



County of Sonoma
Permit & Resource Management Department

Sonoma County Planning Commission Draft Minutes

Permit Sonoma
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

November 3, 2022
Meeting No.: 22-20

Roll Call

Commissioner District 1 Carr
Commissioner District 3 Ocana
Commissioner District 4 McCaffery
Commissioner District 5 Koenigshofer
Commissioner District 2, Chair Reed

Staff Members

Scott Orr, Deputy Director
Brian Oh, Division Manager
Tasha Levitt, Secretary
Sita Kuteira, Deputy County Counsel

12:00 PM Call to order, Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Minutes None

Correspondence

Board of Zoning Adjustments/Board of Supervisors Actions

Commissioner Announcements

Public Comments on matters not on the Agenda: 0m0s

Public Comments on matters not on the Agenda will resume at the end of the hearing. 0h19m
Kathy Pons

Items scheduled on the agenda

Planning Commission Regular Calendar

Item No.: 1
Time: 12:05 PM
File: PLP22-0024; Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan
Applicant: County of Sonoma
Owner: State of California
Cont. from: N/A
Staff: Brian Oh
Env. Doc: Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), SCH#2022020222

Proposal: The proposed project (Project) includes creating a Specific Plan to regulate redevelopment of the state-owned Sonoma Developmental Center located in Sonoma Valley at 15000 Arnold Dr., The property encompasses approximately 945 acres, or about 1.5 square miles, which includes a developed Core Campus covering approximately 180 acres, the surrounding approximately 755 acres of contiguous open space, and the 11-acre, non-contiguous Camp Via grounds within Jack London State Historic Park. The Project proposes to reduce the existing developed Core Campus for redevelopment of up to 1,000 units of various housing types and 410,000 square feet of non-residential use (170,000 square feet of new non-residential use and 240,000 square feet of adaptive reuse of existing buildings) to accommodate 940 jobs. Additionally, the Project proposes policies, design guidelines and development standards. Adoption of the Project will require general plan amendments to maps and policies of the Land Use Element and other elements, as well zoning code and map changes.

Recommended Action:

1. Complete a public hearing for the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report
2. Approve a resolution recommending that the Board of Supervisors certify a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan, with a statement of overriding considerations and findings of fact pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
3. Approve a resolution recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt general plan amendments to maps and policies of the Land Use Element and other elements to enable the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan, adopt the Specific Plan, and approve zoning code and map changes

Location: 15000 Arnold Dr., Eldridge
APN: 054-090-001
District: One
Zoning: PF (Public Facilities)

Staff Scott Orr stated to the public, we are still waiting for the rest of our Commissioners to log in, we have two right now which is not enough to start the meeting and didn't want everyone waiting to join. We will give it 10 minutes and see what we've got. **0h00m**

Commissioner Reed called the meeting to order and stated that there is a time constraint of 5pm today. **0h18m**

Commissioner Reed stated we're going to continue to hone in on the Sonoma Developmental Center and as we left it last time, Commissioner Carr had some specific comments he wanted to make in note form. He asked Brian how to proceed. **Staff Brian Oh** stated we left off last Thursday with Commissioner Carr identifying a number of key issues that would help inform his deliberative process. So, Commissioner Carr shared that this morning with Staff and have it remediated and ready to post. Now that the hearing is open, he'll have it distributed unless he hears otherwise. **0h21m**

Staff Scott Orr stated the reason we're going through this format is for the sake of efficiently. The Commission asked Commissioner Carr to write all this down, so what we're going to proposed is that once it's uploaded for all members of the public and the Commission to see, rather than Commissioner Carr reading it all we're going to propose a 10 minute recess for everyone to read focus on it. **0h21m**

Staff Scott Orr stated so it's basically an extension of the deliberative process hat will give us a little jumpstart in digesting the content. **0h21m**

Commissioner Carr stated his unthinking intention to get it to you much earlier ran into some obvious Brown Act problems and Staff was correct and trying to facilitate this the best way we could and still meet our legal mandate. So take a look at it now, it kind of summarizes what we did last week and the rest of his ideas. Hopefully you guys will be able to absorb enough of it. **0h22m**

Staff Scott Orr explained how to navigate to the new materials online. **0h23m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he tried to send Scott a few paragraphs but that it comes in a format that can't be opened. **Staff Scott Orr** responded when we go on recess staff will take that time to figure out how to open the document. **0h24m**

Staff Brian Oh stated to members of the public that if they've subscribed to the Planning Commission through GovDelivery, that just dropped in their inbox as well. **0h25m**

Commissioner Reed asked if we want to recess to a specific time and suggested 12:40pm. **Staff Scott Orr** responded that would be good. **0h25m**

Staff Scott Orr stated now that everyone has had some time, now would be a good time to talk about how we want to kind of work through today or however you want to take us forward, chair. **0h40m**

Commissioner Reed stated thanks to Commissioner Carr for his notes. We'll hopefully be able to get through all these today. He suggests to step back and look at the outline for the entire plan, chapter by chapter, maybe starting with some of the less controversial chapters to get a sense, a straw vote, to see if we feel the edits and the public comments have been addressed at least. **0h40m**

Commissioner Reed stated then at each of those chapters identify for your comments and other Commissioner's comments where we want to come back and focus most of our energy, knowing that we're trying to get back to each chapter and try to get closure on it. Does that sound good Commissioners? **0h41m**

Commissioner Carr stated his feeling is going through the chapter by chapter, page by page at this point will lead us into the begging the bigger picture question. That's why he was hoping we could go through the bigger, fly over fifty thousand feet using my suggestion list, and then if we still need to after that, go back and look at chapter by chapter. That's his preference. **0h41m**

Commissioner Reed stated his sense of schedule, if he understands correctly and maybe Counsel can weigh in, at the end of the day we have to adopt the resolution for the specific plan and certify the EIR. And that our recommendations are going to be above and beyond the plan. We will put that plan forward, with our recommendations, so we're not physically going to change the plan, right? Going through the plan and getting everybody, are we good with community design. Maybe go community design because there's a lot in there that people like about the plan. Obviously things like land use and open space are things where you may want to have much more detailed kind of comment and see if we have some consensus. **0h42m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked when you said that we're not going to change the plan, as an example on Greg's item number five. Are we considering that change to the plan? It seems like a lot of the stuff that we're developing is some definition of change the plan. **0h43m**

Commissioner Reed stated maybe Staff can weigh in. It's his understanding that the plan will stand and our recommendations will be beyond that. **Staff Scott Orr** stated he envisions if the Commission elects to move the project forward, that it would be recommend approval with modifications to the Board of Supervisors. So we've got the product as is and then we'll have a list of all the proposed modifications. **0h43m**

Staff Scott Orr stated using your example, should the Commission want to rename that from preserved open space, the recommendation would include changing it to Parkland. That's his understanding and asked Counsel if they had the same understanding as what Chair Reed discussed. **County Counsel, Sita Kuteira**, responded the goal would be to have a document that looks like attachment three in the packet that lists out all the policies with any amendments. **0h44m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated so the process would be, just the mechanics of it for the reader, would be that they would get an attachment with a list of whatever proposed changes we have, and then they would have to go back and forth between that document and the draft plan to match them up to figure it out. **Staff Brian Oh** responded what we'd be doing is one document that is very clear what the public draft policy looks like with any of the revisions staff has already published two weeks ago. Any additional recommendations for changes the Planning Commission recommends would be reflective in that document. So to track the change you look at one Specific Policy, the existing one there's how it's being proposed to change by the Planning Commission. **0h45m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked so we're not going back and forth between a list and the document, you're seeing a document with the original language, plus staff and Planning Commission proposed changes. **Staff Brian Oh** responded correct. **0h46m**

Commissioner Reed stated if we use that attachment 3, called draft specific plan goals and policies as amended 1821, that picks up all the current goals and policies and the amendments based on the public comment. So if we go through that document, we can add to that the Planning Commission documents and the becomes the overriding document we send to the Board of Supervisors. **Staff Brian Oh** responded correct. **0h46m**

Commissioner Carr stated there are also changes to the maps and text that all has to be sort of made internally consistent. **0h46m**

Commissioner Reed suggested, last meeting Brian put up that slide with all the chapters and we sort of started at the top with vision and guiding principles and spent quite a bit of time there. He suggested we followed the same outline, but maybe dive down into community design. Look at this attachment three and confirm that Commissioners are on board with Staff changes per public comment and use it as an outline to move forward through chapter by chapter. **0h47m**

Commissioner Carr stated not the way he'd prefer but he's willing to venture off down that path and see where we go. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** added he has no idea what it looks like so he'll follow along. **0h47m**

Staff Scott Orr asked for clarification on what page he was talking about. **Commissioner Carr** clarified you're talking about attachment three the draft specific plan, goals, and policies? **0h47m**

Commissioner Reed clarified the page number being requested. **Staff Scott Orr** recommended starting on page 22. **0h48m**

Commissioner Reed stated he's suggesting this one because there were very few edits, and it might just be a way for us to get a sense of how to go through this efficiently and quickly and get some consensus that the Commissioners are on board, or we're way off. **0h48m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked for clarification on which part of the document is being discussed. **0h49m**

Commissioner Reed stated it starts on Chapter two but the 42-page document complies all the goals and policies and makes edits for staff to public comment. It's the guiding document right now. **Commissioner Carr** clarified if he's talking about starting at chapter five or using attachment three. **0h49m**

Commissioner Reed clarified using Chapter 3 starting at Chapter 5. He asked staff to put up the outline. There's a variety of chapters and we know we're going to have some discussions through land use and open space that we may not all agree on. It would be great to start with the goals and policies of public realm and see where they stand there and knock a few off. **0h50m**

Staff Brian Oh clarified his understanding of the proposal. Last week offered an outline from start to finish on the specific plan goals and policies and to the chairs point, we spent the bulk of Thursday discussing a number of big picture concepts as well as chapter one, chapter two and we touched on three. We touched on land use with number of units, affordability, provisions and so on. He's hearing interest to complete the big picture items across the 7 chapters and potentially Conditions of approval, so we get a clear sense of what's in front of us and go policy by policy. **0h51m**

Commissioner Carr stated he likes talking big picture first. Big picture things we started talking about last, the boundary of the open space and core and who's going to be responsible for the park and what goes on in the core. We almost got to agreement on that, and would feel really good if we could get that settled before we go into the Chair's suggestion. He thinks there's a real advantage to setline this open space park plan element of this plan, so we can focus more on just the core area. **0h52m**

Commissioner Reed stated he was a little confused at the last meeting in terms of where those comments were going to be directed and that's why he keeps coming back to this document, the goals and policies, and is

wondering if those open space comments can get directed into this outline of open space management framework. There's already been staff edits to strengthen the plan and it seems like we may not need to strengthen it. Or, you may not agree with some of the edits that are in the plan, and that we just take it policy by policy. 0h53m

Commissioner Carr stated you're the chair so you get to decide. He thinks we came very close to a tentative agreement on the parkland and core boundary. We were going to have a response back from staff on their discussion with Parks and were going to have them try to produce a map. 0h53m

Commissioner Carr stated those are clear changes on certain documents in the plan and thinks it helps inform our review of the draft goals and policies. 0h54m

Commissioner Reed asked if the maps got produced. **Commissioner Carr** stated he hasn't seen them. 0h54m

Staff Brian Oh stated we have had discussions with directors and Ag and Open Space and Regional Parks and all questions that were raised on Thursday. He did not get a clear sense that the map shall change, so once that is settled, which is another reason I do think we should try and get through the plan itself, staff would be preparing any of those changes that there is a majority consensus for us to make those changes. We have been taking notes and have clear direction on what the Commission is interested in making revisions to. 0h54m

Commissioner Reed stated it seems the edits in the goals and policies support some of the direction that can ensure our comments from the last meeting, without a map. Without a map, he doesn't know how we consolidate that comment other than try to edit the goals and policies, because that's what's reinforcing the plan. 0h55m

Staff Scott Orr stated as the staff person whose primary job is to make sure all the Commissioners are happy, he's in kind of a rock and a hard place. He recommends to try working through as Chair Reed suggested, and if the Commission finds that maybe it isn't as productive as we are hoping for, maybe we can have discussion about changing it. We can probably debate how we want to talk about it for the rest of the meeting, but it might be good to just dive in and reassess how it's going. 0h56m

Commissioner Reed stated we're going to dive right into community realm, presuming everybody's had a chance to review the edits. It's interesting this policy and goals kind of reinforce the sense of community which begins to sort of frame the context for unit counts and everything else. As a landscape architect, he's pretty impressed with the streetscape, the park space, the open space, the relationship to architecture and everything else. It looked like in the policies 2.1 in particular, there were edits there that reinforces the emphasis on open space, so this might be an easy one to get some consensus on from fellow Commissioners and give a thumbs up if we agree with the edits that have been made and move on. 0h57m

Commissioner McCaffery stated he agrees with the edits that have been made. The plan is really strong in this area and thinks staff has done a lot of really good work. 0h58m

Commissioner Carr clarified which section is being discussed. **Staff Scott Orr** clarified. 0h58m

Commissioner Carr stated there's some changes he'd like to suggest as we get through this section. 0h58m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he's sorry that the format of the document he forwarded couldn't be opened by staff. He intended it be forward to everyone to follow along. He clarified where we are in the documents. 0h59m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he understands the County can't dictate to the State it's procedure, but consistent with this section, the specific plan can suggest to the state the course of action relative to achieving what this section deals with. 1h00m

Commissioner Reed and **Staff Scott Orr** clarified which part of the document is being discussed. 1h00m

Staff Scott Orr stated to Commissioner Koenigshofer, we were able to do some document conversion, so when we get to open space, we'll be able to share your comments. 1h01m

Commissioner Reed stated looking at the goals and policies, it really does reinforce complete streets, traffic mitigations, scale, architectural scale of streets. In his mind, this is one of the benefits of the plan. This plan is a visionary or aspirational plan and would suggest that the public realm goals and policies reinforce a wonderful neighborhood for the plan. **1h01m**

Commissioner Reed stated he completely agrees with Commissioner Reed's overview and thinks the basic design of the plan is pretty good, but does have some suggested changes because he thinks there are things that can be improved in the design. He's happy to go to those at whatever point is appropriate. **1h02m**

Commissioner Reed stated he thinks you should start. He presumes other Commissioners may have topics. Please proceed. **1h02m**

Commissioner Carr stated policy 5-2 basically requires sidewalks in front of all streets. He thinks that should be in front of all streets that are accommodating development. There are some streets proposed to feed into the open space area after the passes of developed area and we want to be careful about having paved streets go into the open space area. There ought to be a little bit of a qualifier there. He has no problem with streets wherever there the developed portion of the plan exist. **1h03m**

Commissioner Carr asked street lighting and if acorn lighting is downfacing. **Commissioner Reed** responded he thinks so. **1h04m**

Commissioner Carr stated he's okay with acorn lighting but has a suspicion they're not. **Staff Brian Oh** responded he sees the note and will follow up. **1h04m**

Commissioner Carr stated if acorn lighting is down-facing he's okay with it, otherwise he's opposed. He likes that sort of notion that the lighting along the pedestrian walkways not be at the same distance separation all the way through the streets. **1h04m**

Commissioner Carr stated he'd like to see more flexibility as long as the safety issues are addressed. he'd like to see some staggering of the street light where appropriate. It's a much nicer design and would still provide safety of the people there. He's concerned nowhere in the plan has any signage controls. Signage is a huge issue in any kind of urban development like this. He suggested including a recommendation that signage standards, particularly along Arnold Drive and historic core portions that are reflective of the historic nature of those areas. **1h05m**

Commissioner Reed asked Staff, given the policies and goals are aspirational and it seems like they're trying to protect the historic nature and build on that, that's the comment of the acorn lights and everything else. There is a provision for design review down the road. Do we leave the policies more aspiration and leave it to design review to answer those things? He doesn't think anybody wants to see crazy signs out there. The way design review works would protect us from that, there is some review. **1h06m**

Commissioner Carr stated the concern with this plan is it doesn't require any historical style anywhere that isn't there. It explicitly says, it does not require a historical style. The only historical requirements are for a building that is to be retained in its existing form, such as the main building or some of the residences. It allows the developer to do any kind of building style they want. That's too loose and he's not opposed to having some flexibility in there, but it seems especially in the historic core. He's not saying we should develop those standards now, but that staff or the implementing agency have some kind of signage standards that can be part of the open space plan for the core. **1h07m**

Commissioner Carr stated we should recommend that signage standards be developed prior to there being any design review approval. **1h08m**

Commissioner Reed stated that would be fine. Having working on historic structures and communities like that, a lot of it is deferred to the architects, given the clear direction that this is historic neighborhood and there's historic standards that architects have to adhere to in terms of new construction and everything else. He thinks those guardrails are built into the plan, given the policies and goals. If we need to beef that up, he's okay with

that, but so we don't get bogged down, he'd like to get some consensus that we feel the plan as proposed is really forward thinking and we support it. 1h08m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated relative to lighting, would it be useful to include a statement that would apply generally to all aspects of development and redevelopment, that lighting would comply with the dark skies standards. He asked if that's the right link. **Commissioner Reed** responded he believes that's in the plan.

Commissioner Carr added it is. 1h09m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked about the reference to acorn lighting and this style of lighting.

Commissioner Reed responded he believes the intention was to maintain some of the historic character of the neighborhoods and to try to use that, and it says to the extent possible. 1h10m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he's seen on some new structures in Santa Rosa, there's downward directed lighting but it's no shielded, so in terms of light pollution it's not very effective avoider of it. 1h10m

Commissioner Reed stated he we're in the public realm goals and policies and he thinks lighting is a discussion because the historic nature of this lighting is unique and one of the goals and policies is to try to integrate the existing lighting. If we don't agree with that, we can just take that out, and then there would just be new lighting per lighting standards. 1h10m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he's thinking for example, the potential outcome on the east side if all of those buildings are raised and new construction. Do you see from your professional perspective Larry, potentially calling for a slightly different standard on areas that would be entirely or mostly new development.

1h11m

Commissioner Reed stated he imagines anything outside of the historic core would be new development. In his experience in the historic core, the historic architectural standards don't want a historic theme in new architecture, they want architecture that's new and complementary to the historic architecture. All those standards are in place for the historic core, so he doesn't know that we need to protect it. 1h12m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked aren't some of the buildings called for retention outside of the historic core? **Commissioner Carr** responded yes. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated he doesn't claim anything that approaches your expertise, but spent several years on the Landmarks Commission and sometimes was frustrated that once something met the Secretary of Interiors design stands, the discussion kind of ended, as being compliant, as opposed to some more localized standards. So how does that factor in here? 1h12m

Commissioner Reed stated it seems what he reads into the public realm is that the historic significance is in the historic core, so any new architecture in the core will be responsive to the historic resources.

Commissioner Carr responded but the plan does not say that. He thinks the plan should say that but it does not. 1h13m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated it seems like it suggests that, but he doesn't see it. **Commissioner Reed** responded he thinks it says that any architecture should comply with historic standards. So, those standards all there. 1h14m

Commissioner Carr stated but that's only for historic buildings. So if you have, for example, on the core, some buildings that are historic that would remain and some that are not contributing that are to be removed, and maybe not say specifically provide buildings that replace those removable buildings would be in a historic styles. That's one of things we should definitely add to make this plan clear. **Commissioner Reed** responded we should move off of the historic topic and save it for the historic topic. He stated there would be review for any new construction in the historic core by the Landmarks Commission. So that would be reviewed for compliance with the historical context. 1h14m

Commissioner Reed stated what they don't like is a sort historic theming of things, and any new construction on a building that's not in the historic core would also comply with those historic standards. It's all in the goals and policies of the historic chapter. 1h15m

Staff Scott Orr stated he really thinks 5-13 really gets to everything we've been talking about in terms of the lighting, historic, honoring the history and dark sky. It's all in there. It includes a staggering arrangement for lights. He's wondering what key component of that may be missing to kind of put a bow on everything we just discussed. **1h15m**

Commissioner Carr stated there's a couple things with 5-13. One has to do with the requirement for all street frontages. He doesn't think where the street is going toward the wildlife corridor edge should be lit in any kind of way that's going to disturb wildlife. Maybe there would be street fronts that do not have pedestrian oriented lighting. **1h16m**

Commissioner Carr stated the last sentence says you can use acorn fixtures even if they aren't dark sky lighting. He's saying let's do all dark sky lighting and in historical styles in those areas of the plan where historical character is important. **Commissioner Reed** asked if he's suggesting we delete 5.5. **1h17m**

Commissioner Carr stated the problem is 5-5 is inconsistent with 5-13. 5-13 says you will use acorn and dark sky for other. 5.5 says if feasible. He asked what are we asking for, dark sky in all lighting and different styles in the short core? Or are we asking for acorn, even though it's not dark. **Commissioner Reed** stated providing the opportunity that in the public realm that we have the ability to reuse some of the acorn lights, if necessary. So, it's not mandated. Certainly the dark sky would dictate over the top. If it's not dark sky, then I don't think those fixtures would be allowed anywhere **1h17m**

Commissioner Ocana stated appreciation for the concern for historical character. We are spending a lot of time on nuances that will be addressed during the design review period. She asked if we could add a line in 5-13 that would say "sensitive to the wildlife corridor". She thinks we need lighting on all pedestrian streets at night, that's just a safety precaution, but does appreciate it should be sensitive to areas open space areas. **1h18m**

Commissioner Carr suggested to change the wording to add the word "pedestrian" so instead of "all streets" it says "all pedestrian streets". **Commissioner Ocana** asked what about driving streets that are alongside the open space, we still have to have lighting on the streets. **1h19m**

Commissioner Carr stated all he's saying is the lighting should be driven by the use of the property not whether it's a street because he's imagining there are going to be streets where pedestrian lighting is not necessary. He's arguing for flexibility on this. **1h19m**

Commissioner Reed stated when he looked at the diagrams, there's an emphasis on the public realm on these complete streets, with the emphasis of actually moving pedestrians, moving bicycles, and less cars. We do want to respect the light that's associated with moving people through those streets and obviously we should be sensitive to the wildlife corridor. He thinks that would be taken care of with the goals and policies in open space. **1h20m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated retaining the historic acorn lighting in the historic, particularly on the main entrance, is fine. With regard to stuff outside the historic district, adherence to the dark sky standards would be his preference. **1h21m**

Commissioner McCaffery stated he thinks the way it's written makes complete sense and to add something to say sensitivity to the wildlife corridor and then we're done. If we're nit picking this thing we're never going to get through it. **1h21m**

Commissioner Reed stated we're just getting warmed up. He asked if Commissioner Carr has any more discussions. He'd like to get a straw vote to see if we're okay with making that amendment to consider the wildlife corridor and kind of leaving it at that. **1h21m**

Commissioner Carr stated well the Commission isn't accepting any of my other recommendations, then we better straw vote it and move on. **1h22m**

Commissioner Carr asked staff for a straw vote. **Staff Scott Orr** responded what he heard the straw vote is on is basically accepting this with the additional policy language that it should be sensitive to Wildlife corridor regarding lighting. **1h22m**

Commissioner Carr asked if we can also do a straw vote on the signage standards? **Commissioner Reed** stated his suggestion is to do this quick straw vote and note Commissioner Carr's comments and then come back to them. Once we get through and kind of see where we stand in the whole plan, we'll come back and do a final debate on these items. Maybe staff will have a little more feedback when we get there. For now, if more of us are in agreement we should proceed to the next chapter. **1h22m**

Staff Scott Orr stated we'll do a verbal in case anyone is listening. **Commissioner Carr** stated he thought you wanted to vote on the whole chapter 5, because he has some other suggested changes for 5. **Commissioner McCaffery** stated he thought we were voting on all of Chapter 5 with that addition. **1h24m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer suggested we vote on 5-13 suggested and then the whole package. **Commissioner Reed** stated he suggests voting on the whole thing. If Commissioner Carr has more things to discuss before we get to the straw vote, let's flag them but we got to keep moving otherwise we'll never get through the full report. He asked Commissioner Carr if he has other concerns. **1h24m**

Commissioner Carr stated several policies referred to policies that would apply to the open space area outside of the core. He doesn't all of those policies or their versions should be excluded from this plan and we should make clear in every case where there's the term planning area, as the applicable area to be affected by a policy, he thinks that should be changed to say the core. He advocates for removing all language that might suggest policies or standards to the open space area and defer those activities to the parks to decide. **1h25m**

Commissioner Reed asked for clarification on which section Commissioner Carr was discussing. **Commissioner Carr** responded. **1h25m**

Commissioner Reed asked if there a term he prefers to planning area. **Commissioner Carr** responded, yes the core area. **1h26m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he's reading chapter five as applying only to the core area. **Commissioner Carr** responded he feels that's the intention, but where it's using terminology that isn't clear, let's make it clear. Anytime there's the term planning area, that refers to the entire 900 acres, so he wants that to be amended to make sure it only applies to the core. **1h26m**

Commissioner Carr stated the other policy he's concerned about, he's not necessarily opposed to them, but thinks they suggest historical provisions which should await completion of the historic preservation plan, which is a recommended plan to be accomplished after the landowner takes over. 5-21, 5-38 and 5-42, 5 K, 5L and 5-52 and 5-53. **1h27m**

Commissioner Reed stated Staff, correct me if I'm wrong, but the policies are supposed to reinforce each other, right? So if there's a policy in here that address the historic resources, it's meant to reinforce what's in the historic resources chapter and if they don't reinforce each other, they should be amended. What he's reading reinforces what's already been stated in the historic districts. **1h28m**

Staff Brian Oh stated he thinks the nuance he's picking up from Commissioner Carr's statement is that maybe there's a way to modify the historic preservation plan policy, so that it and all other historic preservation policies are a component of the larger plan, if he understands that correctly. **1h28m**

Commissioner Reed stated so they'd take precedent over some other policy. **Staff Brian Oh** agreed. **1h28m**

Commissioner Carr stated the other thing is there's going to be a lot more opportunity in that historic preservation plan for advocates from different points of views, both architectural and community and Landmarks Commission and others to weigh in on that plan in much more detailed ways than we can do here. We're too hurried at this point to really focus on what details should be in that historic preservation plan. The draft plan recommends that the historic preservation plan be completed at outset. **Commissioner Reed** responded he believes that's the intention. **1h29m**

Commissioner Carr stated if we could at least put a disclaimer in those policies that deal with historic preservation in this chapter ,to say attending the completion of a historic preservation plan. **Commissioner Reed** stated that sounds good. 1h30m

Commissioner Reed asked staff to put something together to address those and suggested doing a straw vote given those comments, and move on to the next chapter. 1h30m

Straw Vote # 1

Commissioner Carr	Aye
Commissioner Ocana	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Absent
Commissioner Reed	Aye

Commissioner Carr stated he doesn't know if this is a design issue or a land issue, but there's the idea of solar panels on the rooftops and he knows there's a lot of energy conservation and microgrid and really good things in this plan. He asked from staff's perspective, does this push solar panels on the rooftop kind of thing enough, or is there something that could be added that would stress that? **Staff Brian Oh** responded he does think it's sufficient at addressing some of the big picture goals of energy conservation and a focus on renewable energies. If there's an additional policy the Commission would like to recommend, this is the opportunity. 1h31m

Commissioner Carr stated the old school policy was always that buildings with rooftops facing south would be the way to do it. The passive design wouldn't be encouraged and the orientation of any solar panels that people want to put on their roof, is there something like that? **Staff Scott Orr** responded he thinks it's a moot point, we're going to be preempted by the building code with mandatory solar through the building code. It's come for commercial and residential, and not too many buildings don't fall into one of those. Even if we put specific, strong language one way or the other, it's going to have to happen as par of the building code. 1h32m

Commissioner Carr stated then he's find not worrying about it if it's going to happen. We had a comment from an affordable developer who was pretty insistent that 35 feet was the appropriate height wasn't needed as a maximum height for affordable housing projects. He asked if it's worth putting in a design provision that would allow a design provision to go to 35 feet, or is that land use and development stuff. **Staff Brian Oh** responded we do have proposed maximum heights by districts. There's also height maximums and limitations through the development standards within this chapter. 1h33m

Staff Brian Oh stated there's a couple of ways to look at that. If you're looking to maximize production of affordable housing opportunities throughout the site, we could have that as a potential use for more districts. 1h34m

Commissioner Carr asked if staff could look through the height limits at some point and see if there's anything we need to do. He realized that as an affordable housing developer you come in and ask for waivers of some of the standards as an incentive. Perhaps that's addressed through that process but he wants to ensure a five foot difference in height doesn't keep an affordable housing project at bay that might otherwise be important. 1h34m

Commissioner Carr asked are all of the standards, be they design standards, or building heights, are any of those things waivable for an affordable housing based on state law. **Staff Scott Orr** responded depending on the level of affordability there are certain incentives that can be applied to projects that have affordability. Additionally, our affordable housing chapter allows for something called an alternative equivalent, which basically says it may not be exactly some of the examples we have, but we can approve something that looks a little different, providing it's still meeting the same affordability goals. 1h35m

Staff Scott Orr stated with this plan or otherwise, we're always looking for way to make things work to fit the parcel in the area for the sake of affordable housing. We don't want, like you said, something like a five foot difference being the difference between an affordable housing project or not. 1h36m

Commissioner Carr stated so even if the specific plan as opposed to the code, a specific plan has those limitations they're eligible for modification. **Staff Scott Orr** responded right, and depending on whether it's just a

design review application a use permit application, it might be a design review committee allowing for additional height, it might be the BZA, but there's always a possibility. We'll put an asterisk on that thought and just make sure there isn't anything that would prevent your point. **1h36m**

Commissioner Reed stated he sees a hand raised and reminded those attending that we closed the public hearing last meeting and will not be taking any more comments today. **1h37m**

Commissioner Carr stated if we're not going to start in on another section, he does have a couple general questions. He stated apparently there's a change to the fire zone designations in the works by the state that's supposed to be coming around sometime early next year or something and asked if those fire zone designations change in a way that affects this specific plan, in terms of it's policies and layout. **Staff Scott Orr** responded State regulation is always going to trump local, and if there are aspects of the plan that are no longer in compliance with State level, we'd have to look at whether it might take a specific plan amendment, or some other process. He asked if Counsel wanted to weigh in. **1h38m**

County Counsel stated she agrees with Scott's statements. There are areas of the planning area already within the State responsibility are so they're subject to title 14 regulations governing those state responsibility areas. If anything was redesignated, any development that comes along at that point would be subject to those updated standards. **1h39m**

Commissioner Carr stated the Attorney General came out with guidelines pertaining to development in wildfire areas and asked if staff looked at that at all and does that have any implication for the specific plan. **Staff Brian Oh** stated we received the publication and looked at it as it relates to the analysis we did and feel that we are in line with the guidance that was released. **1h39m**

Commissioner Carr asked so, you're not foreseeing any problems there? **Staff Brian Oh** responded no. **1h40m**

Commissioner Reed asked if staff wanted to take a break. **Staff Brian Oh** responded Commissioner Koenigshofer's internet is out and will be joining momentarily by phone. **Staff Brian Oh** added maybe now is a good time for a bathroom break and we'll return at 1:50pm. **1h40m**

Commissioner Reed stated welcome back everyone. Mr. Koenigshofer, you didn't miss much. We were just getting some clarifying questions and think we got some closure on the public realm. He asked if we want to move to chapter 6, public facilities. There were just a couple of staff edits from public comment, mostly relating to portions of the exiting sewer system. **1h49m**

Staff Brian Oh stated he apologizes for the formatting issue for chapter 6 and clarified where it starts on the page. **Staff Scott Orr** read aloud the beginning of the page. **1h49m**

Commissioner Reed stated he didn't have any additional comments on this page, it seemed pretty straight forward. He asked if there are other Commissioners' comments. **Commissioner Carr** responded just a couple. **1h51m**

Commissioner Carr stated the use of term planning area as opposed to in the core and clarified where to change this language. **1h51m**

Commissioner Reed asked if there was any comment from Staff. **Staff Scott Orr** responded and asked Commissioner Carr if he doesn't want to allow regional parks, for example, to have any parking for open space outside the core. **Commissioner Carr** responded that's right. **1h52m**

Commissioner Ocana stated her concern with that is the buffer zones, are we going to allow for permitted uses in the buffer zones? She worries as we shrink the core with these adjusted map areas that the buffer zones then become non-existent and we lost that public space that can be utilized for parking and gardens and that kind of stuff. **1h52m**

Commissioner Carr asked are you talking about the northwest corner or the east. **Commissioner Ocana** responded she's talking about the buffer zones around the entire core area and specified where. **1h53m**

Commissioner Carr stated we talked about this at our last meeting and he suggests in light of the wildlife corridor, the northwest buffer zone be excluded from the core and buffer and be part of the wildlife corridor. Your concern was that would take away a potential for some agricultural use in that particular location, and I also get your concern that might mean there won't be any parking or anything for the state park. He has some suggestions for that, but was waiting for the open space. **1h54m**

Commissioner Carr stated on the eastern side of the managed buffer that tracks the side of Railroad Avenue, that managed buffer should be moved in to the core and being in the core, would make it available under my scheme at least to the parks department or the developer or whoever to use that for some usage that would function as a managed buffer. He knows Parks has thought maybe a dog park is appropriate there or something like that. He suggests that's added to the core and excluded from open space. **1h54m**

Commissioner Ocana stated her concern is as we begin to shrink the core by expanding the preserved open space, specifically in the wildlife corridor south of Railroad Avenue, that's a significant buffer there and if we're going to prohibit the possibility of parks to create parking and trail heads and other public service amenities in that area. If the buffer is removed, then we're encroaching on housing units and whatnot. If we're going to decrease the area of the core by losing the buffer area then she doesn't want to be in a position where we're prohibiting parks from allowing for public spaces in the open space. **1h55m**

Commissioner Carr responded in agreement and stated he doesn't want to be in a position where we're prohibiting parks from allowing for public spaces in the open space. The core area is such a size that the housing and commercial and everything that's proposed in the current plan, let alone a reduced scale plan. There's plenty of land to accommodate so much of what parks needs to do that's more of an urban style development. The dog park, the children's playground and parking for entry into the various parks can all be accommodated in the core. There's plenty of land for that and if for some reason that doesn't turn out to be the case when parks does their master plan. **1h56m**

Commissioner Ocana stated we can't risk it if it that doesn't turn out to be the case, that's what she concerns about and what she thinks she heard Scott say, by eliminating this language we essentially stronghold the parks from having parking specifically to access the open space. **Staff Scott Orr** responded he doesn't think if we modify that goal, whether intentionally or not, we will be hamstringing the parks department from being able to put in the infrastructure they need to have a fully functional regional park. **1h57m**

Commissioner Ocana stated her position is if we are to decrease the core and increase the open space, she's not willing to hamstring Park's Department to provide for the facilities they need, so the public can use that space. She doesn't think we should change 6B at all and recommends a straw vote to see where other commissioner stand. At this point we can't have everything we need to really start some negotiations here to move forwards. **1h57m**

Commissioner McCaffery seconded the request for a straw vote. **1h58m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he thinks we're having a structural area in how we're having this discussion. There are two distinct categories of this entire property: the core and the open space. We're co-mingling policies that might be applied to both when with a very easy resolution of format we could correct that challenge. We should be talking about what parks amenities and such in the core and separate from that we should be talking about the open space area. We could say everything that we want to provide for in the core relative to parks and that shouldn't be viewed as having any application outside the core. Then we should address the parks issue in the open space discussion. There is precious little treatment of the open space component of this entire discussion the way this is formatted. **1h58m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated we're just stumbling over stuff that should be really easy. If we want to have a dog park in the core, we should say that a dog park is allowing in the core that becomes part of the design responsibility of the applicant and the interface with regional parks or whatever mechanisms going to develop and manage the dog park in the core. If we want to say that a dog park is okay in the open space realm, then that should be a separate statement. That to him is a separate discussion when we get to the open space part and how we ought to be approaching that. What we're tripping over is stuff that's appropriate in the

core area may not be appropriate in the open space area and we're trying to decide both those things at the same time. He requests that we isolate the discussion here to what's in the core. 2h00m

Commissioner Carr stated he thinks that's what we're doing. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded it's not the way the thing reads though. The buffer areas should be within the boundary of the core. 2h01m

Commissioner McCaffery stated he thinks we're talking about where is the boundary of the core. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded he understands that, so draw a line around it. 2h01m

Commissioner Reed stated he knows that's been discussed at the last meeting and that we want to go through with the Commission and look at the map and figure where that boundary goes. For the purpose of moving this forward, if you look at the goal, keeping in the context that this is the goal that has been compiled by the community in terms of where this plan suggests it goes and how it's reinforced with parks and rec. 2h01m

Commissioner Reed stated if you look at 6.4, there are specifics beyond that goal and he doesn't think that we should hamstring Parks and Rec either by removing this goal. **Commissioner Carr** responded he's not suggesting we remove the policy, he's just saying change SDC to in the core. 2h02m

Commissioner Reed stated he doesn't think we've decided what that boundary is. It is a goal to allow parks and rec some ambition within that space. 2h02m

Staff Scott Orr asked if there would be any interest in augmenting this goal by something like "increase the park spaces at SDC, prioritizing the core, so it's acknowledging that is the priority. If the choice is, use open space or use the core, it's saying, use the core when possible but it's a little more open. 2h03m

Commissioner Ocana responded she would be okay with that. It is important to keep the public facilities within the core and believes that as we shrink the core and expand the open the space, we have to allow the flexibility of either ag and open space or the parks department to be able to create the facilities so people can actually use those spaces. 2h03m

Commissioner Carr stated he completely agrees and wants to make sure there's a plan to accommodate whatever it is we want to plan for there. Because we haven't really gone through the land use thing with any kind of finalization, it seems there's a good potential to reduce the scale of the land use side of things to provide for that extra space that the parks would need, and still keep the wildlife corridor as maximum as possible. Maybe we put this off until we talk about the land use stuff and maybe that helps us feel better about having enough land in the core for the park stuff. 2h04m

Commissioner Ocana suggested we do a straw vote based on Scott's recommendation and then we take up the core and land boundaries in the next segment or whenever that's appropriate. **Commissioner McCaffery** seconded the request for a straw vote. 2h05m

Commissioner Carr asked what are we voting on specifically. **Commissioner McCaffery** responded leaving 6 like it is. **Commissioner Ocana** stated if other Commissioners have other parts of chapter 6 they want to discuss, then we can only take a straw vote on 6B, or we just take a straw vote on approving chapter 6 with the addition in goal 6B. that is to maintain and increase the parks spaces at SDC, prioritizing the core, to provide for recreational spaces. 2h06m

Commissioner Carr asked if that also includes modifying 6-2 to change planning area to core. **Commissioner Ocana** responded she doesn't have a comment on that and asked if staff had a comment on changing that language. **Staff Brian Oh** responded there's no issue changing that. **Commissioner Ocana** agreed. 2h06m

Commissioner Koenigshofer suggested a potential language change to 6B and 6C. 2h07m

Commissioner Carr stated he has a problem with Eric's suggestion that we have 6C that allows park facilities in the open space area. He would rather modify, if we're concerned that the area is too small then let's modify the core area open space boundary. He'd rather do that then have policies that presume what parks department, state and county are going to do with respect to their facilities. 2h07m

Commissioner McCaffery stated he's okay with that too. [2h08m](#)

Commissioner Reed stated this chapter defers, in his opinion, to the open space chapter, so we'll discuss that when looking at the map. [2h08m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated just for the sake of record keeping, changing 6B to prioritize the core and changing 6.2 planning area to core. He thinks particularly the change to 6.2 is really good and makes total sense. He asked if we want to do a straw vote on this. [2h09m](#)

Straw Vote # 1

Commissioner Carr	Aye
Commissioner Ocana	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Absent
Commissioner Reed	Aye

Commissioner Carr stated he really thinks we should try to wrap up this quandary about the open space and the core and open space boundary and the whole thing about converting this all to parkland and try to do that sometime today. [2h09m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked if he think that's in the land use or in the open space. **Commissioner Carr** responded frankly he doesn't remember. He thinks the core area and open space boundary is a map and it's in every chapter, so it's the same boundary in every chapter. Number 5 on his suggestion list has a proposed boundary that it sounds like there still may be some Commissioners with issues in it. He asked Staff to bring up the map. [2h09m](#)

Staff Scott Orr recommended we approach this from the land use chapter since talking about the boundaries is, it becomes impossible to move the boundary without affecting the land use component. So, if we talk about moving lines on a map, we do that in the land use section. If we talk about how the open space is used, maybe we talk about that in the open space section. [2h10m](#)

Commissioner Carr suggested using the two figure together. He pointed out two wildlife constraints in figure 1.6. That's the boundary that very closely reflects what he's been suggesting. We use it for the open space. There's a green line called critical wildlife linkage. That's the boundary he's like to use to follow the open space area on the north side of campus. [2h11m](#)

Commissioner Reed clarified if that coincided with the removal of those historic buildings. **Commissioner Carr** responded yes the Paxton, Thompson and Bane and gave specifics. [2h11m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked if there's a map we can pull up that identifies the core area in the context of this. **Staff Brian Oh** responded yes, he's ready. He stated if there are any additional big ticket items that come up in either chapter 7, regarding phasing and the conditions of approval, at least maybe there's a quick confirmation that there is the issue, so we know what the scope of this afternoon looks like. Otherwise he's ready with the maps. [2h12m](#)

Commissioner Reed clarified if he's referring to chapter 7. **Staff Brian Oh** responded and clarified. [2h14m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he's hoping to get through the open space stuff and then go through some of the historical. He feels isn't going to take a while to get through the open space and historical. [2h15m](#)

Commissioner Reed stated his hope with 6 and 7, as Brian mentioned, is that we at least identify if there's any issues and just go through it quickly. If we agree it's a big deal then we'll have to come back to it. [2h15m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated he wants to bring Commissioner Koenigshofer up to speed. He and **Commissioner Reed** brought him up to speed. [2h16m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he has some major concerns with Chapter seven that mainly has to do with phasing of development and also phasing of various plans that are recommended in the specific plan as to when they would occur and when they would recur relative to the beginning of development. He thinks seven would be good to talk about after we've gone through everything else. **2h17m**

Commissioner Reed asked if other Commissioners have thoughts on chapter seven. Knowing we're going to come back on that, he doesn't know if other Commissioners have reviewed the edits to chapter 7. Do other Commissioners have concerns or is it just Commissioner Carr? **2h18m**

Commissioner Carr asked if there are edits to seven and stated he doesn't think he's seen any edits to seven. **Commissioner Reed** responded he was just looking at 7-2 on page 41. **2h18m**

Staff Brian Oh stated that's correct. What you're seeing in the gray highlight for 7.2 additional project review is in response to this question about having more clarity and certainty around what happens upon adoption of a specific plan into the implementation phase. This was a question that was posed during the site tour, in addition to a number of public comments. That is the one revision in this chapter that we wanted to highlight. **2h19m**

Commissioner Carr stated he's got a couple of concerns but maybe that would be quick if we just deal with page 41. **Commissioner Reed** responded sure let's see what you've got. **2h19m**

Commissioner Carr stated the first paragraph under 7.2, the last sentence says that the standard conditions of approval will be updated by county staff, over time to reflect changing conditions, etc. Is that administrative or would those changing conditions come back to the Planning Commission and the Board? Wouldn't that be a specific plan amendment? **Staff Brian Oh** responded it would be. Appendix A is part of the specific plan. Part of that language here was more about the final piece or any potential changes to laws and guidelines that may be in conflict with what you see in Appendix A. **2h20m**

Commissioner Carr stated he doesn't want to approve something that's going to authorize staff to make whatever changes it wants. Is there some way we can clarify that where necessary, a specific plan amendment would be required to do that, or you just delete that sentence. These are mitigation measures in the EIR, you can't go in there and just change that stuff. **Staff Scott Orr** responded he doesn't think there is a desire to just go in there and change stuff. Part of what he envisions is also, as the site develops, what is in the original conditions of approval maybe doesn't reflect the reality of what is built out there. We would want to amend the plan and a plan amendment is a legislative act. It wouldn't be something that staff has the ability to do. He asked Counsel to weigh in. **2h21m**

County Counsel stated her understanding is there is some delegation to staff here to ensure that the standard conditions of approval can be updated if there are regulatory changes. The standard conditions of approval are implementing the plan policies, so they need to be consistent with the plan. **Commissioner Carr** responded and asked what's the process for doing that? If you have a condition that's identified as a mitigation measure in the EIR, you can't just change it without going through some type of review or plan, can you? **2h22m**

Staff Scott Orr stated he knows that hypotheticals can get us in trouble, but let's say as part of the process there becomes an issue with the acorn lights and we have a conditional of approval that references acorn lights, but the historic preservation plan had some issue with those and recommended a different light. So, instead of continuing to require acorn lights, maybe we'd be consistent with the historic preservation plan requiring a different kind of light. That's the first thing that popped into his head as a possible example. **2h22m**

Commissioner Carr stated we've allowed flexibility there and that's fine. He could see where that would be consistent. This seems too open ended to him and he's suggesting there be a clause about maybe, where necessary, a plan amendment would be recommended. **2h23m**

Commissioner Reed asked if is that doable Scott? **Staff Scott Orr** responded he thinks so. **2h23m**

Commissioner Carr stated that was his only concern with that page. **2h24m**

Commissioner Reed asked if there are any other additional comments with seven, or we are all good. **Commissioner McCaffery** responded I guess we could do a straw vote. **2h24m**

Straw Vote # 3

Commissioner Carr	Aye
Commissioner Ocana	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Aye
Commissioner Reed	Aye

Commissioner Reed stated we've got three out of the seven somewhat out of the way, so did we determine land use is where we want to go next? **Commissioner Carr** stated he thought we were going to talk about open space, he doesn't know why we keep ducking open space. [2h24m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated he thought we were going to talk about open space boundaries which is reflected in the land use maps. **Commissioner Reed** responded yes he was specifically looking to the map. [2h25m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated if you take that wildlife corridor on that one figure and then go to figure 4.1-2, which is the land use map. **Staff Scott Orr** responded thank you for your patience on the map side, it takes just a little bit of effort to flip back and forth. [2h25m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he's suggesting that green line become the boundary between the open space and the core, and that issue is that northeast corner, at least from Commissioner Ocana's concern. On the land use map, that essentially means we drop the Paxton, Thompson and Bane buildings and keep the Wagner building and then go straight across, keeping the two residences north side of Arnold drive. [2h25m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer clarified which line Commissioner Carr was talking about. He asked if the core is currently approximately 280 acres. **Commissioner Carr** responded he thinks it's 180. **Staff Brian Oh** responded that's correct. [2h26m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated it's 180, he's been misstating it. If you look at the area on either side of the creek that would be included in your new proposed boundary, this isn't really a reduction of usable area within the core because it's within the creek setback, so it wouldn't really factor in as a reduction of potential development footprint. If you look at the totality of your proposal, Greg, do we have any idea about what percentage of the current acreage would be quote lost to that revised boundary? **Commissioner Carr** responded he doesn't know and to be fully clear he's suggesting we add some core area to the eastern side of railroad avenue based upon that proposed managed buffer. It adds about the same amount of land that would be taken away by that bump on the northwest corner. [2h27m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked if he's proposing that the green line become part of the line all the way down in the area east of railroad. **Commissioner Carr** responded no, it's already designated all the way to Railroad Avenue on the east side. He's not proposing that any of that be taken out of the open space area, except that managed buffer that we talked about last week, he's suggesting that come out of the open space buffer and be added to the core. [2h28m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated that makes sense because isn't the managed buffer something that would be managed within the terms of the development agreement. So, it ought to be in the core because it's going to be subject to treatment in the development agreement. [2h29m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated it also is an area where parks can use some of that land if necessary for some of it's support which complies, like a dog park, for example would be a managed buffer. [2h29m](#)

Commissioner Ocana clarified there are two expanded wildlife buffers, one where the Paxton building is and two along the edge of Sutton Field Lake. She wants to be sure everyone is in agreement that we are removing both of those expanded wildlife buffers from the core area. Essentially at the corner where Railroad takes a sharp turn south, that whole corner is locked off. She's in agreement with that. [2h29m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated looking at the land use map Figure 4.1-2 you'll see there's no development proposed in that area. **Commissioner Ocana** responded she understands and is in agreement. We've been referencing the expanded wildlife buffer of just where the Paxton buffer if, and it didn't sound like we had made

absolutely sure that we were also referenced the expanded wildlife fire buffer that butts up closely to Sutton Field Lake. She wants to make sure we're all on the same page that we're going to reduce the core by those two areas. [2h30m](#)

Commissioner Ocana stated her next concern and what she's not in agreement with is removing the space, it's not on this map. It's on figure 2.2-1. There is a significant amount of managed landscape fire buffer on the south end of railroad drive that she doesn't think we should remove as managed buffer. That should remain and be allowed as public space so that parks or open space can do what they need to in order to allow access to the open space. Her understanding is that there's a discussion about removing the buffer from the south end of railroad. [2h31m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he's not suggesting that at all. He's suggesting that the managed buffer on the east side of railroad all the way down the railroad corridor, almost to the southern boundary, be included in the core. [2h32m](#)

Commissioner Ocana clarified which buffer is being discussed and whether or not Commissioner Carr is suggesting we remove the portion of the managed buffer of the southside of railroad and allow only the managed buffer on the north side of railroad. **Commissioner Reed** added or remove the core area boundary to include. **Commissioner Ocana** responded that she thinks is going to be a harder sell. [2h32m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he's not clear on what's being suggested. He's not taking anything out of the current core on the southside. **Commissioner Ocana** responded she's not talking about the core, she's talking about the open space. So if you look at the open space on the southside, maybe she's reading this wrong, but it appears the managed buffer is 1/3 in the core and 2/3 in the open space, and want to be sure that we're going to leave the 2/3 of buffer in the open space. [2h33m](#)

Commissioner Carr asked to see the map and clarified where Commissioner Ocana is talking about. **Commissioner Ocana** and **Commissioner Carr** clarified. [2h33m](#)

Commissioner Ocana stated she's happy with that, it increases the core area. [2h34m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he's trying to open that up to potential use by either the developer or parks or whoever to make sure there's enough land in the core for them to do so a reasonable amount of facility support for the park. Where he's cutting back is that expanded wildlife fire buffer above the neighborhood and also the bump on the westside. [2h34m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated he's like to offer a recommendation. In regards to that Railroad boundary, we're going to remove space from the core, would the Commission be okay if we position the boundary to add in an equal amount of acreage that we're taking away, so that it's still the same functional size although the boundaries are more respective to the environmental constraints we're trying to protect and avoid. **Commissioner Reed** responded that sounds good. [2h35m](#)

Commissioner McCaffery stated looking at the overheard map, it looks like the section of that quadrilateral that's made up by Harney, Baker and Toyon, there's an existing buildings and hardscape and the lower half of that quadrilateral is an area that currently has improvements on it. That would be such a good spot for park parking, slash ranger station which little impact. [2h36m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he'd be okay with that and asked Staff what those buildings are. **Staff Brian Oh** responded and clarified. There are no residential structures, there's some utilities related to infrastructures in the eastern part of campus and some truck storage facilities. [2h36m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he would be okay with what Shaun is suggesting and clarified. [2h37m](#)

Staff Brian Oh stated when we're talking about moving the core area boundaries, that boundary is bounded by the parcels that are for sale. Counsel, correct me if I'm wrong, but everything east of the core area outline is within the community separator zone, so there are additional implications if we doing a transfer from one area to another. Opening up the core area for further development, he doesn't believe that was the intent of the legislation. [2h37m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated but if we were doing an equivalent addition to subtraction of the community separator, we would be okay right? That's allowed under the community separator policy. If you add the area in the northwest and the north to the community separator to offset the loss of community separator in the South East, we'd be okay for community separator, right? **County Counsel** responded. 2h37m

County Counsel stated it's not something staff has reviews yet. An alternative is thinking about what the uses are that your Commission wants to be in certain areas as opposed to moving the core area. Her understanding is that these boundaries are what was provided by the State as their plan for how they intend to dispose of the property, so we can change the uses in certain areas without necessarily moving the boundaries. Another way to think about it, if we're looking at area within the community separator, we just have to ensure we're not making land uses in that area any more dense or intense than what's currently allowed. 2h38m

Commissioner Carr stated that's fine and we probably aren't going to be able to in this plan, designate any land use for that area, that's going to be up to the plans that come forward. If the State is saying that's our parcel, that makes me even more desirous of changing it to be honest with you. This is our plan, this isn't the State's plan. He thinks Shaun and Commissioner Ocana's desires to have those two areas outside the core included in the core and then remove an equivalent amount along the pinch point. That balances out the Community Separator issue. If the State wants to fire us all and go off with whatever they're going to do based upon the face that we move a parcel boundary, he finds that hard to believe. 2h40m

Staff Scott Orr stated it sounds like there is a majority moving forward with this, so how he thinks it would play out moving forward as this recommendation to change the boundary consistent with that wildlife corridor. Staff would, using some of the time between now and the Board, be able to also provide the Board information on what are the tradeoffs. A few buildings we've slated for preservation would need to be potentially demolished, but it does open up this area on the other side of railroad that does have existing development that is less environmentally sensitive. Just to explain the rationale behind the equal transfer that the Commission believes is a more appropriate balance of built versus environmental considerations. Does that sound seem fair? 2h41m

Commissioner Carr stated that says it all. He knows Counsel is going to have to weigh in and make sure we're doing the right thing, but he's ready to straw vote that one. 2h42m

Staff Scott Orr conducted a Straw vote. 2h42m

Straw Vote # 3

Commissioner Carr	Aye
Commissioner Ocana	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Abstain
Commissioner Reed	Aye

Commissioner Carr stated he would suggest that Commissioner Koenigshofer is very happy with what we just did although he can't guarantee it. **Staff Scott Orr** stated he hopes so too. 2h42m

Commissioner Carr stated this helps because now when we talk about different policies about what's in the core and what's outside the core, which is what Eric was so concerned about, it should at least clear up some of our discussion around that. We probably need Eric to come back if we want to continue this open space thing because he has some strong feelings about so now what to do with the open space area. This is an area where Staff was going to report back to us where he thinks we can fairly quickly come to some conclusions around what do we do about this open space area. 2h43m

Staff Brian Oh asked if he's hearing we should wait for Commissioner Koenigshofer. **Commissioner Reed** asked if maybe we should take another little break. **Staff Scott Orr** stated he's promoting him back. 2h44m

Commissioner Koenigshofer returned and **Staff Scott Orr** gave him a recap of what was missed. 2h45m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he's not concerned if we're reducing the core area, but we're not reducing the potential development numbers within it, so maybe that requires some calculation by staff. **2h47m**

Commissioner Carr stated it was a compromise decision. He's happy with one of the areas that were removed along the norther boundary, the "pinch point", that's a big improvement. He thinks the area easy of railroad that's a very small area with the buildings and because it was occupied by structures at the present time, it didn't seem like a big loss and it was important to other Commissioners to make sure we have enough land to accommodate a lot of the park facilities and housing etc. It was a compromise but he thinks a good one overall. **2h48m**

Commissioner Reed stated great, it sounds like we have consensus. **2h49m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated you can leave him as an abstention on that since he didn't get to participate fully in the decision. **2h49m**

Commissioner Reed stated we should proceed with open space since we dove into that, that helps to clarify the mapping. Shall we go through the goals and policies and see if we have some specific edits. **Staff Scott Orr** clarified the section being discussed. **2h49m**

Commissioner Carr stated there's are some policy he wants to add to this area. He asked if we want to go through the policies first. **Commissioner Reed** responded and suggested we go through the policies first and get everybody on the same page and come back. He asked Commissioners if that sounds good and if there are any comments on staff edits in response to public comment. **2h50m**

Commissioner Carr stated this is an area where there's quite a bit of both original draft plan policies and edits that pertain to the open space area. He suggests that all of those be removed that any policy that has bearing on the open space area to the agricultural open space district and/or parks, that the two Parks departments to establish any policies pertaining to the use. So, in other words, this plan should divorce itself from the open space area other than a few key policies that direct the land to be transferred to the appropriate county or district and/or State and County Parks. And that the developer be required to go up to collaborate with the district and the parks to establish the appropriate connection between the parks and core area through some specifics driven by the Parks department and district through conservation easement. Some of these policies presume that's the open space district that the plan is going to dictate that. He's saying those should all be removed and leave it to the Parks folks and the district. **2h51m**

Commissioner Reed stated why don't we chat about that a little bit. **2h52m**

Commissioner McCaffery stated from our last meeting he remembers we were kind of spinning our wheels on this for about two hours and one of things we talked about was having staff weigh in on the implications of that. One of the discussion points was about how our recommendation doesn't necessarily hold any weight as far as what the State exactly wants to do and some of it's going to maybe go to one park and one to another. He would like staff to weigh in on that and if they've researched that in the time between meetings. Maybe we can get some more info to make a good decision. **2h52m**

Staff Brian Oh responded on top of the two hours in the public hearing, staff met with the directors for both Agg and Open Space and Regional Parks yesterday afternoon. Again, reaffirming the County's position which is inclusive of all three organizations that are departments who've engaged throughout this process, seen these policies and have provided comments to the environmental impact report and there's nothing proposed in this plan that either department feels is in conflict with their goals. That said, there's some options that we look at, from a legal perspective, on the potential for zoning or not rezoning the open space. We have advanced and incorporated as a group throughout this process with both Regional Parks and Agg and Open Space. **2h53m**

Staff Scott Orr stated there was a suggestion of potentially in table 3.4-3, adding the word public so preserved public open space. He related that as a potential suggestion for the Commission to consider and apologized for jumping in front of Commissioner Koenigshofer. **2h54m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked Brian what role would Agg and Open Space district play if they never take title to the property as an action prior to transfer to State or County Parks. **Staff Brian Oh** responded we didn't

get into alternate scenarios but Agg and Open Space is prepared to support the process and transfer as the county takes that process upon completion of the specific plan. **2h55m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he doesn't think this needs to trigger another 2 hour discussion. He's talked with Misti Arias who is the head of the Ag and Open Space District and he's talked with Director Wick. His point is really simple and narrow, it's more of a procedural point. The benefit of which would access the experience and resources of the district by, he knows we can't dictate that the State transfer the title directly to the district. He's suggesting that we recommend and explain why that's beneficial to the community, to County and State Parks. In brief summary here's why: the district has operated in the capacity of taking title to land and then transferring it without fee to county parks, using that example. What the district does prior to the transfer of title is works in collaboration with regional parks and can do the same with State parks to craft a conservation easement that the district puts on the property. Then the district holds the conversation easement, again in collaboration with the park agency recipient, defines in general terms the scope of the property and the protection of certain natural resource value and so forth. The benefit of doing that is twofold. **2h55m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated there's another phase of process that engages the public along with the district collaboration with regional or state parks in the planning part. The second element is if it goes through the district as he just describes, very substantial amounts of money are then available from the district to be granted to state and regional parks by the areas that they take to assist in park planning. Which can pay for a lot of stuff that would otherwise have to come out of the budget of one of those park jurisdictions. He suggests explanatory language that invites the state to take the step of conveying the property and fee to the district for the express purpose of the district to work in collaboration with the state and county parks, to define the areas each would take in the parameters of a conservation easement to therefore, setting that in firm perpetuity and then releasing a substantial amount of funding to each of those agencies to implement the park plan that would have been developed. Then the details of the park plan are developed subsequent to the transition of the property to the agency, and then they go through their regular park planning process. He recommends putting 2.1 goals and polices. **2h58m**

Staff Scott Orr asked for clarification on where to insert Commissioner Koenigshofer's new proposed language and the intention. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded yes and it points out that the benefit is, a whole bunch of money goes to the undertaking of designing and developing those park features. **3h00m**

Staff Brian Oh stated maybe an "and" to that is chapter 7 implementation financing. Much of that focus is of course, on the core. Since part of the specific plan is addressing the future management and framework of the larger open, maybe that's appropriate area to add as well. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded to makes in that section as well as this section is fine with him. **3h00m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated when most people will at the park open space question, they'll look first at this chapter 2, but obviously adding reference in the funding part would also be. He wants to emphasize, unless the district takes title, none of that money can be made available. It has to have an easement associated with it. **3h01m**

Staff Brian Oh stated that was something reaffirm by Director Arias yesterday and also some limitations around just what that funding could cover. We're happy to work with her on some final language. **3h02m**

Commissioner Reed stated he likes the idea of maybe putting this in the implementation phase. He stated to Commissioner Carr, he would be hesitant to take a lot of this language out of the plan as it exists now because it seems that the plan is pretty strong in reinforcing those relationship, and it weakens the plan if we take some of that language out. **3h02m**

Commissioner Carr stated he disagrees and asked Eric, in light of that addition to open space, is he suggesting that we still have policies in the plan that presume the use of that conservation easement by the district. **3h03m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he thinks having language in the specific plan that addresses the outer boundaries of what would the plan allow within the open space, or as you propose restating it as parkland, is appropriate to give guidance to the district about parameters. Yes, there's stuff we would retain, for example, in the State or County Part, he thinks we would agree it's not appropriate for a winery or wine tasting room. On the

Westside of the core area, adjacent to the State parks would go to the state. On the Eastside of the core area, adjacent to the county part would go to the county. Each of those would probably be treatment as separate easements because to convey part to the state and park to the county would require separate deeds etc. It's just a mechanical thing. When we look at those two different characteristics of property, the part on the east that would go to the county would become part of the existing county park, basically. He's sure regional parks would discuss with the district the scope of uses that could be put on the East Side. Part of the discussion would be relative to those existing Agg buildings on the east side. Is there any application that regional parks would like to incorporate into their park that might have to do with some agricultural or recreational activity. He's completely comfortable leaving that to the district and regional parks with community input to figure that out.

3h04m

Commissioner Carr stated he is too, but look at policy 2-5. That's the kind of policy he thinks should be removed and that can be determined or not included by the district and the parks and not be in the specific plan.

3h06m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated that's a good point and somewhere else in the material there's reference to the Suttonfield Lake and it says basically no human activity. So it's a real contradiction which he'll try to find because it needs to be reconciled.

3h07m

Commissioner Reed stated so why don't we talk to Commissioner about 2-5. Do we want to remove that? The concern evidently is activity on Sutton Field Lake? **Commissioner Carr** responded he suggests we do.

3h07m

Commissioner Reed stated it just says consider creating a designated area, so we're saying do not consider.

3h07m

Commissioner Carr stated he's not saying it's a bad idea, just to leave that to the district.

3h08m

Staff Scott Orr stated just one word of caution for the Commission. If this is deleted, it's gone. Being silent on it doesn't add or remove anything, it just makes it more likely that nothing is going to happen. If it's in here, Parks has the ability to consider it. If it's not in here, it's deleted from existence, referenced nowhere and Park's still has the ability to consider it, but they don't have a prompt to consider it.

3h08m

Commissioner McCaffery stated he would like parks to be able to consider it.

3h08m

Commissioner Reed stated he thinks too it strengthens the plan instead of weakens the plan by taking it out.

3h08m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he thinks leaving it in is not a problem since it says consider. If the conveyance goes to the district and the district collaborated with county parks about the scope of the conservation easement, let the district and parks people decide whether or not there's any wildlife habitat or other natural features that would be adverse to the implementation of this paragraph. Then they can figure out how to deal with in with their expertise. We do need to be cognizant of this possibility, the State didn't decide to convey the Parkland to the district, then it basically falls to, he guesses the developer as opposed to the regional and state parks. He'd rather have the district in that capacity.

3h09m

Commissioner Carr stated as long as it's considered, it's not mandatory either way. Let him point out a few other quandaries. Referencing 2-1, he reads it as manage landscape fire buffer has to be permanent public open space. So we just decided that that would be open to possible use by parks or other entities in the core. Maybe there needs to be a message for that to clarify that the manage landscape offer now has a potentially different potential than public space, we wouldn't want that to get in the way.

3h10m

Staff Scott Orr stated he hears a recommendation to reconcile potential conflicts between the changes in boundaries with policy 2-1. **Commissioner Carr** responded and the other reconciliation is in 2-11, there's a dark sky policy here about effective wildlife corridor. He thinks it's a good policy but is just wondering if we should look at it and make sure it's consistent with what we did a little while ago on the street lighting.

3h11m

Staff Scott Orr stated to Commissioner Carr he believes 2-13 is the one that you referenced regarding limitations in your Lake Sutton Field, but he thinks it's specific to the area where the wildlife corridor is narrowest, so that may be the spot. **3h11m**

Commissioner Carr asked, so you're saying 13 is okay? **Staff Scott Orr** responded he doesn't think 13 is in conflict with 2-5, but remembers Commissioner Koenigshofer had mentioned that possibility. **3h12m**

Commissioner Carr stated the last one he's concerned about is 2-16 and this is a fencing issue. At some point we need to talk about fencing throughout the core and open space area. He would be reluctant to stipulate what fencing may or may not be appropriate in the open space area, but also wants to make sure at some point we talk about fencing within the core. There are folks that want no fencing anywhere in the whole place but thinks that's impractical, there's going to have to be fencing some places. He a little worried about that allowing fencing in the wildlife corridor. **3h12m**

Commissioner Reed stated fencing has been mentioned so many times in the biology studies, that there are safe fencing types that allow for wildlife corridors and the intention of the plan is just trying to reinforce that. **3h13m**

Commissioner Carr stated he would prefer that we not have any fencing at all in the open space area, or if there is fencing that it be provided as in relation to whatever usage the district and parks come up with through their conservation easement. **3h13m**

Commissioner Reed stated he presumes that the fencing is part of the management of the property, there would be areas you would perhaps want to fence for a garden or something like that and you would just be using those standards to put that fencing in, rather than leaving it unknown or undecided. **Commissioner Carr** stated there may be facilities that need a fully screen fencing, like the water treatment plant for example to protect the wildlife. There are aspects of the open space that may have to vary from that restriction and even for wildlife friendly fencing, he thinks we should let the fencing issue be determined by the district and parks folk. **3h14m**

Commissioner Reed asked if it's his recommendation to remove 2-16. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated in responded to Greg's point, sometimes the conservation easement will allow for grazing because it's consistent with fire fuel reduction, health of vegetation etc. The whole fencing thing he kind of gets a kick out of because it's a 2 and half strip of wire a 1 ft and half off the ground, he doesn't know why anybody would put a fence up like that, it doesn't do anything. **3h15m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he wants to bring to Staff's attention on the final EIR report, on page 1-4 chapter 2, 2-12, he read a passage and asked staff to take note of it. He stated that seems to conflict with some of the potential recreational usages, certainly of Sutton Field Lake. He asked for Staff to look and see if that is an incongruity or conflict. **3h16m**

Staff Scott Orr asked Commissioner Koenigshofer to repeat the requested section. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** clarified. **3h17m**

Commissioner Carr stated he thinks the kayaks are going to be occupied by AI. **3h17m**

Staff Brian Oh stated the reference is also in attachment 3 that we're walking through and clarified where. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked Brian if that reads to him as mixed messaging. His note is to ask staff if it doesn't intent to restrict human activity around Sutton Field Lake, it sure could be read that way. **Staff Brian Oh** responded he sees the point, we'll take a look at the revised content and reconcile. **3h18m**

Commissioner Reed asked can we bring it back to 2-16 and get an idea from Commissioners if we want to remove anything related to the fencing. He asked Scott, given his comment on removing our other language that it just opens to door, is it better to have it in or not have it all? **3h18m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked Greg, could you just leave the first part of the first sentence in and let the specific design of fencing be left to more detailed review. **Commissioner Carr** responded that would certainly be better than what's there now. **3h19m**

Staff Scott Orr asked so does that mean we're okay with barbed wire at the bottom? **Commissioner Carr** responded the problem is what if you need fencing that's not wildlife safe, for example, if the water treatment plant has aspects to it or some other usage that the parks or district want to impose needs fencing and wildlife permeable fencing doesn't do whatever job is needed to be done. Maybe rather than saying all fencing say allow where needed. **3h19m**

Staff Scott Orr asked what about something along the lines of all fencing, except for public utility infrastructure, just something that allows for the water treatment plan or whatever else. Maybe that's not the language but just building an exception for higher intensity uses that may require fencing, not only for the facility, but also to keep things out of the facility, so you don't have a moose falling in there. **3h20m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked, in the collaboration between the district and parks departments, if they want to do a dog park, this would prohibit it because you can't have a dog park with fencing that has an 18 inch gap at the bottom. **Staff Scott Orr** responded that's a fair point. **3h21m**

Commissioner Carr stated maybe just say unless necessary for the specific use, fencing shall be wildlife permeable and just leave it at that. **Staff Scott Orr** asked if folks want to straw vote that. **3h21m**

Commissioner Reed stated he thinks the intention is to address the wildlife corridor open space and just leaving it simple, do the best you can to respect that and if you can't because there are overriding constraints, then you can't because there's overriding constraints. **3h22m**

Commissioner Carr clarified that this policy requires it. **Commissioner Reed** responded he understands an is agreeing with some edits to suggest that there alternatives when you can't achieve that. **3h22m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated something along the lines of, except where required by an approved park plan or something like that. **Commissioners Carr and Reed** agreed. **3h22m**

Staff Scott Orr stated so he's hearing 3 Commissioners supportive, so modifying 2-16 with language consistent with what Eric just said, similar to except as required in an approved parks plan. **Commissioner Carr** agreed. **3h23m**

Commissioner Carr stated policy 2-27 and 2-30 both refer to riparian corridor standards for setbacks, conservation plans, etc. Since it appears that we're moving this area, the core area into the urban service area in the county general plan, that modifies their typical riparian corridor standard in urban areas. He suggests what we do in this plan is require a 100 foot set back from the top of the bank of Sonoma Creek and a 50 foot setback from the top of bank as proposed for Mill Creek, regardless of the County code. There is a procedure that allows for that variation to which he's okay with. He thinks a starting setback of 100 in Sonoma Creek should be the policy of this plan and for the most part the development areas that are depicted on the maps are consistent with that. **3h23m**

Commissioner Carr stated he wants to make sure somebody doesn't come in and propose development in a smaller setback for whatever reason they want. The wildlife corridor along the two creeks is just as critical as the larger one that we talked about already. **3h25m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked if Staff has a map they would put up to where we could see how that would look on the ground. **Staff Scott Orr** responded while Brian brings that up, he asked Counsel, our riparian corridor is based on certain criteria. If we're changing the riparian corridor setbacks, we're essentially changing the zoning, and we're kind of making a one off riparian corridor setback change. Does that pose any larger problems? It's not something he's aware we've ever done before without findings specifically related to the functions of that section. **3h25m**

Commissioner Carr stated this whole plan is a variation to County code that you've established zoning recommendation that basically says the zoning is SDC and all of the regulations that we're following that may differ from the current code are embedded in that zoning. He doesn't see why the stream setback wouldn't be given the same benefit of discretion. **3h26m**

Commissioner Reed asked can we possibly call it a stream setback and maybe have it supersede the riparian corridor? **County Counsel** responded that was going to be her suggestion. She and Scott could look into the mechanics of making it work. To your point, Commissioner Carr, we can have standards that are stricter, so even if it's not called the riparian corridor setback and rezoned along those lines, then we might be able to just have a standard that is 100 feet to the top of the bank. [3h26m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked where's Mill Creek. **Commissioner Carr** stated the plan currently provides 50-feet for Mill Creek, so he wants to make sure we're not undermining that by saying it can go by County code, it's only 25-feet for County code. [3h27m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer clarified Commissioner Carr's proposal. **Commissioner Carr** clarified. [3h27m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked so it misses the existing buildings right there around Sonoma Circle. **Commissioner Carr** responded the only area, just on walking the property, is Toyon Boulevard. As long as the residential areas don't get closer than that. The issue also applies to other uses that might come along the creek, so it's not just the residential development. [3h28m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked where Toyon is, is the edge of Toyon outside where you're talking about. **Commissioner Carr** responded he believes it is but couldn't guarantee it. [3h28m](#)

Staff Brian Oh showed on the map where it's likely to impact, but we would have to verify. [3h29m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked for clarification on Commissioner Carr's suggestion. **Commissioner Carr** responded. [3h29m](#)

Commissioner McCaffery stated that was his question to. If there's something existing there, he would think you'd be able to redevelop that, but of course no development on the Westside of Toyon, he thinks that would be out of the question. [3h29m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated so it would be stated as, 100-feet, or to the nearest existing roadway or something like that. **Commissioner Carr** responded that would work. [3h30m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated he does like the idea of having a specific policy related to this. Looking at the existing zoning, for Sonoma our buffer is 100 feet, so even though it's a 50 foot setback, the way our GIS is structured, we have twice as much as what's shown. So looking at the visual, 100 hundred makes perfect sense and then Mill Creek is already fifty feet as part of our current riparian corridor zoning. So that's a pretty easy ask. [3h30m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated Sonoma Creek inside of an urban area would not be 100 foot, that's his concern. **Staff Scott Orr** responded looking at the existing conditions there, he thinks it'd be really challenging to do anything within 100 feet without massive tree removal. **Commissioner Carr** responded all he's saying is take out the code reference and just leave it at 100 feet and it can be, as Eric suggested, except where existing roads are within that. [3h31m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked to point to the specific policy. **Commissioner Carr** clarified. [3h31m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked so you're suggesting remove riparian corridor. **Commissioner Carr** clarified to remove the first line of 227 to say ensure that development here is to 100 feet. [3h31m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated to Commissioner Carr, he thinks it might strengthen actually to leave 27 and 30, but add an additional new one, specifically saying, on top of the fact that you need to follow the right period or ordinance, you need to have a 100 foot setback from the creek. So it's all the protections of 27, 30 and on top of that specifically calling out Sonoma Creek to make sure there's no ambiguity there. **Commissioner Carr** responded that okay. [3h32m](#)

Commissioner Reed stated straw vote and stated everyone has thumbs up. [3h33m](#)

Commissioner Carr asked in 2-37 to change from planning area to core. [3h34m](#)

Staff Scott Orr asked happy with wooden fencing outside the core? **Commissioner Reed** responded let's not go there. [3h34m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated he wants to make sure needs are met and 37 is about fencing. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded we didn't want any wooden fencing because it's a fire hazard. [3h34m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated he completely agrees with 2-44 and asked is any of the core in a flood prone area? **Staff Brian Oh** responded there's component F-2, but this is more focused on more the open space. Restrict development in flood prone areas to trails and informational signage. **Commissioner Carr** clarified so this applies only to the open space area? Does it create a conflict with the core area at all? **Staff Brian Oh** responded no he doesn't believe it creates a conflict. [3h35m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated you might just want to make sure of that because he knows we have some areas that are susceptible to flooding. He doesn't think they're in a 100 year flood plain. We also do have possible inundation areas, so he wants to just make sure we're not restricting development in areas of the core where we want to housing. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded that's why he finds it so difficult that this isn't clearly stating, you can do this in the core, you can do that in the other area. It's hard to follow, figure out and will lead to mistakes. [3h36m](#)

Commissioner Carr asked can we say restrict development in the core and flood prone areas in the core? **Staff Scott Orr** responded does that mean we're happy to put stuff in areas outside the core? **Commissioner Carr** responded right, no development if the district wants to do a nice conservation easement, he suspects they're not going to let development in any flood prone area. [3h36m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated you might have trails. **Staff Scott Orr** added a little 3 foot informational sign for a trail. **Commissioner Reed** added he doesn't think it hurts. [3h37m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated this is an area where he feels like the district is going to make the decision. **Commissioner Reed** responded let's move on then. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** added assuming the district is involved. We have to consider the possibility that it won't be. You have reference to the owner/operator of the preserved open space shall prepare and open space plan. [3h37m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked so 2-44, we're okay regardless? **Commissioner Carr** responded he just wanted staff to look at it and make sure we're not compounding a problem for ourselves depending on whether we're talking about the core or open space. [3h38m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated under wildfire evacuation 2-54B, there was some debate in comments about whether an onsite shelter in place facility was a good idea. This seems to say to him we're going to do one of those, should we maybe say consider?

Staff Scott Orr asked if there's a feeling that no potential facility is better than having one? **Commissioner Carr** responded he's not necessarily against them, but the fire district particularly came out strongly against them. They said their top priorities evacuation and they feel like if there's an onsite shelter that people will not evacuate as readily and that creates a problem for them. There's other people who think that's a good back, but wonders if rather than insisting on it, just say consider it. [3h39m](#)

Commissioner Ocana stated she agreed with Commissioner Carr and asked staff or Counsel what kind of liability we'd the county would be putting themselves in if we designated an area where people felt they didn't necessarily have to evacuate. They could go there and then if something happened. Sometimes we provide the option to not do what's recommended and then people take that option and there's a risk of litigation. She thinks that's a great idea but that's her only concern, she worries about people using it when they shouldn't. [3h39m](#)

County Counsel stated that's not an issue she's looked into. **Commissioner Ocana** stated she doesn't know how difficult it would be to come back to us, maybe in the next meeting, just kind of give us an update on that. It could be as simple as building it and then with a big sign on it that says "enter at your own risk if there's a wildfire on it's way", but I do hear where Commissioner Carr is coming from and wonder if there's a way to protect the county if necessary. [3h40m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked if there's a comment from consultants. He presumed this was part of some fire resiliency plan, that was part of the program for the specific plan. **Staff Brian Oh** responded he does have Rajeev and can speak to the non-legal component. To what Commissioner Carr stated, there's been a number of comments one way or the other. We would not be doing something in conflict with either our local fire safety officials or our emergency management department. So, if there is some desire to have a recommendation to include consultation with our local safety officials, that may be appropriate. That said, this is also recognizing that this was an evacuation center for other emergencies, so he thinks that's sort of the dynamic at play for consideration. [3h41m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he looks at it like having insurance. We're going to have housing dedicated to some developmentally disabled folks whose mobility or transportation options might be limited. The other thing is, it's a plan B. If you're caught in a circumstance like the people who were evacuating down Mark West road and couldn't get out and then went to the parking lot and survived. He'd think the determination of when it was open would be made by fire and emergency officials in the moment depending on whether or not, in their judgement, it was needed. The potential for litigation if something traffic happened and there was no designated onsite shelter, the plainest attorney would find this document and say you knew it was a hazard and you opted not to provide reasonable safety precautions, and then maybe you have a liability issue anyways. [3h42m](#)

Commissioner Ocana stated okay she thinks it's been established. [3h44m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated his reaction to it was that it was fire officials who were raising this, he's fine with it and just wanted to make sure we're okay with fire officials that are going to be responsible for this site. [3h44m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated when we do have an emergency and activate the emergency operations center, one of the things that is done early on in the process is taking a look at every available asset that could be used as part of the response. Whether that's spaces for people to evacuate because they're in a warning zone or looking at where we can send large animals. More facilities in more places in the county helps that process, whether or not they need to be used in any given moment.. He does hear the concern. [3h44m](#)

Commissioner Reed stated it looks like we might have just gotten through open space. **Commissioner Carr** responded not quite. If you go by Greg's list of suggestions. Number 1, he'd like to rename this parkland instead of preserved open space. Second he's hoping to add a requirement that a developer collaborate with the district and or parks people as far as the connections between the park and the core, because one of the things that's in the plan now is some suggestion about each of these roads that's going to empty into the open space area and the mobility access map. Talking to parks, they said they really wanted to be sort of in the driver's seat as to where the core area would feed into the park system. He wants to make sure whatever the core development does is consistent with what the needs of the open space area are in terms of access. [3h45m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked if that would be in mobility and access. **Commissioner Carr** responded no it would be in open space because you're asking for collaboration between the parks and open space entity. He doesn't care where it goes as long as it's in there. [3h46m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated the other thing he wanted to do is provide a cutout for recognizing 3 uses in the open space area/parkland. One is the water treatment plant, that needs to be allowed to operate however is necessary for supplying water, regardless of the open space designation. And the cemetery which is very important in various aspects. Make sure the cemetery can proceed to exist and be maintained and everything else. Also when we get to traffic, to talk about the highway 12 connector because that's something proposed at this time to go through the open space area. [3h47m](#)

Commissioner Ocana asked for clarify from Commissioner Carr on the purpose for changing preserved open land to parkland. What the reason behind it? **Commissioner Carr** responded to make it clear what we're doing. He thinks what we're proposing to do is turn these into parks and making it parkland is maybe a signal or acknowledgment that's what this plan is doing. [3h48m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated Commissioner Carr, to him, in a vacuum Parkland implies that it's less protected than preserved open space. When he hears parkland he thinks develop this entire place as a park, whereas when he

sees words like preservation, we're going to limit what we're going to do to the open space. Ultimately it's a change we can make either way if the Commission wants to do it, but to him it's actually going further away from the protection side. [3h48m](#)

Commissioner Reed stated he appreciated that, Scott and that would be his tendency as well. That word preserved and it's been reinforced by so many of the goals as preserved open space. He asked Commissioner McCaffery for any thoughts. [3h49m](#)

Commissioner McCaffery stated it's kind of like what Eric was saying about how one side is going to be more open spacey and the other more parky. He thinks to not complicate things keeping it how it is makes sense. Even though some of it may end up being a park, that's his thoughts on it. [3h50m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he hasn't thought of it in Scott's terms and much of his orientation is if that gets pushed through the Agg and Open Space District, he has no concerns whatsoever about what comes out of it. If it isn't then Disneyland's a park, right? The idea of a preserved open space/park he thinks summarizes the whole deal. It's not as succinct as one word. [3h50m](#)

Staff Scott Orr suggested how about preserved parkland and open space. **Commissioner Reed** stated that's nice. **Commissioner Carr** responded good suggestion. [3h51m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked about the cutouts and how to carve out the cemetery or if it's not already protected in the language. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded and suggested to have specific direction that requires cutout for whoever the future user owner or whatever, that these specific uses are established and will be retained. [3h51m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked if need to add additional language to the plan to reinforce that? It seems like it's in goals and policy somewhere he's seen. **Commissioner Carr** responded he hasn't seen it and we probably need a policy that just explains that. [3h52m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated those features all occur on the West side. **Commissioner Carr** responded yes, except the highway connector. **Commissioner McCaffery** stated the cemetery was specifically mentioned in the State by the State as to be preserved as a cemetery. [3h52m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked is the footprint of the water system currently definable? Or is that something that could change depending on how it needs to be upgraded? **Staff Brian Oh** responded it could change, there's an established footprint with existing utilities but we have always discussed within the county that there needs to be a closer look to establish the boundary. [3h52m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated so the cemetery is a pretty straight-forward. Boundary plus access to the water system existing facilities plus whatever increase might be required consistent with the development agreement to provide municipal water source or something like that so it allows for some flexibility and expansion. [3h53m](#)

Commissioner McCaffery stated hiking up to the cemetery he remembers seeing an antenna that might have been a cell tower or something that's on that site as well. [3h53m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated the only reference he had to it is googling the site and looking at the structures. He asked staff to come up with language to make it clear that future use of the open space parkland area would retain the protection for the existing cemetery and the water treatment plant. We have yet to talk about this connector, so he would include the highway 12 connector in this policy if we decide to have it on the east side. [3h54m](#)

Staff Scott Orr asked to that point, is there a feeling that policy 2-15.3, which is specific to the cemetery. The other ones kind of mentioned in Commissioner Carr's list don't have such a specific policy that calls for their preservation. He wanted to make sure everyone was aware of this policy. **Commissioner Carr** responded he missed that and asked if he's saying we could add the water treatment plant to that section. [3h54m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated more-so if we are going to add a policy to some of the other uses that you think are critical, that we don't need to include cemetery in that new policy because it has its own. So rather than inserting water treatment into this one, maybe there's a standalone policy just for the sake of if we like 2-53 as is, we leave it and can add a new one to address something where we feel doesn't have enough intention.

Commissioner Reed asked if they go in public facilities. 3h55m

Staff Scott Orr responded he thinks in public facilities there's a section on water that might be a good home for it. **Commissioner Carr** stated where we really want it to have an effect is when the open space parkland uses get dealt with. That's why he thinks having it in open space might be a better alternative and maybe a cross reference in the utilities or something. 3h56m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked, when Shaun reports seeing some sort of tower, that might have been some sort of internal communication or radio when they were operating the facility. It raises the question if we should find out what that tower is and maybe if it's no longer relevant, call for its removal. 3h56m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated it also raised the issue of in the core and in the preserved open space, do we want to have restrictions or prohibitions on cell towers? **Staff Brian Oh** responded two part answer. It is active existing communications, the pole you're describing. We do identify a permitted use for telecom facilities, in recognition that there is one existing in the open space. He doesn't believe it's a permitted use elsewhere. 3h57m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked if it's limited to that existing one. **Staff Brian Oh** responded yes he believes that's the intent. 3h58m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked if there's a phase out provision. **Staff Brian Oh** responded there's no phase out provision. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded he'd prefer, unless there's some really compelling reason, even eliminating an existing one when the time comes would be preferred. 3h58m

Staff Scott Orr stated any telecommunication facility that has the use permit is required to return the land to its original state when the tower is decommissioned. But we are seeing an increased need on the county government and public side for making sure there aren't areas with deficient telecommunication equipment, really in terms of emergency response. He suspects there's probably not a use permit for this one since it's on this facility. We are also very limited in what we can control in terms of telecommunication facilities because of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 where we can really only determine what they're going to look like. 3h58m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated that's true, but the telecommunications act doesn't require owners of property to agree to the placement of facilities. It may limit what the County can do by way of regulation, but a private property owner, even a public agency that owns a property, he doesn't believe is compelled to accept a proposal by the telecommunications operator. 3h59m

Staff Scott Orr stated you are correct that they're not compelled, typically there are leases mutually agreed on between the land owner the telecommunications. 4h00m

Commissioner Carr stated so why don't we do the research we need to and find out if that existing tower is even being used and what it's status is. Let's also decide whether we want to restrict any new telecommunication facilities in the open space area. 4h00m

County Counsel stated if there's a desire to legislatively restrict telecommunications towers, we would want to do a little research in to the Federal preemption question. 4h00m

Staff Scott Orr stated last time he was onsite he noticed the tower and the equipment on it looked relatively modern and functional, as opposed to some more derelict ones he's seen on road trips. 4h01m

Commissioner Carr stated that's part of Sita's research. Let's make sure what the status is before we jump in. If it's falling apart or not being used much, maybe we can get rid of it. **Staff Scott Orr** added it's definitely not a fake tree. 4h01m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he'd want to know is it a public operation that's police and fire dispatch or is it a private facility that's leased and if so, what's the term of the lease. We want to know the facts about what it is so we can figure out what we may or may not want to do. **4h02m**

Commissioner Reed asked would it be anticipated in the new development that they would consider telecommunications and build it into the community as opposed to kind of an isolated tower? **4h02m**

Commissioner Reed stated the community is going to want to have a lot of telecommunication. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated that's why he likes the clarity of where we're talking about the core versus not the core. He's talking about the open space/park, not the core. **4h02m**

Commissioner Reed stated he withdraws his comment. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated no he's just saying it's a completely different conversation for him. **Commissioner Reed** responded he understands. **4h03m**

Commissioner Carr stated the upper elevations of Sonoma Mountain and that kind of stuff are just fraught with desire for communication, so we really do need to get our information together and figure out what we want to do there. **4h03m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated there probably are some exceptions, for example putting one on top of half dome would probably not be allowed. **4h03m**

Commissioner Reed stated let's wrap up open space and try to take a break before we move on. He asked for any final comments. **4h03m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated he would like to be able to talk to staff about the material he submitted and then potentially bring it back at our next meeting as a wrap up on that subject in terms of where it might fit in in the plan. **4h04m**

Commissioner Reed asked how are Commissioners feeling, do we feel like we got through that? How about a 10 minute break? **4h04m**

Commissioner Ocana stated she will not be present on the 10th and has two issues important to her, so if she can take the liberty of dominating at least some of the discussion before we end at five, she'd really appreciate that. **Staff Scott Orr** responded that's a good point because we should definitely reserve probably at least 20 minutes today to talk about the next meeting. At the last meeting we talked about meeting today, tomorrow and Monday. We just talked about it, we didn't do anything official, but if there's desire to still do that, that would have to be officially done today. **4h04m**

Commissioner Carr asked when come back, are we going to jump into chapter 3? **Commissioner Reed** stated it's either that or Land Use. **Commissioner Carr** and **Commissioner Reed** agreed. **4h04m**

Commissioner Ocana stated again she's not here on the 10th. Maybe we should get some scheduling in because she wants to make sure she gets this addressed. If we're meeting Monday or Tuesday, she's fine with that, if we're not she'd like to discuss these topics today. **Commissioner Carr** stated he thinks if we get through traffic today we can do land use and historical tomorrow and those are big discussions. **4h05m**

Staff Scott Orr stated on the subject of the 10th, Staff has talked with other Commissioners about having a non-SDC meeting because we do have other things that need to get through by the end of the year. We're not currently planning to have an SDC meeting on the 10th, from the staff side. **4h06m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated that's his recollection from our last meeting since Commissioner Ocana wasn't available. **4h06m**

Commissioner Carr stated we need to finish Monday at the latest because, as he recalls, we had a problem Tuesday too and a staff conflict. If we can roll through land use and historical tomorrow then maybe just if we need anything Monday it would be let's wrap up and talk about the EIR and what we're going to vote on this thing. **4h07m**

Commissioner Reed stated sure and asked which chapters they're in. **Commissioner Ocana** responded she's not sure which chapter because she doesn't find them anywhere. Perhaps it would be implementation and financing. She wants to discuss a community benefits agreements and there was also some discussion about the affordability and disabled persons group homes that we hadn't quite finished up in the last one. 4h07m

Commissioner Reed responded great and stated we'll be back at 4:20pm. 4h08m

Commissioner McCaffery asked Scott what time our meeting tomorrow? **Staff Scott Orr** responded you all have yet to pick a time. He assumed one o'clock-ish, but he acknowledges it's Friday so there may be a desire to start earlier. 4h19m

Commissioner Carr stated at the risk of upsetting Commissioner Koenigshofer he thinks we should try again for earlier. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** clarified. 4h19m

Commissioner Reed stated everybody's back, why don't we pencil in tomorrow. **Staff Scott Orr** added we just want to be sure of any time constraints tomorrow. Acknowledging that it's a second meeting of the week and it's a day we don't normally meet and we do have some working professionals. Maybe we'll start from a point of constraints tomorrow. 4h20m

Commissioner Carr stated nothing before 10, the rest of the day is fine. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated same here. **Commissioner Ocana** stated unfortunately she has a scheduled appointment between 12 and 1pm. She will try her very best to reschedule it, she has to be at the bank. She can commit to a 3 hour meeting tomorrow. She wants to be here the entire day on Monday. Since we're not taking a vote tomorrow, she hopes that does not constrain other Commissioners. 4h21m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated regarding Commissioner Ocana's availability he would be fine to meet from 2 to 5. 4h21m

Commissioner Reed asked Commissioner Ocana when her meeting is. **Commissioner Ocana** responded and clarified 2-5 would work fine for her. 4h21m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated or 1-4, he's just accommodating Commissioner Ocana. 4h22m

Commissioner Ocana asked if we'd have a quorum if everyone wanted to meet early could she just jump in? **Staff Scott Orr** responded in effect it wouldn't be too different from today, but in an ideal world we'd have meetings on different days and you'd be able to review the tapes, with a short turn around he's not sure that would be possible. He asked Counsel to weigh in. 4h22m

County Counsel stated we would want to have a Commissioner that missed part of it review the tape before any final vote. **Commissioner Ocana** asked can we do 1-4 or 2-5 then. 4h23m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated or 1:30-4:30pm. **Staff Scott Orr, Commissioners Reed and Carr** all agreed. 4h23m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked if links will go out for the Zoom meeting. **Staff Scott Orr** responded links will go out once we have an official motion to continue, which is how he recommends we end the meeting today. 4h24m

Commissioner Carr asked we're done at 5pm today, right? **Staff Scott Orr** responded that's correct, so many in half an hour he'll give the signal it's time for a motion. 4h24m

Commissioner Carr asked about Commissioner Ocana's specific desires for today and what they were. **Commissioner Reed** responded he was going to suggest those might be better suited during the land use discussion and wrap up on the implementation rather than mobility, unless there's something specific to mobility we could try to get to today. 4h24m

Commissioner Ocana stated we can go on to land use. 4h24m

Staff Scott Orr asked if Brian or Counsel if they wanted to ask any points of clarification on particularly the community benefits agreements, that we should look into for tomorrow, or are you feeling comfortable? **Staff Brian Oh** stated if Commissioner Ocana feels like there's additional work that's needed. **Commissioner Ocana** responded that's why she wanted to bring it up today. It's really important we talk about community benefits agreement, even if just for 15 minutes because there isn't anything in the plan right now and there are public requests for a community benefits agreement. If we could spend a little time to find out whether or not that's feasible to come back to us or even appropriate for the plan, she would appreciate it. **4h25m**

Commissioner Carr stated he wants to support Commissioner Ocana on that but thinks it's very complicated and probably more than we can tackle in any kind of detail but thinks it would be good to hear what the implications are from Staff. He was thinking of recommending a policy in the plan that says explore community benefits agreement and let that unfold as the new developer comes in. He agrees with Jacqueline to get some information from staff about what it means. **4h26m**

Commissioner McCaffery stated he agrees with Commissioners Carr and Ocana; however, he thinks the specifics of a community benefit agreement would be in a development agreement that would ultimately be between the county and developer. Getting some wording in there that there needs to be one and many some framework of what's in it would be a good thing. **4h26m**

Staff Scott Orr stated he know it upsets the plan but staff would also appreciate at least spending a few minutes on it today just so we have the morning to prepare in case there's anything we're not able to answer. **4h27m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated why don't we just spend the rest of our 25 minutes on it. **Commissioner Reed** agreed. **4h27m**

Commissioner Ocana stated she understands this would be a situation between the county and the developer once we have a developer on board. The idea is that we can guarantee that in the specific plan that a community benefits agreement will be at least, rather than encouraged because she doesn't think that's strong enough, will be sought or whatever language. She asked Brian or Sita to weigh in. **4h27m**

County Counsel stated what she's heard so far is consistent on the staff side. At the upper level, we don't recommend requiring a development agreement because by definition, they're voluntary. So, what allows us to negotiate these agreements with the developer is that they're not required. We could have a provision that says if there is a development agreement between the developer and the county that the developer must engage the community and parties must consider community benefits as part of that development agreement. The agreements themselves aren't required but if there is a development agreement, then it does have to have this community engagement process and consideration of community benefits as part of it. **4h28m**

Commissioner Ocana asked in that consideration could we provide for specifics and maybe strengthen that. For example, discussing worker housing, small business support, the idea of encouraging local or community-wide small business to occupy commercial spaces. Is that possible? Is that language staff could bring back to us tomorrow or Monday? **County Counsel** responded yes she thinks so. **4h29m**

Commissioner Ocana stated it's not going to completely satisfy, she knows people want to guarantee it but she seems the county's perspective on it. She would like to at least have it written down and thinks that's really important. **4h29m**

Staff Brian Oh stated within the agreement provision related to workforce housing as supporting the establishing of small business and he didn't hear this but feels like he's seen this just around affordable housing. **Commissioner Ocana** responded affordable housing is such a funny thing because even with workforce housing, who are the works? So there's a big difference between the housekeepers of the hotel and people working in the concierge. She'll leave that up to your expertise on what to provide but the idea is that we have a very broad range that will support all different levels of economics. **4h30m**

Commissioner Ocana stated people throw around living wage and what that means for the Sonoma Developmental Center and Sonoma Valley, how can we perhaps encourage a development agreement with that? She wants to comment on developmentally disabled housing. It's very important we establish that these

group homes are not segregated to one area of the development. She's seen that written and discussed about where we put everybody off to one side and that's definitely segregation of that community. Putting a written statement somewhere that's not encouraging, that's a lot stronger that establishes that these 5 different modules should be interspersed throughout the development. 4h31m

Commissioner Carr stated he supports everything Jacqueline just asked about and wants to see what this means in terms of living wage. Counsel at one point was going to come back to us with policies that we might adopt with respect to affordable housing being allocated to onsite workers. If not that, then local valley works as a priority. The indication earlier was that we might have some ability to do that. He doesn't know if that's part of a community benefit agreement or whether that's a separate issue, but he'd like to hear back on options for separating and intermingling the developmentally disabled units. His understanding from some of the comments is that there are many advantages to having them together just in terms of services. Absent an advantage like that he completely agrees it would be better intermingling them with the rest of the population. 4h32m

Commissioner Carr stated getting into a little more detail. As part of the community development agreement, getting some affordable housing in the higher ranges. Affordable housing is basically from zero to one hundred and twenty of the area of median income, or AMI, and funding for the upper level of that is usually very difficult to come by because most of the State and Federal funds available are for the lower aspect of that. So potentially exploring the size of the hotel in relation to the upper path of the affordable housing up to 120 AMI for workers who still don't qualify for the lower park but are making higher wages and still need help finding a place to live would be a possibility. Talking about local preference, there's way to do it. The pipeline into those units can be advertised locally and that can just inherently make it easier for someone local to get into those units. So maybe put some language in there about that. 4h33m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked staff if they have a link to provide with some community benefit agreement examples, that would be nice to have. He asked if operators of a facility like that have a preference about proximity to other facilities, so if we get something on that or something who has specific knowledge, he'd be interested to hear that. The general premise of sticking with the idea that we don't want to cluster the residential portion of the project where you've got the upscale neighborhood and the other neighborhoods. So, in keeping with that desire to mix the neighborhoods, he's all on board with that. Regarding the developmentally disabled facilities, he's on board with that pending advice from those with expertise in that field. 4h35m

Commissioner Carr stated he keeps reading about how a lot of housing projects or existing residents don't allow section 8 vouchers. He asked if there's some linkage to this community benefit agreement as to whether or not we an influence or require how many of the units can be mandated to allow section 8 vouchers for their home. His understanding is it's difficult now to find existing homes that qualify, where the land owner is not wanting to allow section 8, so he would put that in there if it's relevant. 4h37m

Commissioner Reed asked if we want to dive into the mobility section or save that for tomorrow and finish up with our motion to continue. 4h38m

Commissioner Carr stated why don't we tackle this connector business. The community is all over the map on this. Some don't want any connectors, some want almost a freeway and some are looking at evacuation only. His feeling is there are issues with the property owners to the south of the boarder between Toyon Road and Highway 12. It's a ranch there that's been using State property for a while for all his products and stuff. He's got some legitimate issues. There is a potential to deal with the land use and growth issues along a new road to stifle what typically happens, as soon as you put in a road somebody wants to do all kinds of development. There are issues around how you connect up to 12 and whether you've got to pay for an intersection and deal with the right of way issues etc. and some legitimate concerns about the ability of folks to evacuate if we have any kind of disaster in the area. 4h38m

Commissioner Carr stated he's in favor of a connector that is limited to evacuation. He's also intrigued by the possibility that if we do a permeable paving for that, some sort of a gravel surface that doesn't interrupt groundwater recharge or anything and if we gate so fire people can open when necessary and if make it a bike path with the ability for a biker to bike to the highway 12 corridor where this is a designated Sonoma Valley trail that the Park's Department has been working on for years now to try to assemble a bike route from Sonoma to Santa Rosa for years. There's probably good reason to have that bike path and keep it right on the southern border. 4h40m

Commissioner Carr stated the rancher is probably going to have some issues with this but he thinks this is the better approach and there is another way out for the rancher and to have a connection to the possible future bike path of the valley trail. If that's not something the Commission wants to do then he's kind of opposed to any connector at all. It's going to have more negatives than positives. [4h41m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked Brian to bring up the map of the connector location. It seems like the benefits stated in the plan for the connector was largely that traffic mitigations or VMT. Allowing more access and taking traffic off Glenn Ellen and potentially South. [4h41m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated that's correct and with the connector the future traffic was reduced. The problem is, there was never any analysis of what the traffic would be if you didn't. He recognizes that and also the need for evacuation. [4h42m](#)

Commissioner Reed stated he's not sure he agrees but likes the idea that we don't need a connector for traffic and that we can provide evacuation and multimodal bicycle pedestrian wise. [4h42m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked if he recalls correctly that the alignment would be along that line there. That property line would be the alignment, just a straight shot. **Commissioner Carr** responded it would follow Toyon out to where there's a dairy road that diverts so you'd have to build new road going straight along the southern boundary to 12. **Commissioner Koenigshofer** clarified. [4h43m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated folks at the ecology center and a number of habitat folks are really about not going through that eastern open space area directly. They acknowledge that there is some wildlife corridor impact on the southern route, but nearly as prevalent as if you go say from the extension of Harney straight across. [4h43m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated to him you'd do it along the property line in a straight line. [4h44m](#)

Staff Scott Orr asked Brian to put up 3.1-1. [4h44m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated it seems to break down into competing benefits/impacts. It reduces traffic going both directions on Arnold, but it turns it into a road versus evacuation only which would be very limited use for vehicles and would provide the benefit of bike trail, walking path and perhaps part of the trail system Greg referred to. [4h44m](#)

Commissioner Reed stated just for consideration he notices in the analysis of vehicle miles traveled there was some category of induces vehicle miles traveled, by providing the road that people would tend to drive more to because it was easier. **Commissioner Carr** responded that's true there is standard sort of amp up in VMT if you add a new road. [4h45m](#)

Commissioner Reed asked Scott, the crosstown connector is proposed in the current plan, or is it an option or how is it presented in the plan? **Staff Brian Oh** responded it is a core component of the plan. We don't anticipate going as far as identifying a preferred route. That would be for the future. We'd outline additional studies on how we foresee the next 5-10 years on the topic. So we've just identified two potential options. [4h46m](#)

Staff Scott Orr stated to add to that, should the Commission elect something more along the lines of Commissioner Carr's connector, EVA-only bike path, that would apply to that too in terms of that actual location of it. **Staff Brian Oh** responded correct and added from an EIR perspective it was something we studied. It's part of the final environmental impact report so it's well within the purview. [4h46m](#)

Commissioner McCaffery asked if a connector road was put in could it be made in such a way that wildlife could safely traverse it. **Staff Brian Oh** responded there are some best practices. He can't speak to cost but whether it's an overpass or underpass, there are strategies to blend the use of a road for people and wildlife. [4h47m](#)

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated all you have to do is convince a whole bunch of animals to go to the underpass. [4h48m](#)

Commissioner Carr stated the other piece of this, according to the Ecology Center, the habitat issues down in the eastern side where you go past Harney and past railroad over the hill. It's Wetland Restoration is their big issue. There's some historic wetlands in that area so that's a different issue for wildlife crossing. 4h48m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated the Harney extension, if we could call it that, from the point of view of future park us that would be a non-starter. It goes straight through the center of what would be lands added to the County's regional park, that just doesn't make sense to him. **Staff Brian Oh** responded to put a little context to Commissioner Carr's statement, there are some historic wetlands in this area that we've identified. 4h49m

Staff Scott Orr stated this is the 4-minute warning before we start talking about schedule for the last couple minutes. 4h49m

Commissioner Carr asked if we can straw vote this. 4h49m

Commissioner Reed stated we may have a general agreement, his question is how does it frame this project because the highway 12 connector is kind of a broader impact on the region as a whole and he can see the benefit that it brings to traffic or more benefit. He thinks it brings more benefit to the region than it does to the project. He would probably want some further analysis as would the Board of Supervisors to how to think about the value of the connector. It certainly has value for evacuation and fire safety, but that could be achieved theoretically through a premium permeable road and bike lane. 4h50m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated if he would support either the alignment along the property line would be the one and evacuation likely because if that were a signalized intersection at highway 12, all the traffic is going to be running through Toyon, which the whole east side of the project is anticipated to be residential neighborhoods if he's not mistaken. He wants to be very careful about loading a whole bunch of through traffic on the projects' residential component. He could see where people would look at that new route and say that's probably a way quicker way to get to Glen Ellen than the current route option. Preliminarily he would say evacuation along that Southern property line. 4h51m

Commissioner McCaffery stated his gut feeling is that there needs to be a functional connector road and it should be along that southern boundary. 4h52m

Commissioner Reed noted Commissioner Ocana nodding her head. **Commissioner Ocana** stated she's in agreement, she's for a road. Having it evacuation only is out of sight out of mind and is concerned about gates and what not. Even if it was just a very small two lane road with culverts for animals to get under, she's more in favor of having it functional on a regular basis. 4h52m

Commissioner Reed stated given that, the alignment along the property line does seem to take it into that residential neighborhood, so that would have to be considered in the design of the road as it comes through. 4h52m

Staff Scott Orr asked if he want to do a straw vote with our final minute? Or marinate on this one and lead off with it tomorrow. **Commissioner Reed** responded maybe some marination and come back with some rationale for the benefits of the road. He would prefer to not see a road and have the evacuation satisfied, but at the same time, there may need to be a road through there. 4h53m

Staff Scott Orr stated now is the town we should do the continuous motion. 4h53m

Commissioner Ocana asked if we confirmed for Monday. **Staff Scott Orr** responded he believes we've all discussed being available for Monday and planning to meet Monday, but it won't be final until we formally have a continuance vote tomorrow. We do have a special meeting agenda posted on the planning agency website for tomorrow with the zoom link and will also get a govdelivery notification out. 4h55m

Commissioner Carr asked if it would help at all if we could configure what it is we want to tackle first thing tomorrow. He asked Commissioner Ocana if she wanted to start out. **Commissioner Ocana** responded her need are satisfied. 4h55m

Commissioner Reed suggested we might just dive into the land use. **Commissioner Carr** responded that's fine too and do and do we want to straw vote the connector at that point while we're fresh on it? **Commissioner Reed** agreed. 4h55m

Commissioner Koenigshofer stated which would be a two part vote, one on alignment, two on scope. 4h56m

Staff Scott Orr stated on behalf of Staff, thank you Commissioners. Today there was some really excellent deliberations. 4h56m

Action: **Commissioner McCaffery** motioned to continue to a date certain of November 4 at 1:30pm. Seconded by **Commissioner Koenigshofer** and approved with a 5-0-0 vote. 4h54m

Appeal Deadline: N/A

Resolution No.: N/A

Vote:

Commissioner District 1 Carr	Aye
Commissioner District 3 Ocana	Aye
Commissioner District 4 McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner District 5 Koenigshofer	Aye
Commissioner District 2 Reed	Aye

Ayes:	5
Noes:	0
Absent:	0
Abstain:	0

Hearing Closed: 4:56 PM