

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Mary Gourley](#)
Subject: Rich's Misleading Response - Public Comment 10/18/22
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 4:51:49 PM

Dear Council Members,

I am writing about an exchange with Council Member Rich. I made a written public comment for the 10/4/22 Council Meeting regarding Rich's request for an extension of the SAVS contract on Item 6b.

"Currently, SVdP has made a commitment to allow SAVS to lease the site for one year (with an additional one year extension as an option)"

<https://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us/getattachment/Meeting-Event/City-Council/2022/City-Council-Meeting-October-4,-2022/Agenda-Item-Number-6-b-St-Vincent-de-Paul-SVdP-Resolution-Of-Support-845-Grav-N-Site.pdf.aspx>

My letter, which Council read, can be found here:

https://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us/getattachment/Meeting-Event/City-Council/2022/City-Council-Meeting-October-4,-2022/Council-Promised-1-year;-Now-It-s-3-The-SAVS-RV-SITE-Public-Comment-10_4_22_Redacted.pdf.aspx

Rich's Reply

Council Member Rich wrote me back saying:

Kate:

The Council is not being asked tonight to formally do anything about the RV Village - nothing about a formal extension of the use of the property for the RV Village and nothing about allocation of any City funding for the RV Village.

All that is being asked is that a Staff Lead on issues related to the unhoused be appointed, that a Council Liaison to service providers be appointed, that the Council state general support for the RV Village, and (in separate items), that the Council agree to a resolution being requested by St Vincent de Paul, as support for SVdP's funding request to the County to develop affordable housing on the 845 Gravenstein Highway North site, and a resolution requested by West County Community Services, as support for the WCCS funding request to the County for two tiny homes to be placed at Park Village. That's it.

Diana

Please reply to: Diana Rich

Sebastopol City Council
drich@cityofsebastopol.org

Rich's Omission of Vital Information

What Council Member Rich failed to include or mention is that the very next week on 10/11 the SAVS extension was going before the Planning Commission for a 2 year extension. The 2 year extension was granted.

"With the transition to a longer operational timeframe (from 12 months to 36 months, with the 2 year additional time extension being requested in this application), the Planning Director has determined that definition of the use will change after the initial one year period to be classified as a 'temporary residential use,' as the turn-over of residents would exceed time period ("for a period of generally not more than six months") with the extended use."

https://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us/getattachment/Meeting-Event/Planning-Commission/2022/Planning-Commission-Meeting-of-October-11th,-2022/845-Grav-Hwy-N_SAVS_Report_10-11-22.pdf.aspx

Is Diana Rich Acting in Good Faith with Her Constituent?

Did Council Member Rich act in full honesty, full transparency or full disclosure when she wrote her reply to me?

She did not.

She knew that SAVS was going before the Planning Commission on 10/11 because she's intimately involved with the project. Council Member Rich was actively involved in setting up Horizons Shine, was on the Ad Hoc Committee on the Unhoused and was the person who requested the extension on item 6B.

Why did she fail to disclose information about the following week's planning commission meeting? I was writing as a concerned citizen about that very issue. How many other people were misled by a response by Rich which dismissed valid concerns and did not disclose the Planning Commission meeting?

Are Council Members Obligated to Respond with All Relevant Information to Constituents?

My questions to Council are: "Are elected officials required to give all relevant information to constituents?; Are Council Members under any sort of obligation to respond to a direct query with information that is directly relevant to the citizen's concern?"

My hope would be that, even if you were not required by law to give necessary information, my elected officials would do so because they are ethical people and want their

constituents to be informed participants in our city and government. Isn't our democracy dependent on good faith exchanges between elected officials and their constituents?

In this regard, I feel that Council Member Rich has failed and I would hope that she would strive to be more forthcoming, more transparent and more honorable in her exchanges with people in our community.

Best,
Kate Haug