library Advisory Committee	Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Comm. Alt.	S. V. Library Advisory Committee, Alternate
S.V. Fire & Rescue Authority Oversight Committee	S.V.C. Sanitation District BOD, Alt.			
VOM Water District Ad Hoc Committee	S.V. Fire & Rescue Authority Oversight Committee			
Water Advisory Committee	VOM Water District Ad Hoc Committee, Alternate			
	Water Advisory Committee, Alternate			

Recommended Council Action – Receive Reports

Attachments: None