



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 4, 2022
Meeting No.: 22-21

Roll Call

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

Staff Members

Scott Orr, Deputy Director
Brian Oh, Division Manager
Alisa Sanders, Secretary
Sita Kuteira, Deputy County Counsel

1:30 PM Call to order, Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance.

Correspondence

Board of Zoning Adjustments/Board of Supervisors Actions

Commissioner Announcements

Public Comments on matters not on the Agenda:

Items scheduled on the agenda

Planning Commission Regular Calendar

Item No.: 1
Time: 1:35 PM
File: PLP22-0024; Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan
Applicant: County of Sonoma
Owner: State of California
Cont. from: October 27, 2022
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.

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

Public Hearing Opened: 1:30PM

Chair Reed: Summarized what was discussed in previous meeting. Any comments from other commissioners? We have a 4:30 end time today. **0h1m**

Commission Carr asks who is to pay for Highway 12 connector **Staff Brian Oh** responds it would be a county road, so it would be part of any future public infrastructure as part of the publicly accessible road network. **0h3m**

Commissioner Carr: So, this is not a developer cost? **Staff Brian Oh** responds, the plan does not envision is that way. I think there is some language around providing future developer projects sponsor to provide contributions to future transportation improvements. We have always been communicating it as part of the public capital improvement plan. **0h4m**

Commissioner Carr: Discusses his comment made last meeting about evacuation only to minimize wildlife impact and also the financial impact on the County if expected to pay for Highway 12 connector. **0h5m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer has dropped off the meeting 0h5m

Discussion whether to continue without Commissioner Koenigshofer or to wait for him to come back 0h5

Commissioner McCaffery comments his issues with having an EVA only and suggests having the connector to highway 12, if there is one, to be a full-time connector **0h7m**

Commissioner Ocaña agrees with Commissioner McCaffery and comments concern about whether or not there will be gates on it or potential obstruction from it not being a regularly used path, if connector is evacuation only. I am in agreement of having it as a full-time road **0h7m**

Commissioner Carr to suggest a vote 0h9m

Commissioners discuss straw vote and how to count Commissioner Koenigshofer vote. 0h9m

Chair Reed: I think there was a suggestion yesterday to remove the Highway 12 connection or isolate it to evacuation only **0h9m**

Staff Scott Orr: Through the chair, just to make it clear, I think what I would recommend is that a yes vote would mean connector and a no vote would mean no permanent road connector. Just so that a positive is a positive and a negative is a negative. So, we are not getting confused. Does that make sense? **0h09m**

Staff Scott Orr promotes Commissioner Koenigshofer into meeting 0h10m

Chair Reed to Commission Koenigshofer, overview of what he missed and informs of coming straw vote 0h10m

Staff Scott Orr: Yes, Commission Koenigshofer, picking up where we left the last meeting. There is a straw vote where a yes vote is yes to s Highway 12 connector as a full public road and a no vote would be for no connector or an alternative such as EVA Only. Then I believe the intend of the Commission is to do a second vote on a preference between a connector location with acknowledging that maybe all of the information is impaired but just in terms of preference. So, this would be a straw vote only for the connector being a fully public road. **0h11m**

Straw Vote on Highway 12 connector:

Commissioner Carr	Nay
Commissioner Ocaña	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Abstained
Commissioner Chair Reed	Aye

Staff Scott Orr comments so, in terms of alignment, Chair Reed mentioned he would like more information for each scenario. Do you want to specify that this would be based on equal impacts for both projects as a preference? I know that the discussion was whichever has the least amount of impacts is obviously preferred, but if they were to be equal - **0h12m**

Commission Koenigshofer: For the purpose of this exercise and trying to move forward can we indicate a ranking of the two options, one being more preferred of over the other, subject to further analysis that might reveal facts that make the one that we choose more feasible financially or something like that. Or is there a path that we just say one or the other? **0h14m**

Commissioner McCaffrey: The two things that I'm weighing in on is that Harney is aligned with the existing bridge over Sonoma Creek, whereas Toyon is not. So, if you were to align along Toyon then you'd have to make a little loop that would go over to that bridge which would be where all the traffic would go. So, in my thinking the alignment along the southern border of the property, I think, is superior but coming up with a way to make that connection is important. You are weighing the effects on the wildlife quarter versus the effect on the project, in that sense. **0h15m**

Commissioner Carr: You've actually got two routes to get to that southern boundary, you've got Toyon or Harney to Railroad **Chair Reed responds:** It seems Harney to Railroad would be preferred, wouldn't you say? Given the impact on Toyon. **0h16m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer Comments preference over southern alignment based on protection of wetland and wildlife corridor. **Chair Reed** to share same opinion. **0h16m**

Staff Scott Orr: Through the chair, maybe on option we could go is straw vote for the Southern connector, and if any commissioners feel like there isn't enough information at this time to state a preference, at the moment, they could abstain as one option **0h18m**

Chair Reed to affirm Staff Scott Orr Straw Vote suggestion

Straw Vote for southern connector:

Commissioner Carr	Aye
Commissioner Ocaña	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Aye
Commissioner Chair Reed	Aye

Commissioner Koenigshofer asks staff is the plan explicitly says what type of road we're talking about? **Staff Brian Oh** answers, the classifications is a local road. **0h19m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer discusses the financial responsibility of the intersection upgrade for Highway 12 and if the connector will be a two-way road **0h20m**

Commissioner Carr refers to a question raised by Commissioner Ocaña, do we need to do anything special to make sure It's got a bike line? **Chair Reed** responds I was just looking at policy 3.5, 3.6 of mobility. And it says, actually, we use the existing network to the extent possible but also includes high quality pedestrian bicycle facilities. So, I think that would be the intention. **0h21m**

Commissioner Carr asks Staff if the Plan explicitly needs to state to include a bike lane. **Staff Scott Orr** answers it is enough. You know, whenever we're looking at new public infrastructure, adding in non-vehicular infrastructure is as important. **0h21m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer thanks staff for the clarification and proposes an independent bike. Clarifying to not have a bike lane built into the design of the road itself, that it is not just a line painted on the edge of a broader asphalt strip. **0h21m**

Staff Brian Oh answers it is not this explicitly, but based on this discussion, that's something we can clarify. And then the other component, just to mention, part of this regional parks has had a long-standing study and desire to have a continuous connection for bikes along Highway 12. And so, part of our discussion has absolutely been we think this is a critical component to making that connection between SDC and Highway 12. **0h22m**

Commissioner McCaffrey discusses having the bike lane as a part of the park aligned with the road. **Commissioner Carr** agrees and comments it sounds like, eventually, the County is going to end up paying for this. **0h23m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer comments so long as it doesn't have the potential interpretation that the bike lane and costs associated with the development of the bike lane is a Park's matter and not a Public Works matter, subject to developer impact mitigations. I don't want to shift that financial responsibility to Parks. **Staff Scott Orr** responds I believe if specify class one that is all accounted for. **0h25m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer: Do we need to straw vote to specify Class one **Staff Scott Orr** to respond we could, otherwise, I would just view that as a clarification **0h25m**

Chair Reed: Before we move on to Land Use, do we have other comments in the mobility section? **0h25m**

Commissioner Carr to comment on parking pricing. Referring to Policy 3-34 and suggests making sure the pricing for the parking only applies during the work week and that on weekends, and during events allows free parking to alleviate parking in neighboring areas like the Eldridge neighborhood. Is it the intention that the parking money would go to the developer, or is that to be to go to the county? **Staff Brian Oh** responds part of these proceeds would be going to the continuing programming of the Transportation Management Association. So, that's something that typically a local entity would be responsible for managing. **0h28m**

Chair Reed: I'm looking at 3-27 and where it said no free parking before it was modified to say price off street parking within the core campus to encourage alternative mode of transportation. So, it kind of contradicts providing more parking for events and stuff like that **0h29m**

Commissioner Carr responds I'm suggesting that they don't charge for parking during events. That would help focus the parking for events in the core and not have it spread out to outlying areas. **0h30m**

Chair Reed asks, do you think that contradicts 3-27, to encourage alternative mode use? **Commissioner Carr** responds, I think it contradicts that all pricing on the property is going to be for money. **0h30m**

Staff Brian Oh: Through the Chair, maybe I can put some background to this shift here, and this was in recognition to allow some more flexibility to Commissioner Carr's point. Perhaps the impact on parking is not as impactful off hours, off peak hours, and so this would allow the eventual Management Association to price accordingly. **Commissioner Carr** asks, so, you're stating that built into that is an allowance for free parking at times? **0h30m**

Staff Brian Oh answers, it's not explicitly. By revising the initial which was, there shall be no free parking. This allows for some latitude to either charge less per hour, or charge nothing. **Commissioner Carr** asks, would it be acceptable to make that explicit that there may be times where parking is not charged? **Staff Brian Oh** defers to the Commission **0h32m**

Chair Reed asks Who is managing this? **Staff Brian Oh** answers, typically it is a local entity. We have had some sort of initial discussions, but we don't currently have a Transportation Management Association. That is something we would be exploring with SCTA, our transportation authority, potentially something with just the County as well. **0h32m**

Chair Reed asks, there is no financial incentive for that group to be charging more for parking to be collecting those funds, correct? **Staff Brian Oh:** Correct. And I think that gets to Commissioner Carr's point about public versus private management and oversight. **0h33m**

Commissioner Carr: proposes to put some clarifying language that can state that as part of that parking management, that there may be time where there is free parking. **0h33m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer comments, I would like us to give some preference to the idea that the people who live there are the people of primary concern. Do we have enough in here that makes it clear that the decision we are making assumes that kind of local controlling entity? And do we need to offer any direction relative to whether or not there's resident membership in such a decision-making body? **Staff Brian Oh** responds, modification of 3-42 to make it clearer to direct it towards a public entity. 3-35, perhaps the commission wants to take a look at that to see if that adequately addresses the flexibility and the intent with regards to parking management. **0h35m**

Staff Scott Orr discusses looking at 3-35 which states, if pricing is implemented and also modifying 3-42 to accommodate Commissioner Carr's comments. **0h36m**

Commissioner Carr asks if the County ever limit parking in residential areas to people who live in those areas? We may need that for some of the areas, particularly the eastern side. That is all I had Mr. Chairman on parking **0h37m**

Commissioner Ocaña comments if there can be added language about allowing residents to receive a permit for free parking. **Staff Brian Oh** responds that is a strategy envisioned and I will look at where we can add that to be more explicit **0h40m**

Chair Reed opens the discussion of Land Use **0h41m**

Commissioner Carr proposes putting a cap on total housing, focusing on affordability as much as possible and putting in a pause through the development process to take stock of what has been accomplished and generate a report to the Commission and Board. Also, proposes a total of 450 residential units, 50% deed restricted and 50% attached. Would like to see a policy to prioritize affordable units to the workers that are on site in the area and have residential units be of universal design. Along with the cap on residential housing, also putting a cap on commercial units to keep the jobs housing balance around 1:1 **0h41m**

Chair Reed asks what assurance do we have in the plan to guarantee that the affordable housing is to be built as a priority? **Staff Scott Orr** cites article 89 of existing code and no building permits will be issued for market rate units without affordable units being issued at the same time. **0h51m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer inquires to what extent can the development agreement vary from items, such as what is being discussed? Also, to what extent, if any, is there public process, participation in the development and enactment of the development agreement? **County Counsel Sita Kutiera** answers that the development agreement is a legislative act that's adopted by ordinance. So, it needs to go through the public hearing process. So, there's opportunity for the public to engage um there. Also, along those same lines to one of your earlier questions about where what flexibility does it afford? Because it is a legislative act. It allows the Government to impose slightly agree to different regulations. **0h54m**

Chair Reed proposes discussion about unit count. **0h57m**

Commissioner Carr proposes reducing the total number of units from 1,000 to 450. **0h59m**

Commissioner McCaffrey discusses the benefits of building to the full plan and not reducing number of units and states agreement with Chair Reed. **1h00m**

Chair Reed request a figure to demonstrate percentage of affordable housing from staff **1h02m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer drops off meeting **1h03m**

Commissioner Carr and Commissioner McCaffrey discuss project size and cost, and how units would be distributed between different income levels. **1h03m**

Chair Reed request Staff to bring up Table 4-4 and promote Mr. Bhatia to give an overview of housing. **1h09m**

Rajeev Bhatia joins meeting **1h10m**

Rajeev Bhatia asks what needs to be explained for housing **1h10m**

Chair Reed clarifies question of how affordable housing is distributed across the whole project. **Rajeev Bhatia** answers number of market rate housing and percentages of single and multi-family units. **1h11m**

Chair Reed comments on density of 12 units per acre **Rajeev Bhatia** responds that they are either small lots or attached units **1h14m**

Commissioner Carr suggests expanding to non-profits to help with funding and reduce the amount of units in the plan. **Chair Reed** inquires where Commissioner Carr would lower the amount of units, referring to Table 4-4. **Commissioner Carr** suggests reducing units in low/medium density, medium density and low density by about half to have total units around 450-460. **1h15m**

Koenigshofer rejoins **1h17m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer discusses moving the affordability issue to higher percentages, Table 4-4: Projected Specific Plan Buildout. Questions if the low and medium density directly relates to deed restricted affordable? **1h17m**

Staff Brian Oh to responds it would be both and any units identified as a part of the flex zone **Commissioner Koenigshofer** continues, does not want to see high-end designs, and wants to stick with affordable by design units. **1h20m**

Chair Reed to Commissioner Koenigshofer, you had mentioned you don't want to see market rate. These aren't going to be vacation home that people are looking for in Sonoma and I'm sure the benefits of deed restricting all of that. **1h21m**

Commission Koenigshofer responds wants to have more units deed restricted than what is stated in the plan. Asks Mr. Bhatia what the percentage is of deed restricted is now. **Staff Scott Orr** answers, 25% **1h22m**

Staff Brian Oh adds 25% and with the additional one hundred units, and not on the developer side. It ends up being closer to uh a little over 28% of the total number of units, so 283 deed restricted, low-income units. **1h22m**

Commissioner Carr discusses what size is appropriate for the units that are going to be market rate units and have smaller units to be for the affordable by design uh program. **1h24m**

Staff Brian Oh recaps the discussion of limiting lot size as identified in the residential building standards table. Then, also, there is a policy 4-17 that the commission may want to consider strengthening. At this point, it says at least 50% of the market rate housing should be designed as missing middle. **1h25m**

Commissioner Carr and Commissioner Koenigshofer discuss wanting all market rate housing to be affordable for missing middle instead of 50% of market rate. **1h26m**

Chair Reed: discusses unit types and including some standard lots. 1h28m

Commissioner Koenigshofer responds in agreement with Chair Reed on the characterization of the community. Discusses looking at the community larger than just this project discussion and having larger lot sizes with higher end design for the general market. There's going to be a focal point of the larger community and recognizing that I don't want to under use the opportunity for the places where our community-wide agreement says we are most lacking in terms of housing, general Market the third that's the general market out there is fully occupied. 1h30m

Commissioner McCaffrey to comments using Table 4-4, moving units from low and medium density into that medium flex density so that we achieve what we want as a commission for affordable by design, allow a little bit in the market rate category of the low to medium density, and then also increase that true affordable lower end. 1h32m

Rajeev Bhatia Discusses three things that can be done to accommodate the commission. Ask if there is a way to add to the Development Agreement to add funding for additional affordable housing. 1h35m

Staff Sita Kuteira responds to **Rajeev Bhatia** It essentially just be increasing the policy that we have where they dedicate the property for a hundred units. 1h37m

Commissioner Carr comments on house size and lot limits and bring down the number of units from 1,000 to a lot lower number. 1h38m

Commissioner McCaffrey Agrees with the conversation about dedicating land to affordable housing to be developed at a future time. 1h39m

Chair Reed: Proposes doing a straw vote on the number of units before taking a break. 1h41m

Staff Scott Orr asks staff if they have sufficient notes on Rajeev Bhatia suggestions. Clarifies Chair Reed's straw vote of 1,000 units with modifications from Rajeev is a yes and if the No's have it we will pivot to Commissioner Carr's proposition. 1h41m

Commissioner Carr is reluctant to vote on the issue. Unsure what Rajeev Bhatia's suggestion is and was under the impression it would be revisited when there was more information on other options. 1h42m

Rajeev Bhatia clarifies his suggestions single family detached/semi-detached 10 – 30%, single -family attached 20 – 40%, Multifamily 40 – 60%, the total being 100% and housing and lot size, 10% over 1800 sq. ft and 90% below. 1h43m

Commissioner Koenigshofer discusses having larger units included in the deed restricted. **Rajeev Bhatia** answers that a certain percentage would be taken from each unit type for deed restricted. 1h45m

Staff Scott Orr discusses Article 89 requires a mixture of housing sizes and types in housing projects 1h46m

Commissioner McCaffery discusses removing the 200 affordable housing units from the total number of units for the developer and applying the percentages to the remaining 800 units. 1h47m

Commissioner Carr agrees with Commissioner McCaffery but does not feel it should be limited to 200 but to apply the same concept to a certain amount of land for nonprofits to come in and provide funding for those units. 1h48m

Staff Brian Oh comments that there are a few ways staff can achieve what is being discussed 1h49m

Staff Scott Orr calls a 10 minute break while Staff updates unit information for Commission to review 1h50m

Meeting to resume at 3:30PM 1h50m
Commissioner Koenigshofer dropped off meeting

Staff Brian Oh recaps discussion of identifying some sort of limitation per category to achieve the broader goals around inclusivity and housing, affordability, and accessibility. Shares his screen to show discussed percentages for each housing category. **2h01m**

Commissioner Carr comments on the affordable housing project would follow the current County Code rather than having any bedroom or size limits. **2h03m**

Commissioner McCaffery comments, if the cost share would be providing the land and appropriate utilities to those sites, it would be appealing to the State or Federal housing authorities to get funds for the project to move forward. **2h03m**

Commission Carr agrees with Commissioner McCaffery but would like to vote on total number of units. Would like to see increase in land for 100% affordable housing and being 50% of total units. **2h05m**

Chair Reed discusses a hard finish at 4:30PM and whether the commission should wait for Commissioner Koenigshofer to rejoin to take a straw vote on units. **2h08m**

Commissioner Carr suggests discussing the percentage of units that would be affordable. Disagrees with the 200 hundred units being affordable, if the total number of units is 1,000 would like to see the number of affordable housing to go up. **2h09m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer rejoins meeting 2h10m

Chair Reed recaps discussion to Commissioner Koenigshofer during his absence. **Staff Scott Orr** describes the document shared after the break **2h10m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer ask for clarification about 200 units for affordable housing and if that is a reduction in the total affordable and affordable by design **2h13m**

Staff Scott Orr clarifies unit break down **2h13m**

Commission discusses housing unit break down **2h14m**

Staff Brian Oh clarifies when we identified, with the community, the need for prioritizing affordable housing landed on 25% total inclusionary on the market rate. We built in assumptions around only being able to get there with the number of density bonuses. There is a section in Chapter 4 caps the number of base units, we would take hundred from that. **2h15m**

Rajeev Bhatia discusses Staff Brian Oh's information in more detail and 1,000 units being a cap in the development agreement **2h17m**

Staff Sita Kuteira comments under density bonus law, we aren't able to stop developers from getting density bonuses on top of what's allowed. If the total amount of housing wants to be decreased, then the base number should be decreased. **2h18m**

Commissioner Carr responds, I'm not saying developers don't get density bonus. What I'm saying is in the end regular density plus density bonus, the total is 1,000. **2h18m**

Rajeev Bhatia to Commissioner Carr, the problem with reverse engineering is that the density bonus number changes based on what percent of affordable housing units someone provides. The EIR studied 1,000 units, if you go beyond that the county must reassess. **2h19m**

Commission continues discussion of 1,000-unit cap and wording within the development agreement **2h20m**

Chair Reed proposes a straw vote of no more than a 1,000 units in the plan, in addition to the distribution per Staff Brian Oh's spreadsheet **2h22m**

Commissioner Carr asks, the ten percent allotment to go to where the house size can go over the one thousand eight hundred. Does that apply to all the market rate units? **Rajeev Bhatia** answers yes, 10% of the 800 would go beyond the 1800 sq ft. **2h24m**

Chair Reed clarifies yes vote agrees to cap of 1,000 units and distributed according to the spreadsheet put forth by Brian Oh. **2h25m**

Commission Carr Request two votes, one on the one thousand and one on the distribution formula. **2h26m**

Staff Sita Kuteira comments that under State law you cannot have an absolute cap. Trying change the underlying density in order to encompass the density bonuses. I think that that's having the same effect as trying to cap the density bonuses. **2h26m**

Commissioner Koenigshofer asks under state law, impacts in excess of the EIR analysis are exempt from CEQA? **Staff Sita Kuteira** answers, if it falls into an exemption, then, that might be the case. But if there is a discretionary approval, then we would look to the EIR and see if there needed to be additional environmental review. **2h26m**

Commission Koenigshofer comments order for me to make a decision that reflects the analysis and conclusion in the EIR, which is 1,000 units, in order to do that I would need to draw down the baseline to account for the density bonus. **2h28m**

Rajeev Bhatia comments we would base it off the county requirement for 25% of the units to be affordable. We don't want to say it is a 1,000 max, I think what we can say is that based on the county's requirements for this project 25% inclusionary units. This is our best estimate at the number of units total here. **2h29m**

Commission Carr comments what your charts ended up proposing was somewhere around 720 or 730 as the base number of units. Then you calculated the 1,000 based upon, I'm assuming, density bonuses. **2h32m**

Staff Scott Orr to clarify I'd recommend a straw vote on recommending that the densities be scaled down, so that the density with density bonus is a number less than a 1,000. I think that's the simplest way to convey what I believe is trying to be said. **2h32m**

Rajeev Bhatia asks Scott Orr you're saying is to express the number without the density bonus with it, right? So, you would say the total number of units and the county will require 25% affordability. Then, if you get the bonus and you want to come to us, that's fine. But we're not going to state that number in the plan. Right? **Staff Scott Orr** responds That's my attempted simplification at Commissioner Carr's point about the maximum number units. **2h33m**

Chair Reed Shall we proceed with a vote? **2h35m**

Straw Vote for total number of units in development plan:

Commissioner Carr	Nye
Commissioner Ocaña	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Aye
Commissioner Chair Reed	Aye

Straw Vote for distribution spreadsheet displayed by Brian Oh:

Commissioner Carr	Aye
Commissioner Ocaña	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Aye
Commissioner Chair Reed	Aye

Commissioner Ocaña asks has Staff had a chance to come up with some language for us on a community benefits encouragement? **Staff Brian Oh** confirms **2h38m**

Commissioner Ocaña request to go though the language staff came up with **2h39m**

Staff Brian Oh shares his screen and **Staff Sita Kuteira** discusses this is an option for a policy that could go into this specific plan. As we discussed yesterday, we don't recommend requiring a development agreement because they are voluntary by nature. This language could strengthen the development agreement that we expect to enter into with the developer. **Staff Sita Kuteira** reads Community Benefits Policy displayed on screen. **2h40m**

Staff Scott Orr adds staff items listed as potentials our living wage and other worker protections, local hire policies, workforce housing, public parks and recreation, among others. **2h41m**

Commissioner Ocaña discusses some added words and additional provisions to the Community Benefits Policy. **2h42m**

Commission Carr suggests to also includes a proposed amendment to 7-12, from Sonya Cardabell's public comment. **2h45m**

Commissioner McCaffery comments additional language to include in Commissioner Ocaña's list **2h46m**

Staff Brian Oh shares his screen to show additions made to Community Benefits Policy for confirmation from the Commission **2h47m**

Commissioner Ocaña suggests adding "commitment to economic and educational opportunities for individuals with developmental and physical disabilities" **2h49m**

Staff Brian Oh makes note of adding 7-12 from public comment submitted by Sonia Cardabell. **2h49m**

Chair Reed calls for straw vote **2h51m**

Straw Vote for Community Benefits Encouragement:

Commissioner Carr	Aye
Commissioner Ocaña	Aye
Commissioner McCaffery	Aye
Commissioner Koenigshofer	Aye
Commissioner Chair Reed	Aye

Chair Reed asks when continuation should start on Monday. **2h51m**

Commission Carr discusses highlights of things to be discussed **2h52m**

Chair Reed Clarifies voting on recommendations; at the end of the day we have to adopt the resolution and move forward to the Board of Supervisors. **2h52m**

Action: **Commissioner McCaffery** motioned to continue the meeting to 11AM on Monday the 7th. Seconded by **Commissioner Carr** and approved with a 5-0-0 vote. **2h57m**

Appeal Deadline: N/A
Resolution No.: