

City Council  
Mayor Stephen Zollman  
Vice Mayor Jill McLewis  
Councilmember Phill Carter  
Councilmember Neysa Hinton  
Councilmember Sandra Maurer



## City of Sebastopol

**Agenda Item Number: 20**  
City Manager  
Don Schwartz  
[dschwartz@Cityofsebastopol.gov](mailto:dschwartz@Cityofsebastopol.gov)  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC  
Mary Gourley  
[mgourley@Cityofsebastopol.gov](mailto:mgourley@Cityofsebastopol.gov)

### CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 7, 2025

As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of January 21, 2025

Please note that minutes of meetings are not meant to be verbatim minutes and are meant to be the City's record of a summary of actions that took place at the meeting. The vote/action is the required information of the meeting actions that took place. Approved minutes are available on the City Council Meetings page.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Zollman called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Mayor Stephen Zollman  
Vice Mayor Jill McLewis  
Councilmember Phill Carter  
Councilmember Neysa Hinton  
Councilmember Sandra Maurer

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager Don Schwartz  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley  
City Attorney Alex Mog

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG :** Mayor Zollman led the salute to the flag.

**REMOTE PARTICIPATION UNDER AB 2449 (IF NEEDED):** To consider and take action on any request from a Council Member to participate in a meeting remotely due to Just Cause or Emergency Circumstances pursuant to AB 2449 (Government Code Section 549539(f)). Assembly Bill 2302 (2024) ("AB 2302") revises rules for when members of local legislative bodies may participate in meetings remotely. Specifically, it amends the number of meetings that may be attended remotely for just cause and under emergency circumstances and clarifies the definition of the term "meeting," for purposes of remote attendance. AB 2302 caps the number of remote meetings a member can attend each year based on the frequency of a legislative body's meetings: Five meetings per year for those meeting twice a month.

All Councilmembers were present in person.

**PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS/INTRODUCTIONS:**

The following was presented:

- Year of Service Award – Ana Kwong, Administrative Services Director: 10 Years

**Reference Order: 2025-001**

Mayor Zollman requested reordering of the agenda to move Item Number 8 first.

**STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** Conflicts of interest may arise in situations where a public official deliberating towards a decision, has an actual or potential financial interest in the matter before the Council. In accordance with state law, an actual conflict of interest is one that would be to the private financial benefit of a public official, a relative or a business with which the Councilmember is associated. A potential conflict of interest is one that could be to the private financial benefit of a Councilmember, a relative or a business

7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, California 95472 Tel. 707.823.1153 Fax. 707.823.1135

[www.cityofsebastopol.gov](http://www.cityofsebastopol.gov)

with which the Councilmember is associated. A Councilmember must publicly announce potential and actual conflicts of interest, and, in the case of actual conflict of interest, must refrain from participating in debate on the issue or from voting on the issue and must remove themselves from the dais.

There were no stated conflicts of interest by City Councilmembers.

**PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (FIRST COMMENT PERIOD):** *Up to Twenty (20) Minute Time Limit (Two Minutes for up to ten speakers). Additional public comment will be held at the end of the discussion and action items for up to an additional twenty (20) minutes. Mayor has discretion to allow for additional time beyond the 20 minutes allocated for public comment dependent upon the subject matter or number of speakers.*

*Process for calling on Speakers: Mayor or designee shall ask for public comment as follows: Speakers to be called on in an alternate manner (One speaker in person to be called on first; then one speaker remote to be called on second with additional speakers to be called on in the same manner) based upon the time limit.*

The following member(s) of the public spoke during public comment.

A member of the audience. RFP Sculptor

Item Number 8:

8. Consideration of Approval of Solid Waste Collection Agreement with Sonoma County Resource Recovery for garbage, recycling, and organic waste collection services and authorize the execution of a professional services agreement with R3 Consulting Group, Inc. (R3) to provide the City with consulting services during the transition of solid waste collection services to SCRR. The funding for this contract will be paid by Sonoma County Resource Recovery (SCRR) and will have no fiscal impact on the City of Sebastopol budget. (Responsible Department: Assistant City Manager)

Assistant City Manager Gourley presented the agenda item recommending the City Council after receipt of the staff report, presentation, hear from members of the public, consider approval of the Solid Waste Collection Agreement with Sonoma County Resource Recovery for garbage, recycling, and organic waste collection services and authorize the execution of a professional services agreement with R3 Consulting Group, Inc. (R3) to provide the City with consulting services during the transition of solid waste collection services to SCRR. The funding for this contract will be paid by Sonoma County Resource Recovery (SCRR) and will have no fiscal impact on the City of Sebastopol budget.

Garth Schultz, R3 Consulting, presented a presentation to the City Council.

Mayor Zollman asked if members of the ad hoc committee would like to make any comments prior to questions of staff or the consultant. Both members of the ad hoc committee provided comments.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff or the consultant from the City Council.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. The following member(s) of the public provided public comment:

1. Resident since 1986
2. Kyle
3. Serafina
4. North Bay Jobs Justice
5. Mario
6. 20 year homeowner

7. Sunny
8. Tom
9. A member of the audience/employee
10. Maddy
11. Ambrosia
12. Saivya
13. Woody
14. Angela
15. Bill
16. Mary Ann
17. Myriah
18. Kenna
19. Steve
20. Maraline
21. Lisa
22. Glenn
23. Oliver
24. Jim
25. Eric
26. Betsy
27. Andy
28. Sarah
29. Sonoma county conservation action
30. Hans
31. Robert
32. Bronte
33. Logan
34. Michael
35. Jean
36. Countney
37. Trevor
38. Walter
39. Celia
40. Michael
41. Nikki
42. Employee of Recology
43. Mike
44. Danielle
45. Manuel
46. Emily
47. Steve
48. Michael
49. Dan
50. Kevin
51. Marie
52. Brian

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff.

The Council discussed the agreement and recommended options.

**MOTION:**

Mayor Zollman moved and Councilmember Maurer seconded the motion to approve the Solid Waste Collection Agreement with Sonoma County Resource Recovery for garbage, recycling, and organic waste collection services and authorize the execution of a professional services agreement with R3 Consulting Group, Inc. (R3) to provide the City with consulting services during the transition of solid waste collection services to SCRR and to recommend Option 2.

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: Councilmembers Carter and Hinton  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved the Solid Waste Collection Agreement with Sonoma County Resource Recovery for garbage, recycling, and organic waste collection services and authorize the execution of a professional services agreement with R3 Consulting Group, Inc. (R3) to provide the City with consulting services during the transition of solid waste collection services to SCRR and to recommend Option 2.

Minute Order Number: 2025-009  
Resolution Number: 6637-2025

Mayor Zollman called for a break at 8:36pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:46 pm.

9. Discussion and Consideration of City Council and City Staff Committee Assignments. This item is to discuss the Mayor’s recommendations for City Council Committee Assignments. (Mayor/Responsible Department: City Clerk)

Assistant City Manager Gourley presented the agenda item recommending the City Council discuss and consider ratification of the City Council and City Staff Committee Assignments.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff or the Mayor.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. There was none.

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff. The Council discussed changes in assignments.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Hinton moved and Councilmember Maurer seconded the motion to approve the Committee Assignments with the following amendments:

Councilmember Carter – Primary to Zero Waste Sonoma and Councilmember Maurer Alternate  
Councilmember Hinton – Primary – Service Clubs and Councilmember Alternate

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved the Committee Assignments with the following amendments:  
Councilmember Carter – Primary to Zero Waste Sonoma and Councilmember Maurer Alternate  
Councilmember Hinton – Primary – Service Clubs and Councilmember Alternate  
Minute Order Number: 2025-010

11. Authorization to implement Volunteer Firefighter Stipend Policy. There is no budget impact with this item as there is funding budgeted in the FY 24 25 Fire Department budget in the amount of \$124,000. (Responsible Department: Fire/City Manager)

Fire Chief Bray presented the agenda item recommending the City Council after receipt of the staff report, hear from members of the public, consider approval of Authorization to implement Volunteer Firefighter Stipend Policy. There is no budget impact with this item as there is funding budgeted in the FY 24 25 Fire Department budget in the amount of \$124,000.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff from the City Council. There were none.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. There were none.

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Maurer moved and Mayor Zollman seconded the motion to approve Authorization to implement Volunteer Firefighter Stipend Policy. There is no budget impact with this item as there is funding budgeted in the FY 24 25 Fire Department budget in the amount of \$124,000.

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved Authorization to implement Volunteer Firefighter Stipend Policy. There is no budget impact with this item as there is funding budgeted in the FY 24 25 Fire Department budget in the amount of \$124,000.  
Minute Order Number: 2025-012

12. Consideration of Council Approval to Initiate the Recruitment Process to Hire Fire Captain(s) Position(s); There is no General Fund budget impact as funding for Positions are to be Funded through the Measure H Funds in the amount of \$117,217 (Responsible Department: Fire/City Manager)

Fire Chief Bray presented the agenda item recommending the City Council after receipt of the staff report, hear from members of the public, consider approval to Initiate the Recruitment Process to Hire Fire Captain(s) Position(s); There is no General Fund budget impact as funding for Positions are to be Funded through the Measure H Funds in the amount of \$117,217.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff from the City Council. The Council asked questions of staff.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. There was none.

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Maurer moved and Vice Mayor McLewis seconded the motion to approve initiation of the Recruitment Process for Fire Captain Positions; Funding for Positions to be Funded through the Measure H Funds in the amount of \$117,217 for Remainder of FY 24-25 (Hiring is expected April 2025) and approve Resolution for Budget Amendment for Two Fire Captain Positions Salary and Benefits and Related Costs

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved initiation of the Recruitment Process for Fire Captain Positions; Funding for Positions to be Funded through the Measure H Funds in the amount of \$117,217 for Remainder of FY 24-25 (Hiring is expected April 2025) and approve Resolution for Budget Amendment for Two Fire Captain Positions Salary and Benefits and Related Costs

Minute Order Number: 2025-013  
Resolution Number: 6639-2025

13. Consideration of Approval of Contract for 4Leaf and Reimbursement Agreement– Contract Scope of Work is for Barlow Development Agreement and Application Processing. Item is required as contract approval level is above the signing authority for the City Manager. There is no budget impact as the contract will be funded by the Developer; Barney Aldridge (Responsible Department: Planning)

Community Development Director Emi Theriault presented the agenda item recommending the City Council after receipt of the staff report, hear from members of the public, consider approval of Contract for 4Leaf and Reimbursement Agreement– Contract Scope of Work is for Barlow Development Agreement and Application Processing. Item is required as contract approval level is above the signing authority for the City Manager. There is no budget impact as the contract will be funded by the Developer; Barney Aldridge.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff from the City Council. Council asked questions of staff.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. There was none.

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff. There was no further discussion.

**MOTION:**

Mayor Zollman moved and Councilmember Hinton seconded the motion to Approval of Contract for 4Leaf and Reimbursement Agreement– Contract Scope of Work is for Barlow Development Agreement and Application Processing

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

**City Council Action: Approved Contract for 4Leaf and Reimbursement Agreement– Contract Scope of Work is for Barlow Development Agreement and Application Processing**

**Minute Order Number: 2025-014  
Resolution Number: 6640-2025**

14. Approval of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sebastopol Police Officers Association (SPOA) for a One Year agreement – January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025 and Approval of Budget Amendment for \$168,300 for negotiated items. (Responsible Department: Assistant City Manager/Human Resources)

Assistant City Manager Gourley presented the agenda item recommending the City Council after receipt of the staff report, hear from members of the public, consider approval of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sebastopol Police Officers Association (SPOA) for a One Year agreement – January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025 and Approval of Budget Amendment for \$168,300 for negotiated items.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff from the City Council. There were none.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. There were none.

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff. There was no further discussion.

**MOTION:**

Mayor Zollman moved and Vice Mayor McLewis seconded the motion to approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sebastopol Police Officers Association (SPOA) for a One Year agreement – January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025 and Approval of Budget Amendment for \$168,300 for negotiated items.

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sebastopol Police Officers Association (SPOA) for a One Year agreement – January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025 and Approval of Budget Amendment for \$168,300 for negotiated items.

Minute Order Number: 2025-015  
Resolution Number: 6641-2025  
6642-2025

- 10. Consideration of additional funding for Pilot Program for High School/College Internships (\$2500.00)  
This item is to continue the pilot program for high school internships and requested additional funding to continue internships from January 2025 to June 2025 (Responsible Department: City Clerk)

Assistant City Manager Gourley presented the agenda item recommending the City Council after receipt of the staff report, hear from members of the public, consider approval of additional funding for Pilot Program for High School/College Internships (\$2500.00) This item is to continue the pilot program for high school internships and requested additional funding to continue internships from January 2025 to June 2025.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff from the City Council. There were none.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. The following member(s) of the public provided public comment:  
Kyle

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff. There was no further discussion.

**MOTION:**

Vice Mayor McLewis moved and Mayor Zollman seconded the motion to approve additional funding for Pilot Program for High School/College Internships (\$2500.00) This item is to continue the pilot program for high school internships and requested additional funding to continue internships from January 2025 to June 2025.

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved funding for Pilot Program for High School/College Internships (\$2500.00) This item is to continue the pilot program for high school internships and requested additional funding to continue internships from January 2025 to June 2025.

Minute Order Number: 2025-011  
Resolution Number: 6638-2025



**CONSENT CALENDAR:** The consent agenda consists of items that are routine in nature and do not require additional discussion by the City Council or have been reviewed by the City Council previously. These items may be approved by one motion without discussion unless a member of the City Council requests that the item be taken off the consent calendar.

The Mayor will read aloud the title of each consent item (either full agenda title or a simplified version of the agenda title), and ask if a Councilmember wishes to remove one or more items from the consent calendar; and then open public comment to the members of the public in attendance. At this time, a member of the public may speak for up to two (2) minutes on the entire consent calendar and request at that time that an item or items removed for discussion.

If an item or items are removed from the consent calendar, the item shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor. Council Members may comment on Consent Calendar items or ask for minor clarifications without the need for pulling the item for separate consideration. Items requiring deliberation should be pulled for separate consideration and shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor.

Mayor Zollman asked if any Councilmember wanted to remove a consent calendar item. There were no requests.

Mayor Zollman opened for Public Comment(s). There was none.

Mayor Zollman called for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Maurer moved and Mayor Zollman seconded the motion to approve consent calendar items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Mayor Zollman called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carter, Hinton, Maurer, Vice Mayor McLewis and Mayor Zollman  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

1. Approval of City Council Special Meeting – Closed Session Meeting Minutes of December 16, 2024 (Responsible Department: City Clerk)

City Council Action: **Approved City Council Special Meeting – Closed Session Meeting Minutes of December 16, 2024**

Minute Order Number: **2025-002**

2. Approval of City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of December 17, 2024 (Responsible Department: City Clerk)

City Council Action: **Approved City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of December 17, 2024**

Minute Order Number: **2025-003**

3. Approval of City Council Special Meeting – Closed Session Meeting Minutes of December 20, 2024 (Responsible Department: City Clerk)

City Council Action: **Approved City Council Special Meeting – Closed Session Meeting Minutes of December 20, 2024**

Minute Order Number: **2025-004**

4. Receipt of 2024 Minute Orders/Reference Orders and Resolutions (Responsible Department: City Clerk)

City Council Action: **Approved Receipt of 2024 Minute Orders/Reference Orders and Resolutions**

Minute Order Number: **2025-005**

5. Approval of 2025 City Council Meeting Schedule (Responsible Department: City Clerk)

City Council Action: **Approved 2025 City Council Meeting Schedule**

Minute Order Number: 2025-006

6. Approval of City's Publicly Available Pay Schedule: Adoption of Resolution revising the City's Publicly Available Pay Schedule, effective January 1, 2025, revised January 7, 2025 for Fire Captain Position (Responsible Department: Administrative Services/Human Resources)

City Council Action: Approved 2025 City Council Meeting Schedule

Minute Order Number: 2025-007

Resolution Number: 6636-2025

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS:** Informational Items or Presentations are items that are informational only and do not require action by the City Council. Presentations shall be scheduled as necessary for the promotion of an event or service or general information items to the Council and should be limited to ten (10) minutes total in length of item (total length includes questions of Council to presenter and public comment).

7. Informational Presentation: Government Specific Equipment Annual Report Out (Responsible Department: Police)

Chief Nelson presented the agenda item recommending the City Council receive the informational presentation.

Mayor Zollman asked for questions of staff from the City Council. The Council asked staff questions of the presentation.

Mayor Zollman opened for public comment. The following member(s) of the public provided public comment:

Kyle

Mayor Zollman returned the item to the Council for Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to staff. There was no further discussion.

Mayor Zollman thanked staff for the presentation.

City Council Action: None Required. Informational Only.

Minute Order Number: 2025-008

**PUBLIC HEARING(s): NONE**

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** Two minutes per speaker for up to twenty (20) minutes total for public comments but can be reduced at Mayor's discretion depending upon the number of speakers or Mayor has discretion to allow for additional time beyond the 20 minutes allocated for public comment dependent upon the subject matter or number of speakers.

Kyle  
Robert  
Woody  
Mary

**CITY COUNCIL/CITY STAFF REPORTS/COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/FUTURE MEETINGS:**

15. City Manager and/or City Clerk Reports: (This will be either verbal reports at the meeting, or written reports provided at or prior to the meeting)

16. City Council Reports/Committee/Sub-Committee Meeting Reports: (Reports by Mayor/City Councilmembers Regarding Various Agency Meetings/Committee Meetings/Sub-Committee Meeting /Conferences Attended and Possible Direction to its Representatives (If Needed) on Pending issues before such Boards. ((This will be either verbal reports at the meeting, or written reports provided at or prior to the meeting)
17. Council Communications Received (Information/Meetings/Correspondence Received from the General Public to Councilmembers)

**CLOSED SESSION: NONE**

**ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Mayor Zollman adjourned the January 7, 2025 City Council Regular Meeting at 9:56 pm to the Special City Council Meeting of Tuesday, January 21, 2025, at **5:00 pm**, Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary C. Gourley  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk

Attachment: Zoom Raw Minutes

City Council Meeting - January 7, 2025

For those just coming in. We are just waiting on.

I was going to say, our police chief, he was supposed to be here but I don't see him. All right. Thank you, as always, I'm going to check again. I.T., are we set? All right. Mary, are we good? All right. So, I'm going to go ahead and call this meeting to order, January 7th, 2025 meeting to order at 6:05. And Mary, could you do roll call?

Thank you, Mayor. Councilmember Carter?

Here.

Councilmember Hinton?

Here.

Councilmember Maurer?

Here.

Vice Mayor McLewis?

Here.

Mayor Zollman?

Present.

And will you all join me for the salute to the flag you mark? [ Inaudible ]

Moving along to our proclamations. We have one proclamation, and this is, I'm going to read this. City of Sebastopol years of service award is presented to Ana Kwong for 10 years of service to the city of Sebastopol as administrative services director.

Congratulations on reaching this milestone with the city. Your effort and dedication in Sebastopol administration services department plays a tremendous role in the success of the city of Sebastopol. We appreciate your commitment to the city and this community. This certificate is in grateful appreciation for your 10 years of valued service and dedication to the city of Sebastopol. On behalf of the city Council and citizens of Sebastopol, I, Stephen Zalman, Mayor, gratefully acknowledge your work and contributions to the city, and I look forward to your continued service to the city of Sebastopol and the citizens of this community. Dated this day, January 7th, 2025. I have set my hand. So I do not believe she is going to be with us, but as her boss would you like to say a few words?

I would, thank you for the opportunity. She's trying to take a day or two off, but she didn't have much of over the holiday season that most of us took advantage of. A couple of accomplishments for her 10 year, she did what you never want to do much in your career which is to implement a new financial system, and that was early in her tenure, here. Took us from the dark ages into more modern times. So that's a huge effort and we're benefiting from today. She's expanded her role over time from the finance role to including information technology and much of our HR function under her purview. She has a lot of day-to-day things that are invisible to most folks if they work properly, such as managing our debt obligations and payroll. She puts in many hours, but, it's not just them, the texts and calls and emails, she's working quite extensive hours. She's hired some terrific staff, Carrie Vasquez of her team are two stellar city employees, and that's important for not just the finance department but for the city as a whole, and she's hoping to improve our practices. We now have a long-term financial model we are using that is basically in her direction. We implemented quarterly reports on our financial situation earlier this year, so we continue to make improvements and Anna has been a core part of that effort when she first got here long ago. Thanks for the opportunity.

Thank you, make sure that she gets the certificate. Moving along, at this time I would like to say, I'd like to see a show of hands in the chambers and on zoom as to how many

members of the audience would like to speak at public comment on agenda item number eight. Okay. And I'm seeing at least 25, here. Excuse me, in person, in the chambers. Per council protocols, the mayor, due to the subject matter and the number of speakers, approximate length of an item may determine at the hearing to reordering of agenda items. At this time, I'm requesting to reorder the agenda to hear item number eight, solid waste contract, to be heard prior to the consent calendar and remaining items. And based upon the number that are here, we will still keep the two minutes. And now I'm going to turn to my fellow colleagues and ask if any of them have any issue or concerns with hearing, oh, sorry. Backing up, again, turned my colleagues to see if there's any issue or concern with hearing that item first. First turning to my colleagues, are there any issues or concerns with hearing agenda item number eight first? Looking to my right. Looking to my left. Seeing none, then I will restate and state officially that we are calling on item number eight to be heard prior to the consent calendar with, again, the regular two minutes accorded to each speaker. Then, after number item eight has been concluded, I will reassess the remaining agenda items. At that time. So, at that time, we aren't going to now go to our regularly scheduled public comment, again, on items not on the agenda. I'm going to read our normal part that we read before we go to public comment. Please note that the presiding member of the legislative body conducting a meeting on their designee, or their designee, may remove or cause the removal of an individual for disrupting the meeting. Disrupting means engaging in behavior during a meeting of the legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting. With that, Mary, I'm going to turn to you to administer, again, the public comment period this is, again, for public comment not a genderized.

This is for public comment for items that are not on tonight's agenda. If you'd like to make a public comment it is a two minute public comment for this period. We will do a 20 minute max and we will go to in chambers first. If anyone would like to make a public comment for an item that is not on the agenda, then I go to zoom and then I go back out. We will come into chambers first. Please go ahead. I will jump in when you have about 30 seconds left and if you could just make sure the button is pushed in the middle. Oh, it's on? Okay. Please, go ahead.

Good evening. Is there a systemic disconnect here in the local government between intent and results? It seems more than just a left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing kind of thing. Here are two examples. The RFB for a sculpture at the Redondo trail had one main criteria. The work was required to be site-specific. Over two dozen teams, more than 100 people proposed new works that fit this criteria. When the judge is meant to make the recommendation, they clearly haven't read the criteria, nor spent much effort reviewing the proposals. One judge asked staff if there were criteria. To which staff offered a noncommittal answer. The judges made up their own criteria, primarily, apparently, was whether the art already existed. That is not site-specific. The Bruce Johnson we got is a fine sculpture, but the process wasted all those artists efforts, and ignore the criteria developed by the arts committee. Similarly, but far less egregious was when I came before the council to request a fee waiver for the festival, I learned council had resolved to have more festivals in Sebastopol without creating a mechanism for developing any steps to convert this resolution into action. And in fact, staffing cuts and the lack or loss of interdepartment communication led to a overbooking of the event space and friction with Sonoma County regional Parks.

You have 20 seconds.

I'd like to encourage council to do more to track the progress of the seeds they cast, and encourage you to take an active interest in whether the work done at the beginning of a process is honored by the end of the process. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next, I will go out to zoom. Oliver, can you unmute your self, please?

Sorry, I left my hand up. I don't need to make a comment.

Okay, thank you. Next I will come back into chambers. If there's anyone in chambers that would like to make a public comment for an item not on tonight's agenda. Seeing none, I will go back out to zoom one last time. If you would like to make a public comment, please raise your hand virtually or please unmute your telephone. Seeing none, public comment is closed.

Thank you, Mary, I did see or hear one member in the chamber clapping. If we could refrain from that, too. It does not bode with proper decorum as we conduct the city's business. What I also neglected to say, and I always do want to remind people, that you are definitely strongly encouraged to provide written comments to the city, to the Council at any time by sending them, again, to [citycouncil@cityofsebastopol.com](mailto:citycouncil@cityofsebastopol.com). With that, we are going to turn to agenda item number eight, and I'm going to read the agenda item number eight as stated.

Mayor, can I jump in? Can we go back to statements of conflict of interest? I'd appreciate that.

Yes, thank you for keeping me in line. Yes, I'm going to ask my colleagues if there are any statements of conflict of interest at this time, looking to my right, looking to my left. Not seeing any. Now I can go to at item number eight. Thank you, thank you. This is the consideration of approval of a solid waste collection agreement with Sonoma County resource recovery for garbage, recycling, organic waste collection services and authorize the execution of a professional services agreement with R3 Consulting Group to provide the city with consulting services during the transition of solid waste election services to S CRR. That's the reason we have it underlined, the funding for this contract will be paid by Sonoma County resource recovery, and will not have a fiscal impact on the city of Sebastopol's budget. The responsible, the responsible department for this is the assistant city manager. Turning to her.

Thank you, Mayor. First, I want to acknowledge we did receive a lot of public comment and those public comments have been submitted to the city Council. They received every single public comment that came in, and I appreciate everyone's interaction with that, and they are also posted on the city website. Just want to put it out there that they have been received and the city Council has received those. As stated, the item tonight is to consider the solid waste contract agreement and also consideration of professional services agreement to handle with the transition of the solid waste recovery collection services. I'm going to do a really short background and then I'm going to introduce our consultant team, R3, and then we will hear from the ad hoc committee as well, ask questions of staff and then go to public comment and come back for consideration. Back in April of 2023, city staff brought an agenda item seeking direction on the city's franchise agreement as our current agreement was to expire December 2023. At that meeting, the Council directed that city staff worked with to get an extension to their contract. On June 6th, as part of that, the city Council authorized an extension of the contract from one year, which would go through December 2024, and the creation of an ad hoc committee which was vice mayor, then Councilmember McLewis and Councilmember Maurer to work with Recology to come up with a new franchise agreement. Prior to the meeting where the RP was discussed in February, 2024, the former and current ad hoc committee met over a period of nine months on negotiations, some of those meetings were with Recology, some were just be ad hoc and city staff, to discuss negotiations as well as the ad hoc committee put in multiple hours of reviewing the analysis and proposals that Recology had provided to us. After those multiple discussions and input from dissipation from all committee

members, as well as Recology representatives, the city and Recology could not come to an agreement that we thought was fair and reasonable, so we recommended that this go out to an RP. At that meeting, we did terminate the negotiations process with Recology for the long-term franchise agreement, we were directed, staff was directed to contract with R3 consulting to go out for an RFP, so that process is before this audience tonight. So, I'm going to turn the agenda item over to R3 consulting will give a presentation, we will bring it back to the ad hoc committee for further comments, ask questions, then go to the public.

Thank you, Mary.

Thank you, mayor, council members, staff and members of the public. Again, I'm Garth Schultz, President with R3 consulting group, we're your consulting agency supporting the city on this, competitive request for proposal process. By way of background on our firm, we don't work for solid waste companies, we work exclusively for public agencies in matters such as these. So we have the city's interest at heart. Next slide, please. Mary shared some of this already. But, just by way of making sure that we set the stage, the city's existing agreement with Recology was set to expire. You had a couple of short-term extensions to that. But the city doesn't have the unilateral ability in the existing agreement to extend it at current terms and conditions including rates. That had to be a mutual agreement of the city and Recology. And through those negotiations that occurred, in 2023, the city and Recology were not able to come to agreement on rate adjustments for a longer-term agreement. So, that's why the city went out to competitive RFP, if they didn't have the ability to extend current rates and services and significant rate increases up to 57% over a several year period would have been necessary in order to reach a conclusion with Recology. Next slide, please. This matter has been before the Council several times during the course of 2024. Including from February as Mary mentioned, all the way up through October. It has been discussed in terms of the overall process and the rationale and reasons for it. The city did receive two proposals from qualified firms. One in Recology and the city's income and service provider, and one from Sonoma County resource recovery, or SCRR, which has current operations in the town of Windsor. Over the course of the presentation, and you'll see also in the staff report, we refer to two different options for rate adjustments, both proposers did provide those options in a request for best and final offers. Option one references a one time larger rate adjustment that would take effect in July, one, 2025 at the start of a new agreement, and option two phases in adjustments over several years so that there's less of an initial spike. When I refer to option one, we mean the one time rate adjustment and option two means the several year phased set of adjustments. Next slide, please. The city convenes an evaluation panel comprised of staff and members of the ad hoc MIDI and Vice Mayor McLewis and councilmember Moore. R3 was not part of the evaluation panel but we were technical advisers to the evaluation panel as they went through their review. And consensus scoring process. Through that scoring process shown on the screen, the panel identified SCRR as the highest ranked proposer. And the primary reasons for that were rates and service value and quality of services and references. Next slide, please. For the rest of my presentation, my intention is to supplement what's been presented in the staff report and the draft agreement, and address key questions that we know the community and the Council have about the recommendation is before you. This first set of slides covers why was SCRR's rate proposal ranked highest. The first key point with that is through SCRR's proposal, whether the option one or option two, single-family rates would be overall the lowest. Even though in option one, Recology had lower rates for certain categories on the weighted average taking all customers and all rate types into account, single-family residence came out ahead in the SCRR proposals. SCRR proposed

the lowest overall minimum monthly garbage rates for the 20 gallon service, meaning for those folks that want the cheapest monthly single-family rate, SCRR provided that at a lower option than Recology. I mentioned already that SCRR proposed the lower monthly garbage rates on average, 5% over the agreement term, lower than Recology's and 9% lower than Recology's via option two. Importantly, via option two, all single-family rates in year one would be less than Recology, and almost all single-family rates in years two and three would also be less than Recology's. With the sole outlier being the largest subscription size that single-family residence can subscribe to which of the 96 gallon service offering. That's 5% of residential customers. Overall single-family residence are the majority of ratepayers in the city at around 88% of solid waste service customers. And it is really important for everyone to understand that at the base monthly rate physical family residents, they get their garbage container and they can select a small 20 gallon or slightly larger 32 gallon or 64 gallon or 96 gallon, that's the variable service level they can select based on garbage size, but everyone gets 196 gallon blue recycling cart and one 96 gallon green organics cart with database rate. Folks don't need to pay extra for those first carts, the first recycling and first organics cart. So, next light, please. I'm looking but realizing any to say it out loud. With respect to multifamily dwellings, SCRR proposed the lowest minimum monthly base garbage rates, so those seeking the lowest minimum charge are able to get through SCRR compared to Recology. For those base garbage rates, it's also the lowest overall average, weighted average rate that folks would pay before any payment for extra organics and recycling charges, which I'll cover. Overall, those multifamily dwellings that generate the least amount of waste will pay less with SCRR compared to Recology. That and how much recycling or organics they generate. Here again is important to understand all multifamily dwellings will receive at least one recycling cart, 96 gallon, and one organics cart 96 gallon with their base garbage rate. You get that as part of the base monthly rate. You're not paying for those first containers, those customers would be paying for additional containers above the one of each of those types in the base rate. Next slide, please, Mary. With respect to commercial businesses, again, SCRR proposed the lowest overall monthly rate is available for those seeking the lowest potential charge, that's available with SCRR. The lowest overall average monthly garbage rates are also lower, and the amounts shown here on the slide. Again, SCRR's proposal benefits those customers that generate less amounts of overall garbage recycling and organics compared to Recology's proposal. For commercial customers, all businesses get 196 gallon blue card and 132 gallon green card, included in the base garbage rates. I want to address for a minute, we'll go to the next slide, Mary, please. SCRR proposed cost of service rates for additional recycling above those minimums that are provided with the base garbage rates. Part of the reason that the RFP and the draft agreement sought that kind of solution is that the city and other cities, towns, and counties in the state did have to operate the utilities, water, sewer, trash within the requirements of proposition 218. And proposition 218 is code that's in the California code of regulations, but in essence the fees for property related service need to be proportionate to provide those services, the cost of providing those services. And it's important for the Council and the public to know that providing recycling and organic service is costly. It costs approximately the same to pick it up whether it's a garbage container or a recycling container, and the cost of disposing of the contents isn't all that different these days. It's not the case that the value of the recyclables in a blue card offsets the cost of collection. There's a net cost to collecting recyclables and organics. For these reasons it was necessary and appropriate for the city to seek proposals that would have separate charges for those additional amounts of recycling and organics of the base minimums provided with the garbage rates. They only apply to those additional amounts that customers may



need. There's been a lot of comment and attention paid to the fact that SCRR's proposed charges for these exceed what Recology's proposed charges were. That is correct. However, they also track with proportionate costs compared to the cost of providing service. Next slide, please, Mary. So, one of the things that set play, here, is not charging for recycling or organics additional services requires that the garbage rates fund those. That's a subsidy from those ratepayers that don't need additional services to those ratepayers that do need that additional garbage and recycling service. And I believe the slide largely covers it, but the key take-home here is that this rate structure approach was designed specifically to keep the city in compliance with the proportionality requirements of prop 218 and avoid the perpetuation of a subsidy that was originally in the cities rate structure in the state. Quite some time ago prior to concerns around having rates fit with the cost of service and also prior to having the state have the uptake of having everybody participate. It was more of a voluntary process before. I want to address, there is around 318-ish recycling, a family and commercial customers with accounts in the city. And based on our analysis, around 20% of those won't need any additional recycling organic service. Those folks will just need the base level of service provided with the garbage rate. Meaning those customers will be better off in the rates with SCRR's proposal. Another 46% around 145 customers probably need around one more additional card of some type, whether it's a green card or a blue cart. They may pay around \$60 a month more for that additional cart. Whether that amount is offset by the lower garbage rate or not will depend on their base garbage rate. But the take-home point is that around 74% of multi family and commercial customers either won't need additional services or may only need one additional cart. So the concern around lots of additional recycling and organic service is really around the remaining 26% of multi family and commercial customers which is around 80, 82, somewhere in that frame. Providing context for the Council. Next slide please, Mary. Overall, in terms of why SCRR's rate proposal was ranked highest, SCRR provided the lowest minimum monthly rates for service, for single family, and for multi family and commercial garbage rates. And it means also that the lowest low income rate is available with SCRR, and the lowest overall minimum charge that folks need to subscribe to in order to have this important utility. And importantly, here, I know that this is a subject of the public comments, his benefits those generating the least, not just garbage but also recycling and also organics. While also ensuring that there will be hand in hand touch point with those folks that need those additional services so they can select the right level of service to meet their needs. Okay, next slide. So now, want to address how businesses can avoid those increasing cart charges if they fall under that category of folks that need additional recycling and organic services. First of all, sorry, my eyes are tired. It primarily comes down to working with the service provider to make sure that the right size their containers. An important point here is that folks are not going to see the switch flipped and suddenly received the new charges. SCRR is committed to visiting and working with every single one of those customers to select the right level of service before those new charges take effect. Next slide, Mary. And I covered that here. This bold point is the point that the take-home message. No customers will be charged the new rates without first having the opportunity to adjust and review their service levels to provide the right levels of service and cost. That can be accomplished through a variety of means and mechanisms. Ensuring that they're actually using what they need, that they're considering breaking down boxes, things like that in their recycling containers and looking at ways they might reduce their waste stream. I recognize they may not work for everybody, but, for those it doesn't work for, the thing to understand is that they'll be paying a proportionate and fair cost for the additional services that they need. Next slide, please. I've covered this already so I won't repeat myself anymore, but this rate structure

approach will benefit those and incentivize those in the city's course toward zero waste. Zero waste isn't just about recycling and composting, it's about reducing the overall amount of waste that we generate in society, and there's a cost to recycling and composting that is commensurate with the cost of producing garbage waste. Okay. Final set of slides, to address the key questions that have been coming up over the last several days. Why isn't SCRR unionized. The important point to note is that it's not the company's decision whether to unionize or not. It's their employees. I know SCRR can answer the question if the Council has it directly but my understanding is that they've not voted to unionize. They do receive pay and benefits commensurate with what the collective bargaining agreement, Recology, has with the Teamsters dictate. And importantly, the ownership group of SCRR has sister companies throughout the Bay Area and to my knowledge original one of those is unionized. This group doesn't have an antiunion bend, it's only the fact that their shop is not unionized as of right now. I covered how they treat their employees, SCRR represented to me and to the panel that they match the pay and meet or exceed the benefits for employees. What might happen to Recology employees if the council votes to proceed with SCRR? The RFP and the agreement requires anybody taking over this service to provide offers of employment to displaced employees that qualify. Meaning they have to have the workpapers and be eligible to work but if they're displaced, SCRR is required to provide them with offers of employment. We also understood from Recology during our interviews that they don't anticipate that folks would be displaced if the city were to select another provider. That they would have assignments with Recology elsewhere in the operations. Next slide, please. What might happen to the materials collected in Sebastopol? First, it's important to understand that the garbage and the organic waste are required to go to facilities that are selected and managed and operated through agreements with the county and with zero waste Sonoma. There is no difference in the end disposition of those waste streams. The garbage remains here in Sonoma County and the organic waste gets shipped out outside of the county as there is not composting facilities here within the county. That means the key differences around recycling, and the Recology does have a recyclables processing and sorting facility here, in Sonoma County, and that's a positive benefit, that's not the end of the line for anything that's recycled. Those commodities are veiled and packaged for sale on domestic or international marketplaces, so it's really just the beginning of the transit for those materials. They don't stay here in County, we don't have paper mills or steel mills or other types of recyclables processing here. So, for SCRR, the difference is rather than going to a processing facility in Santa Rosa, it's transferred and goes to a processing facility in Ukiah, they also have relationships with processing facilities in Napa Marin, then starts the long journey to international, domestic or international commodities marketplaces for those materials. Will SCRR be building new solid waste facilities? Not as part of this agreement. It wasn't a requirement, it's not something they proposed. SCRR is in process and have permits for transfer facility in Windsor where they can transfer recyclables, but there is no other facility infrastructure development being contemplated as part of this agreement with the city. Next slide, please. What about the future transition to zero emission vehicles? There is a California air resources Board advanced clean fleets mandate which affects local governments as well as large-scale solid waste operators. Neither company had a specific solution for that in their proposal for their solid waste collection vehicles, though I should recognize Recology did have a street sweeper, in their proposal, but there was no potential direct movement or funding of transition to full zero emission vehicles in either proposal. Another question and this is largely because of the existing condition of surface and the town of Windsor, will SCRR make folks sort more of their recyclables? The answer is no, here in Sebastopol Recology,

SCR's proposal is a single stream container for recyclables, for cans and bottles and paper and cardboard all go into the same container. The same approach that's currently employed in the city today. Will SCR issue penalties for bad waste sorting? That's another question that came up. The draft agreement does contemplate the ability for any hauler, any operator that you would contract with to assess contamination fees for folks that put the wrong things in the wrong bins. SCR will have that right as Recology also would if they were the selected provider. SCR has are presented that they would have not issued such penalties in the town of Windsor. They had for overages, but, it's their policy not to issue those penalties unless it becomes absolutely necessary after multiple, repeated contact with the customer in order to try to get them to the right behavior. Next slide, please. What will the zero waste education be like? The agreement is very detailed in a sense about the outreach and education requirements of any provider. And the types of things that SCR has committed, I won't read through them but, in our assessment it needs the best industry standard practices. And there's more of them on the next slide, Mary. Will SCR support local nonprofits and businesses? Recology has been recognized for having done that here in Sebastopol. And SCR is active in Windsor, and I believe they look forward to doing so here, I've got some considerations listed on the slide but as they are not the contractor yet, they've not really established formal plans around the specifics of that at this time. Next slide, and we're almost done, thank you for your patience. Why did the city use folks like R3 for this process, and how will this cost be paid? You addressed it at the beginning of the item with respect to the other contract that's being considered. We were hired because this is something that only comes around one every 10 or 15 years in the city, and we work with local governments up and down the state of California in these capacities, it wasn't something staff had the existing capacity and experience to conduct, so that's we are at the table. And supporting the city as third-party public servants, our costs would be funded by whoever is selected by the city for this contract. The city will be reimbursed for our costs, whether by SCR or another provider. And a final point, and I believe we're on to final steps, does the city benefit more with an agreement from SCR than they would from Recology? The answer is, but a consideration wasn't part of the evaluation process. We did not look at any other additional benefits or kickbacks, which there were none to the city in this process, the only things that I will highlight is that SCR proposed, and it was an RFP requirement with their street sweeping services to conduct services of drain inlets to support public work staff. SCR did comply with that requirement, Recology declined to provide that, stating they couldn't do so with the technology they have. And through the negotiation process, the city did secure additional community benefits, funding for new containers in the downtown area, and enhanced services for events to support community organization and nonprofits, meaning waste services and port-a-potty services at those types of events. It's not a direct benefit to the city, but to the community organizations working with the city and both SCR and Recology through their proposals, and interviews. Two short sentences, and, assuming you reach a resolution this evening, you'll be asked in January 21st, approximately, to pass a resolution selecting option one or two, and also setting the franchise fee amount, and that's 10% per the RFP. The agreement requires the Council to set that through resolution, as it's not spelled out in the agreement. And the final action would be around February or March, consider first and second reading of an ordinance amending the section of the municipal code states that solid waste agreements would be 10 years, your existing one with Recology is 15 years, this is a cleanup item to make sure that the agreement term and the code are consistent. And I'll save the next lies unless you think I should cover them now. Great. Thank you, Mayor, I'm here the questions you may have.

Thank you very much. Mary, I think it's at this point we're going to turn to our colleagues who have put in an enormous amount of time.

I like to give the opportunity to Vice Mayor McLewis and Councilmember Maurer to provide comments they may have through the negotiations process and how we got here.

Want me to go ahead? Well, this was quite a long process. Over a year and a half, and I was one of three who voted to negotiate with Recology. And to those councilmembers wanted to go out for an RFP. We gave it our best shot to negotiate with Recology, we failed. And that was very disappointing process. So, I just want to thank R3 consulting group, they've been really great. I want to thank the ad hoc committee Vice Mayor McLewis, are city manager, the engineer she worked with us as well. And for me, coming to the end of this process, actually felt really, really good about where we landed. And feel really good about we work together, this was a 100% agreement from all of us. And I'm going to keep it brief, and turn it over to Joe.

This was a long process. And I was one of the people who voted to go to RFP, initially. And I can say that when we started the process and formed the ad hoc Sandy were not on the same page all the time. We had many many discussions as the ad hoc, so I have to say we went into it. On opposite ends, and it was a learning process. Of Sonoma, to better understand what the contracts are. To understand the value of whatever it was that we needed to be evaluated because obviously not an expert in this. But, I'll save a lot of comments for later but I just want to say that over the 10 months, we gave it our best shot in this negotiation. We did. And we could not come to agreement, and the bottom line was sitting up here and making decisions for everybody and knowing the inflation and the cost associated, that people are seeing increased in costs as we negotiate in those 10 months before going out to RFP, I looked back at the increases that we had experienced over a few years in addition to the sometimes greater than 50% increase that was being proposed, there's no way I could as a councilmember say that was okay, which is why we ended up at an RFP process. I just want to say that I have been feeling really good about this, I still feel good about this recommendation tonight. It took us a long time to get here, I just, I really do truly appreciate working with all the staff, it was a learning process and I will be the first to tell you that I thought all along hiring a consultant, we hear all the time about consultants and we shouldn't be spending money, and I thought it tooth and nail until we sat down and it interviews, and then I gained a better understanding of what I didn't understand and truly appreciate the education and their due diligence. That's why we did go for a consultant and I have no regrets with that, I learned a lot. And I think that doing the cell has allowed us to feel better about this recommendation that we were making tonight, because we did our due diligence and I truly feel good about it. I have other comments but I'll save that for later. I wanted you all to know that I'm good with where we're at.

Thank you, I definitely want to say, on behalf of myself, thank you both very much for all of this. It has been a very long time. I have seen the work, Mary, I'm turning it back to you.

So this is the opportunity for the city Council to ask any questions of the consultant or if they have other questions. This is your opportunity and was the questions have been addressed we will go out for public comment.

Great, thank you. I'm opening it up to my fellow colleagues for questions at this time. Starting down on my right.

My first question was, I would like to have an estimate, if the city knows it, how many hours have been spent by staff and council on the garbage. That includes the period we were go sheeted with Recology that we couldn't come to agreement and the last year that

we've spent. Do you have any estimate of how many hours you guys have put into this negotiation?

I have consider that in my first guess, just for my own time was anywhere between 80 and 100 hours on this. Probably more like 100.

For me as well, doing the background.

I just want to say, thank you for that. I know this stuff is a lot of work.

And staff.

I would agree. All the meetings that have taken place, the review of the proposals that came in, the analysis, it was well over 100 hours.

Any more questions? Yes. Councilmember Carter.

I have, I have a number of questions. Because I'm jumping in midstream. The first is, I feel like we've missed an opportunity to negotiate for biweekly. I don't know if that's the right word. But less pickups. Just fewer pickups. Just having recycling one day, one day a week, and then another so there are fewer trucks on the road, creating less wear and tear on our roads. As we know, the heavier trucks on our roads are what cause significant damage to our roads. Am I online? So, I'm wondering, if that was ever in play, or could yet be in play?

Is a good question. Thank you, councilmember, it's a good question. First off, I look to my colleagues to help refresh my memory, because it's a little dull at the moment. I believe that in the RFP, we did ask for proposals to alternatives such as the kind you're suggesting. For something like a biweekly or a less than weekly service option. And neither proposer did proposed such an alternative. And this question comes up somewhat frequently in these conversations throughout the state, and what I can say is that a number of communities have studied moving to an every other week service offering to achieve some of the objectives that you've stated, none of those that have studied it have enacted it. And the reasons for that are primarily, it doesn't provide as much cost efficiency benefit as one might think, and customers perceive it as a takings of service. City of San Francisco, city of Mountain View, Castro Valley sanitary District, those are a few that I know that come to mind. That have studied this over the last seven or eight years. To my knowledge, none of them have moved forward with it after conducting extensive study.

Okay. I have some further questions. If that's okay.

Sure, and I'll get together a few more as well.

Okay, so the other ones were about the methodology for the scoring situation. The numbers were on there but I'm disappointed to not see criteria or methodology for those scores. As I began my due diligence, mid last week, I spent a lot of time calling around, doing what I call smoke test and calling you guys to see if you provide services, answer random questions, see how your services were, this and that. And looking at the sustainability reports for the last five years, for Recology and any sustainability data for SCRR, and I looked at your criteria and the scores, and I came to quite a different conclusion. I don't mean any disrespect, I see the difference in the price, being 20 to 25, that seems like a large difference compared to the sustainability, 17-16, that to me is hard to explain, one company, what you're planning on doing. Over the next couple years to reduce those. That's part of the sustainability report, and something that significant sustainability. When there is one point difference in the sustainability criteria, I get curious, so I looked, how it came to be. Because I'm sure there's logic behind it.

Is a great question. So first, it was using the evaluation criteria and points that were considered by council, in April 2024. The matter came before council and council reordered some of the points and the draft criteria at that time. And that's what elevated service rates in value to be the highest overall percentage of points at 30 out of 100. The evaluation panels methodology and process was to rely on the contents of the proposals

provided by the proposers. Their interviews and the representations during interviews, and then checking of references. The methodology for scoring was a consensus-based scoring approach of the evaluation panelists. In any evaluation process, there is a matter of subjectivity at play. It's not a precise science to come up with scores when you've got a panel of five folks trying to make decisions based on an interview, but that is the methodology that was employed, the one that was contemplated in the RFP process and the one that resulted in the scores that were posted on that presentation and in the staff packet.

So are you able to speak to why the sustainability report is so close?

I can ask if ad hoc to support us, part of it is that the information that they had to rely on doesn't include the types of sustainability reports from the companies that you might have been researching, it was based on the contents of their overall proposals. And in some cases, there wasn't a lot of variance, that the panel could discern between the proposals and that's why those scores were as close as they were.

I'm going to go to Councilmember Hinton.

I've pulled some old notes from a meeting of June 16, 2020. Where Recology came to us and asked for us to fund a rate increase to support purchasing of new trucks. My specific comments were that I thought that we should think about that when we're getting closer to our negotiation with them, and I know that some sort of rate increase passed on a 4-1 on that meeting date. I'm not sure we're hearing from Recology tonight, but I don't know if you had any background. I'm curious about, it feels like we passed an additional rate increase over and above our contract on that June 16th 2020 meeting. Was that considered, was that discussed because I'm going back to some notes, here, and I think it's relevant mentioning especially in light of the record of the comments that were made that evening.

I can't speak to that date as it predates my engagement knowledge of the city. What I can speak to is that Recology's proposal contemplated the fact that existing trucks and operations in the city still have useful life on them. They did not propose to start this new contract with new vehicles. Existing vehicles, potentially those that were the subject of that 2020 purchase, I can't say for sure. Will remain in place until they reach their useful life and then new vehicles would need to be put into service.

Can you address the new hauler and their vehicles? It's been asked tonight.

The new hauler, SCRR, will need to purchase new vehicles in order to provide operations in the city. Those vehicles are on order and they're awaiting the results of the next step in the process in order to finalize those. And those would be diesel vehicles, carb standards, fueled by renewable diesel. The same approach that Recology takes with its existing vehicles today.

Do you know if that includes both hauler vehicles and street sweeper vehicles?

Yes, they have a street sweeper vehicles that they would need to purchase. And I believe that's diesel but I would have to get them to clarify me or correct me on that point.

Another question. Does this new agreement, I've tried to read all the details but you would know them better, or somebody that spent 100 hours. Cover and exclusive agreement, for example, the cubic yard bins, does this give an exclusive agreement to this hauler for all types of garbage? Or, say, a client but has a lot of waste, or somebody doing construction on their home could request another bin company that might be more efficient to drop and pick up their large cubic bins.

Thank you for the question. So yes, this agreement is an exclusive collection agreement covering all waste hauling services, for which the customer pays the hauler for a service. And that's as I understand it the same as what you have today in the existing Recology agreement, and exclusive service of residential commercial and debris box or construction

waste services. It is a continuation of that practice. There are exclusions, or exceptions to the exclusivity requirement in the case that anybody has materials that they can donate or sell for a value. In the example of construction site, if they had building materials that they could donate or sell or cardboard that they could sell, those types of materials for so long as the customer is not paying the entity taking the material, that's an exception to the exclusivity of the agreement.

Vice Mayor?

For clarity, the question about the vehicles, can you clarify for everyone with SCRR the cost of the new trucks are included in the rate, correct?

That's correct.

And as far as with Recology, new trucks, that's down the road could come back at some time. I don't recall.

We didn't get to the point of negotiating that specific term with Recology, but what we know is that in their proposal, the funding of the purchase of new trucks at the outset of the agreement was not included in their proposal.

Going back down, further questions? Councilmember Carter?

I'll have another, and another, and another question. So, I'm curious if there's a dollar value that we've established for the city itself as providing the service. How does this, do we have a number value for the municipal need? Does that make sense? The city purchases has waste issues, and we must have waste, the city itself. As part of our city budget.

I don't know if Mary might know or have an idea. I'm sorry. I don't have those numbers at hand. I don't know if it's part of due diligence if anybody in the process knows or if Mary might know.

City manager, I can speak to that. Through both proposers, the services that the city receives are included in the overall contract, the city does not pay a direct cost for service of city facilities.

So I understand regardless of the situation, the city's trash along the sidewalk or whatever is picked up as part of being able to service the rest of the town.

Correct.

Okay. Are there other questions?

I don't see any.

There's a three year and a one year. And I'm sure that there is, there's a 2% change thereafter, what right does the company have to change prices?

Excellent. After the first year in option one, there's a formulaic approach to annual rate adjustments. You have one today, in the existing agreement with Recology which is a formulaic cost of living adjustment, to their service rates to keep up changing cost of labor and trucks and vehicles and maintenance and stuff like that. There is a similar mechanism in his agreement with SCRR. A portion of that is tied to an index called the water sewer trash index, it's posted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it's a CPI for water, maybe garbage and trash, I'm stating the wrong one. Garbage and trash index, international index that tracks utility rates for garbage. Their compensation component will be adjusted by the annual rate of change in that index capped at 5%. Additionally, there is a provision for the change in the tipping fees for disposal of garbage and organics, and recycling which are outside of the contractor direct control. Those will be part of the formula, it's covered in the very final pages of the agreement exhibit 14, and so the annual mechanism will be in place for the remainder of the agreement. The only other mechanisms that they would have to come forward is to request a change in rates due to a city requested change in service, something like you want to add this thing then you would negotiate in good faith with them around the cost and rate adjustment to add a new

program or service. Or, in the case of an extra ordinary events such as a change in law, something that dramatically increases the cost of providing services outside of their control. So, those are the only ways in which their rates would be adjusted in those future years. That process would have been similar irrespective of which contractor the city would go with.

So is there any exposure to rate change because Recology owns its plastic recycling facility, but then SCRR is more dependent on others?

It's a good question. So, Recology, in owning and operating, will have a certain amount of knowledge and control over their operating cost for that facility. What they wouldn't have much control over is what is the market saying about the value of those materials. If you think back to 2017, the China national sword where he and China and many other Pacific nations said we're not taking any more of your contaminated trash, United States, that plummeted the cost of those commodities. And virtually everybody was affected the same way, the cost of recycling went up. So if the commodities market changed, both providers would be affected in similar ways. To your point is, might it be the case that Recology would be a little bit more shielded from that mark potentially, but only in the sense that they would control their operating cost. Everyone's still subject to those same domestic or international market conditions.

Okay. I'm going to leave it there. For just a S.E.C. More questions?

I want to make a comment for the public, but I already had a meeting with the consultant earlier to request a grid that showed commercial rates since we had heard from so many businesses and I asked her to be sent to the Council this morning. Also met with businesses today around town. Just want to disclose that, I'm not asking as many questions publicly because we did receive additional information that I have requested earlier today. Thanks.

I apologize, I just want to additionally say that, thank you for all your research and going out to businesses, making sure that they're comfortable with these prices. It took me a while to absorb that these were worst-case scenario prices and that in most cases they're going to be lower and they're going to be negotiated. It took me a little bit of time, I called individuals and tried to match what they are paying right now with what was recorded as our stated costs and things like that.

I'm not seeing any more questions before we go to public comment. So, no? Mary? Public comment?

Thank you, can I see a show of hands as how many people in chambers would like to make a public comment? And then going out to zoom. Mayor, would you like to keep it at two minutes?

We definitely seem to be having more online, now, than we did before. With that, yes. Definitely going to be limiting it to one minute.

One minute? Thank you, Mayor. This is the opportunity for public comment on the solid waste. Solid waste contract. It is going to be a one minute time limit due to the amount of speakers that we will have for this item tonight. Our rule is that we will go to in chamber first, and then out to zoom, so everyone who wants to talk will have an opportunity to talk. So I will ask for anyone in the chambers right now if they want to start, I will jump in when you have 30 seconds left to let you know that the timer is close. Okay. And just make sure that the light is on and green so people can hear you.

The light is what? Mike is on, right? Okay. All right. I have been a resident of Sebastopol since 1986, when I bought my house. And I've lived through a lot of different waste service. Recology has been the best. And there's a change that I've seen, and I think this is something that we should be really seriously thinking about. We are trying to reduce



garbage. It's not going to happen unless we do it. And we are going to have to pay for it. And garbage is like, there's more garbage than there is sewage.

You have about 20 seconds.

And the water rates have gone up. Now, the water rates, went up for the same reason that the garbage rates are going up. We have all been dealing with inflation, the cost of moving things, the cost of,

Man, one minute. That is one minute.

Thank you. Anyhow, that's how I feel. And I really really hope that we do not

Thank you, man.

Thank you for your public comment. Kyle, can you unmute yourself, please?

I can.

Can you see the timer?

Yeah, I can.

First off, this is really atrocious. You can't be dropping public comment to one minute willy-nilly like this. Whoever is advising you on this, please stop. Two things I need to bring up, the first is in April of 2043, I emailed council regarding looking at the actual damage to our roads as a result of waste haulers. I suggested that in any sort of negotiation that we have that this be a consideration. I also provided documentation as to what this looks like in cities across the United States. I'd love to hear how that was considered in the negotiation process with any of our vendors. I doubt it was, but Phil brings up some great points that we really need to be considering the damage to our roads as a result of these massive trucks. One councilmember actually did respond to me, but it's pretty rare that council numbers actually respond to the things I state. The second is the city has a vested interest in increasing rates on us, because they get a kickback for our franchise fee from the vendor. So it's not like the city is working to try to keep our rates low, they want them higher, they make more money off us through that franchise fee.

Thank you, Kyle, for your public comment. Next, I will come back into chambers, if there's anyone in chambers that would like to make a public comment, please up up.

Hi, everybody, my name is Serafina, thank you for your service. I am a committee member, I own a home, business owner, multiple businesses in town as well as the executive director for the arts, I'm here to support Recology. They have been an ongoing fiscal sponsor for Sebastopol Center for the arts, funding or organization in times of need, this summer, they funded scholarships for children to attend our summer camp program, came and taught our kids about recycling, they have continued to sponsor us this year, they took our staff on a tour of their recycling facility. So, they've been a really great committee partner, additionally, Sebastopol Center for the arts will suffer financially as a result of the increase, we do a large amount of,

You got about 10 seconds.

Thank you for your time.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will go back out to zoom. I'm sure I'm not going to announce this right and I apologize. Can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you, can you see the timer?

Yes. No, I can't see the timer, actually.

I will jump in when you have about 30 seconds left, go ahead with your public comment.

Okay. My name is [ Inaudible ] I'm a lead organizer with Northbay jobs with Justice. A coalition of over 30 labor community and environmental organizations. So, why will SCRR has been talked about as potentially more cost-effective solution for waste services, there are significant concerns regarding the actual savings and the broader consequences of shifting from Recology to SCRR, especially for the impact on our community. Recology's workforce is unionized, and presented by a local chapter of the

Teamsters and during the organizing campaign Northbay jobs with Justice provided a key community support network and saw the incredible effort that the workers put into organizing and winning a contract.

15 seconds.

By contrast is a nonunion company, so I'm respectfully asking you to delay this vote and make an informed decision, the true cost of switching to SCRR have not been adequately considered. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back into chambers, if there's anyone in chambers that would like to make a public comment, please step up to the podium. Go ahead.

Hello. My name is Mario Berrios. I live on Santa Rosa. I worked for 24 years in garbage companies. Three different garbage companies in Sonoma County. We're part of Teamsters. We own the company, Recology. It's 100% employee owned. I just want to ask you for a favor. Support local owners. We own the company. Thank you. Good night.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go out to zoom. Jillian, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you can you see the timer?

Yes, I can.

Go ahead with your public comment, please.

I have been a 20 year homeowner in Sebastopol, and I also run a business in Sebastopol, and the cost of the new format are cost prohibitive and are going to create a situation where businesses are not going to want to recycle and compost to the cost effects that will be incurred. By the new disposal companies. Which is actually illegal for a business to do and you are creating a situation of small businesses in Sebastopol are going to struggle to stay viable. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come back into chambers.

Hello, my name is Sonny Galbreath, I've been a Sebastopol resident and high school teacher and environmental and labor at good for 25 years. I am proud that in Sebastopol general plan conservation and open-space goal 11 states strive to establish Sebastopol as a leader in environmental protection stewardship and sustainability. A vote by the council to end the contract with Recology goes against this and other goals of the general plan and tarnishes our town interpretation as a leader on environmental issues. Recology has been an amazing partner in so many community endeavors to reduce waste. I ran or to view an Apple Blossom schools compost and recycling program for 15 years and have help student and teacher led compost and recycling efforts at schools in the county.

You have about 20 seconds.

Recology has been an amazing partner and it would be a huge loss to lose them. I know Sonoma County resource recovery does not staff at the level of zero waste helpers and advocates that would be a tremendous loss. As a labor advocate it would be a tremendous loss to lose an employee owned union company and good jobs in our country. I'm very upset about that as a union member myself. And deeply concerned that it will decrease compost and recycling rates in our state and our city because of the price incentives.

Thank you.

Next I will go out to zoom, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you.

I believe I am unmuted. Can you if you could just let me know.

Go ahead with your public comment.

I am a relatively new business owner in Sebastopol, I also happen to run an accounting firm. I ran the rates that were given to me. I will be in the extreme upper percentiles of the cost of garbage compared to the literal hundreds of businesses that I do the small business books for. I, too request that a delay in the vote be done. Recology, I don't think it's plausible that, although for example in my specific example and I know I'm one of the

minority according to the consultant, my garbage will go down by \$100 for the cost of compost and recycling will increase by more than 1000, so my \$1400 a month bill would be \$2500 per month going forward.

15 seconds.

To the prior speaker, this will become detrimental and for myself and other businesses in there. If I'm a signal or business I'm sure you're to hear from many more who will be disappointed in choosing to do business in Sebastopol. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come back into chambers.

City Council members, I'm the recording secretary of his Teamsters local Union 665. I represent drivers, customer service agents and agreement operators at Recology. You may not know this, solid waste presents the six most dangerous job in the country. These men and women put their lives on the line in your community deserve to work with dignity. With this in mind I want to bring up concerns over the cities contract. The Teamsters have been working hard to get good jobs for members in the community, union jobs were provided these allowed workers to stay in their community, spend money other businesses and retire with dignity. For me, the choice is clear, Recology is unionized and employee owned. They have healthcare, pension, and wages that they feel proud to work where they have a voice. By garbage, executive to make a buck, while their employees do the work. Going up in the community I knew Sebastopol city as being a valued labor production good paying jobs and environmental protection. The community where more than just money matters. This decision seems to go against those values. Tonight I asked the Council does not

Sir, that's one minute.

Okay. Thank you, city council.

Next, I will go out to zoom, can you unmute yourself, please?

There we go.

Can you see the timer?

I can, yes.

Go ahead.

I'm the political director with the Northbay labor Council. And, I also am in favor of keeping Recology on board. Also just as a side thing I lived in Sebastopol for 15 years, and Sebastopol has always been that place where you can always count on them to do the right thing. And it's been mentioned before, but, we talk a lot about staying local, buying local, being local, Recology is a local organization. The participates in the community. And I appreciate the consultant mentioning that recycling and composting doesn't stay where it is, so in other words, if the other company gets this and they chuck their stuff up to Ukiah, it moves on from there, that's an irrelevant point. I appreciate I'm saying it, but, Recology will not be making that trip to Ukiah several times a week. It's local.

Matty, that's one minute.

Thank you.

Next I will come back into chambers.

Hello, my name is ambrosia Thompson, with Recology Sonoma Marin. I've been a specialist devoted to the city of Sebastopol for the past seven years. In that time I've been elected to serve as a board member and president of the Chamber of Commerce. Served on the city's climate action committee, since inception in 2019 and currently lead the CaCC zero waste working group affected this year. Each year I work with around 150 Sebastopol businesses, schools, multifamily dwellings and special events to implement compost programs. Right sized services and educate on the importance of recovering resources and how to do it properly.

You have about 20 seconds.

As well as providing helpful tools to indoor outdoor containers posters labels et cetera. I'm proud to say that those effects have paid off as the city went from 40% landfill diversion rate in 2018 to the current landfill diversion of 51%.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go out to zoom. Can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you, can you see the timer?

No, I can't.

At jump in when you have 20 or 30 seconds left, go ahead with your public comment, please.

I've lived here in Sebastopol 43+ years. And I've had the pleasure of working with Recology as the sustainability coordinator at Sebastopol Union school District for the last eight years or so. They've been a huge asset to the school community, they've helped me in numerous ways recycling and composting, the programs I run, there. I feel very strongly that we should stick with this company. I think Sebastopol has had a few unfortunate financial choices that have made the customers of Sebastopol in a hard situation. But this feels like a make up for other choices that were unfortunate. So I'd really like to stick with Recology.

15 seconds.

Recology, they're very personable, I've seen the employees, they're wonderful, I want to stay with them at all costs if possible. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I would come into chambers.

Good evening, I live just outside of the city boundaries. So I'm not a customer of the city's waste services. I'm here tonight to urge you to at the very least continue this item, I appreciate the work that's gone into it, but, I think something that went by really quickly in the presentation, and that needs to be understood is that we still need to this incentivize non-recyclables, throwing stuff away, trash, we need to incentivize recycling in the presentation, it was said that recycling costs, it costs to recycle. It does, but that doesn't mean that raising recycling costs is going to get people to reduce their waste. We're not there yet.

You have about 15 seconds.

So just on the merits, I'm looking at this objectively, if you look at the cost structure, correctly, on labor on trust, on long-term trust and community engagement, I think this is actually not a difficult decision. I think Recology is the right choice so I urge you strongly to reconsider. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will go back out to zoom. Marianne, can you unmute yourself please? Marianne, can you unmute yourself? I will come back. Angela, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you. Can you see the timer?

Yeah.

Go ahead with your public comment, please.

My name is Angela, I'm part owner of homebody refill, and I want to encourage us to keep Recology. They're great, let's keep it local as possible, reduce emissions as much as possible, and that's all, thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come back into chambers.

Hello, [ Inaudible ] I'm just going to start out with, right now we're paying \$1300 a month for our waste removal. With this, change, we would be going to almost \$4300. It's a huge, huge hit for us. This is, it doesn't sound relevant, but minimum-wage just went up \$.50 an hour the other day. Last year, our payroll was \$1.4 million. And it just went up more. We have the sewer and water went up, that was \$1000 a month, just a few months ago. Our cost of goods have gone up over 20%. Excuse me, 20% in the last three years. It is getting harder and harder and harder to have a business in this town.

You have about 10 seconds.

Okay. Anyway. The businesses can only take so much. And eventually they're just going to close their doors. We see it around town right now. So please. We consider this. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go back out to zoom. Marianne, can you unmute yourself, please? I can hear you, can you see the timer?

No, I can't.

AI jump in when you have 20 or 30 seconds left, go ahead.

I like to point out that your consultant put up a slide stating that the recyclables were going to be trucked to Windsor, to the SCRR facility that they have permitted in Windsor. That is not true. That is against their permit. I'd like to read from the permit itself. The planning commission added the following conditions to large collection facilities shall solely be used to process residential and commercial recyclables collected from Windsor business residents and businesses. Period. You cannot bring Sebastopol recyclables and garbage to Windsor to be sorted.

You have about 15 seconds.

That's the main point I wanted to make. Because you cannot do it, and on pages 156 and 157 of your contract, those permits are listed. They need to be taken off. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back into chambers.

I am Mariah, the director of the Sebastopol Chamber of Commerce. Almost 2 1/2 years, now. During which time I've gotten to know many of the business owners in town. I speak to them on a daily basis. Several are hanging on by a thread right now. With the water and sewer increase, the upcoming sales tax, one more extra bill might be the straw that breaks the camels back. This business community wants to feel support, they work very hard. In addition, Recology waves are Apple Blossom fees which would be about \$7000, in addition to also sponsoring many of our events. So I hope that you make the right decision to keep your business community in mind.

Thank you, Mariah, for your public comment. Next I will go back out to zoom. Cannot, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you. Can you see the timer?

Yes.

Go ahead, please.

Council, this sounds like it's been a very hard, long process, and staff. And from the tone, I'm getting the impression that staff and council did not feel like Recology has been a good partner in the process. But you can hear from the public comment and the great response here that the public does have the perception of Recology as an excellent partner, and I share that perception that Recology has an excellent track record of doing public education and collaboration with our schools and other community groups. I think that staying with Recology is the best way to protect our environment, to protect our local businesses, and to protect workers rights. And I won't repeat other excellent arguments made by others. I'll pass it on.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come into chambers.

Steve Pearce, this has been a long process, but, was there any written objective scoring criteria, not just the waiting criteria, but scoring criteria, SCRR scored three points higher on quality of service and references. What is this based on? Customer satisfaction surveys? Windsor staff recommendations? This part of the scoring is hard to understand without much more information. They scored higher than Recology in community employment and partnerships. How was this bid comparison on this point impacted by the fact that Recology is employee owned and unionized company and SCRR is not?

You have about 20 seconds.

SCRR placed a ballot measure in the last election in Windsor where they tried to overturn the required competitive bidding and 10 year contracts. Did that have any impact

on the scoring for integrity? They spent over 100,000 and lost in a 3-1 margin. I want to back up that we really need to look at the franchise fee in terms of impact on our roads. Steve, that's one minute.

Okay, thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will go back out to zoom. Can you unmute yourself, please? Can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you, can you see the timer?

This is Marilyn from screaming Mimi's, I don't know what name you said but it told me to unmute.

Okay. So, sorry about that, can you see the timer?

No, I can't, that's okay.

Al jump in. Go ahead, please.

Thank you. I just want to say considering that this Recology is locally owned, minimal transporting and recycling of recycling and waste, they're very accessible, very easy to speak with when I have a problem, they've had many years of good service, I've been in business 30 years and since I've been using Recology they're very easy to get in touch with. I love their commitment to sustainability and zero waste, and the community support. On top of that, looking at the prices, my prices are going to skyrocket. And the six or seven dollars a month you're sitting residents is going to be absorbed for the quick by all the prices in town going up.

You have about 20 seconds.

Thank you. To make up for this, but I think the savings is minimal and you need to reconsider how it's going to affect this. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come back to in chambers.

Lisa Pierce. I, too, am in support of taking a pause and closer look at the two bids before us. Recology has proven itself as a company to be a good partner with our city. This should be worth something. It's not clear looking at the scoring metrics if this really was worth something or not. Recology has gone above and beyond with their commitment to recycling in our community. The Apple Blossom Festival and Apple there are two examples of this. We know when Recology is handling the waste for an event it is not just going to be handled, but the level that it will be handled will be very high come up with excellent attention to detail, positive energy, and lots of education going on.

You have about 20 seconds.

The tactics that SCRR used to try to lock up and protect their contract in Windsor didn't smell so good. And it went down in flames at the ballot box. I hope we can stick with Recology. A company we know and trust. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comments. Next I will go back out to zoom. Lynn, can you unmute yourself? Can you see the timer?

Yes, I can. Good afternoon, my name is Glenn Brassington, I'm a high school student at Orchard view school, and I urge you to keep a record Recology as the solid waste provider. My school in collaboration with Apple Blossom has had a compass and recycling program for 17 years diverting over 100,000 pounds of waste from local landfills. This would have been hard, nigh impossible to do without Recology's zero waste team which is donated supplies and mentored us on climate action projects.

Switching to SCRR would undo much of this progress and is not just limited to students. The solid waste agreement contains misleading numbers that do not factor in recycling collections or composting. If you want to encourage residents to throw everything in a landfill you will get more cheaper rates. However once you factor in recycling collection and compost, the rates would be much higher. Mayor, vice mayor and council members, by choosing a swap to SCRR you will force business owners to making impossible decisions do not recycle or compost in order to keep their rates down which would make

it harder for them to comply with state laws. Please prioritize your community and economic health.

Thank you for a public comment, next I will come back to chambers.

Okay, am I on? Yeah. So, great to see a room full of people but there's nobody here a year ago and all these people from Recology that are refusing to negotiate with the city. Which is why we had to have this very laborious process, and thank you for all the hard work. Recology is \$1 billion a year tri-state company, it's not a local company, it's got local factions but they own 42 companies. This is very big business, this is millions of dollars at stake. We all are struggling to get by, I heard what Bill said from, it's brutal. It's really brutal to keep the business going in Northern California at this point in time.

You're about 20 seconds.

Basically, all this is about is trying to get our numbers back down to a sensible number and I'm sure there will be more negotiation around the businesses, but Recology didn't step up to the plate a year ago, and here we are. And I wish some of you people have been here a year ago, frankly,. Laura and I were the only people in the room a year ago. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you for your public comment, next I will go back out to zoom. Can you unmute yourself, please?

This is Jim and Carrie, sorry, I can't change my name.

Can you see the timer?

I can. I'm adding my voice in support of Recology. I've had very good experience was with them, they were very transparent when I talked to them. We're going to get rate increases. Welcome to the club. If you choose one set of rate increases from Recology versus the new company, that's okay if it's only about rate increases, but the report that I read doesn't really explain all the other problems that we may or may not have, and I think if it's not broke, don't fix it. And we're going to have to have rate increases but so far I've been happy with Recology and this other company is a complete unknown, and I do not like the smell of it, and I like the union shop, and I'm sorry the report is not compelling enough to make this change, to me. Thank you very much.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back into chambers.

That evening, my name is Eric Muse, I'm one of the new owners, we're new to your business community and have enjoyed being here so far. And anticipate it will be exciting moving forward. I want to share that I've had a great experience with Recology so far. We took over a business that did not have recycling, nor did it have composting. I know that it's on the agenda of the city to move to more waste diversion and ambrosia was instrumental in implement in those programs and moving much of our waste into recycling and composting. So, it just seems odd to me when I look at what's going to happen to our rates that the reward for that is to increase for about \$3500 a year.

Something to consider, please.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go back out to zoom. Can you unmute yourself, please? Can you unmute yourself, please? I will come back to you. Betsy, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you. Can you see the timer?

I can, thank you.

Go ahead, please.

My name is Betsy, I live here in Windsor, S TRR is our current garbage franchise holder. They, SCRR was the only sponsor for measure Q, which asked the Windsor voters to remove the requirement for competitive bid and remove the 10 year contract requirements. SCRR spent more than a quarter of \$1 million to get this on the ballot. Myself and four of my friends thought it was a bad idea, and we pulled together about \$500 to say we don't want this. This is not good for Windsor. We want competitive

bidding, and this is the exact reason we want competitive bidding. 75% of the Windsor voters agreed with us. And we will be going to a competitive bid, so I really encourage you to relook at the bids, to relook at signing a new contract that's going to be potentially for 25 years with SCRR, and as was said earlier, the goods cannot be transferred in Windsor, it is in violation of our contract, thank you.

Thank you, Betsy, for your public comment, we will come back into chambers.

Good evening. My name is Andy Fulton, I'm the assistant general manager here at Recology Sonoma Marin. I share some of the same concerns Councilmember Carter does, specifically around the scoring. As it relates to community employment. In a letter to council, Sonoma County research recovery rather they were founded by a few waste industry professionals. Recology is comprised of a few thousand employee owners. Hundreds of those live here in Sonoma County. And some of those you've heard from, some you will hear from tonight live here in Sebastopol. If you take a look around the room, this is what employee ownership looks like. Whether you're wearing a suit jacket or hive is, our owners showed up in support tonight. We aren't owned by venture capitalist or wealthy investors.

You've got 15 seconds.

We're all part of this community, we care deeply. And on behalf of all of us I like to ask the council to consider delaying tonight's vote until further evaluation of both proposals can take place. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will go back out to zoom, can you unmute yourself, please? Brontë, can you unmute yourself, please? I will come back. I'm sure I'm going to say this wrong, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you. Can you see the timer?

I can.

Great, go ahead, please.

So, my name is Sarah, and I'm echoing what Betsy said. I'm the Windsor resident, and SCRR, their service is not as great as Recology, and they spent over \$200,000 of ratepayer money to fight competitive bidding on my city. Sebastopol, don't make the same mistake my city did, keep Recology. They're union based employees, and they invest hundreds of thousands of dollars across Sonoma County wide in their communities. Keep them. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come back into chambers. Please.

My name is Matthew Calloway, I present carcinoma I urge you to retain Recology as the city's solid waste hauler. Switching to SCRR would undermine Sebastopol's long-standing commitment to sustainability and social equity. Recology's local facilities help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and they must accordingly align with the city's general plan goals to combat climate change locally. SCRR lacks local facilities, requiring calling, as it's been said over and over again it's so important that it's employee owned, a unionized organization that provides fair wages and supports local families. Sebastopol has been a leader in climate action and committee focused decision-making and I urge you to stand by these principles and choose Recology, the partner that best represents these environmental values and the commands that have been made to fight climate change on a local level. Thank you very much.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go back out to zoom. Can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you. Can you see the timer?

My name is Hans Herb, I was the general council for the independent waste recovery Association about 20 years ago when we took on waste management when they were trying to take over the situation. You may know that at this time, they were able to stop the transition because waste management was determined to be a corporate criminal



enterprise by a judge in the Sonoma County Superior Court. It was later worked out, the point is, when I listen to these comments here, and I hear about Recology, I would encourage everyone to go home, Google Recology. Or read the newspaper. It was just a couple months ago that they got taken off criminal probation in San Francisco for a \$100 million, I know it sounds nutty, look it up, don't take my word for it. A \$100 million fleecing of the people of San Francisco. I'm not saying that this should be the be-all and end-all in terms of that the people need to understand who they're dealing with. This is not a family-owned company, this is a huge enterprise. Thank you very much.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back to in chambers.

My name is Robert Vanderwall, good evening again. I commend you for the work it took to get ready to make a decision. So it pains me to suggest you delay. I wish I'd asked for a delay and a redo about the sculpture at the Rodota Trail when it became clear it had been reinvented to favor one particular piece. Criteria must be correct and sufficient before making a decision. Coming up with criteria is notoriously difficult, and the rubric you came up with is good. But, your constituents have additional values to those that are contained within your rubric. I suggest you go back and keep working on this. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comments. Next I will go back out to zoom. Brontë, can you unmute yourself, please?

Yes, is this working?

Can we reset the timer and can you see the timer?

I can, yes.

Go ahead please.

I am a chef and farmer, I've lived in Sebastopol for almost 10 years. Thank you to the council for all the research they've done on this, what I'm hearing is a variety of stakeholders in the community that are really, really concerned and also have a lot of support for Recology, my main concern in this is the small business owners. I feel like they need to be reassured that you guys have their back when they're making the deal, they can't handle anymore. I, as a single woman in a small home who pays for Recology and willing to pay \$20 more a month if it means that my friends can keep the restaurants and cafes open. I really hope that you guys do the work to support these business owners and if it takes more time, do it, and if it costs us as small families 10 or \$20 more, I think I speak for a lot of us when I say this is our local culture and we need them. Thanks.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back to chambers.

Thank you. I name is Logan Hardy, I think there's a very important piece of this contract which is that recycling and composting costs between Recology and SCRR's contracts are 200 to 300% more expensive with SCR than Recology. That means the more you divert where you take material out of landfill, the more expensive your bill is. Consultant knows this only affects 26% of customers, who are they? It's screaming meanies, Sebastopol hardware, it's your lard from your businesses that are going to be significantly impacted by much higher rates with this new contract. I appreciate the questions that were asked regarding the scoring. I think it's strange that when you have a local facility versus one that's 60 miles away, we are scored only one point higher in sustainability. I think it's strange given the community support you see here and our local employment and our local recycling center, that we scored less on community support and employment.

Questions that need to be asked.

That's one minute.

Thank you. Thank you.

[ Inaudible ]

Thank you, Logan, for your public comment. Next I will go out to zoom, Michael, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you, can you see the timer?

I can see the timer.

Go ahead, please.

Hello, my name is Michael Carnegie, I bought a business on Main Street for 31 years, and for 10 of those years, I have been coming to city and to Recology at the waste receptacles on Main Street. One half says recyclables, the other is for garbage. Well, while you might think you're doing a good thing by throwing your recycles into the recycling side, I assure you that it's a lie. That all of that, including the recycling, goes into a single truck that comes by, and it all goes to the landfill. So, I've been saying this for 10 years, and Recology has not done anything to correct the problem. So, whoever you end up going with tonight, and Recology is great on every other front, but the main street garbage is, it's a lie. They're not being used for recycling. It goes against who we are as a city, and it needs to be taken care of. Thank you.

Thank you, Michael for your public comment, next I will come back into chambers.

I was going to tell you about my visit to the plant but I don't have time, so I think all I have time to tell you is, that we need more time on this. I think we need a pause, and you put a lot of work into that report, and you got a lot of good information, and there is some numbers there, but as you see, as you go to the community, there's a whole other level of information that the community has that's a little bit different. This is part of the fabric of our community, that Recology has been a part of, and there's questions raised that we need time to get clear answers, because the community is wanting to know about how the businesses are impacted. We're not seeing the benefits that have happened in the community, community groups that relieve the city of some of his responsibilities. So, just want to say I think we need more time, a little more time, before we make this decision and to be able to dig into scoring and answer these questions and give people more than a minute that I thought I was going to have to talk to you about why,. To bring down the cost for recycling.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will go out to zoom. Courtney, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you. Can you see the timer?

No, I cannot.

Okay, I will jump in when you have 30 or 20 seconds left. Go ahead with your public comment, please.

Okay. I would love to urge you to stay with Recology, they have been a wonderful resource to us, I'm with committee market. They have provided us with trainings, helping us move toward becoming a green certified business. They provided tours and trainings for our staff, they are like-minded business who share the same practices and attention to sustainability and the environment. Which is super admirable and we would love to continue to support them. Like many other folks who spoke tonight who are small business owners. This would be a big deal for us, and the increase to our monthly bill would be a huge hit. On top of all the other increases this past year,

You've got 15 seconds.

Okay. \$3000 a month which is insane, community market doesn't have an owner, and I'll go back into our workforce and community. We would like to urge the Council to stay local and support the businesses of Sebastopol.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back to in chambers.

Hello, my name is Trevor Scott, I'm a current Recology driver. Next month will be my seven years, I started as a sorter. I've done almost every position in between sorter to driver. Recology has always been really supportive of me moving up in the company. And, like you heard tonight, we're 100% employee owned, so we take a lot of pride in servicing the community. Thank you.

Thank you, Trevor, for your public comment. Walter, can you unmute yourself, please?  
Walter, can you unmute yourself, please?

Yes.

Thank you, can you see the timer?

No.

I will jump in when you have 30 or 40 seconds left, go ahead with your public comment, please.

My name is Walter Wheeler, I've been a resident of Sebastopol for 50 years. Along with being a union member for 25. I think Sebastopol has made a variety of mistakes which have resulted in residents footing the bill. For our water and sewer bill has skyrocketed to make up for shortcomings of the city. A six or seven dollars savings on garbage will not. The human aspect of the consultant findings was lost. I also feel it's a gamble to take on this new hauler, and that trust in Sebastopol judgment is low. Please stay with Recology. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come back to chambers.

My name is Celia Ferber, and the community relations and sustainability manager for Recology Sonoma Marin. I've been an employee owner for five years. It's been an honor and a privilege to serve the city of Sebastopol for seven years. As has been mentioned numerous times tonight, we've formed many strong partnerships across the great community. Our involvement in the community extends to our recycling processing as well, we take Sebastopol's recyclables to our state-of-the-art recycling facility in Santa Rosa for processing. We offer public tours and have and businesses since we opened the facility in November 2023. SCRR Will Hall Sebastopol recyclable materials to a facility that is 65 miles away. And does not have the ability to process his many materials. That will result in an increase of approximately 100,000 pounds of greenhouse gas emissions annually. An increase, if it's hauled to Ukiah. I asked the ad hoc committee, how could SCRR be ranked one point higher on sustainability in the scoring.

That's one minute. Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go back out to zoom, if there's anyone on Zoom that would like to make a public Michael, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you, can you see the timer?

I cannot, but I'll make it brief.

Go ahead.

I'd like to echo some of the other community members comments on the excellence of the service provided by Recology. They've definitely improved over our previous hauler and countless ways. Including some of the smaller roles, and compliance with California increasingly complex in regulatory systems. And I'm wondering if all the due diligence was done to determine compliance those regulations with all of the applicants. For example I could not find the other, the intended awardee in the our DRS system, which, You have about 15 seconds.

To track all of their haulers processors, and other waste handlers. I encourage waiting on this decision.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will come back to chambers.

I'm Nikki Burke, I'm the rate analyst for Recology, I like to call into question the assertion that there will be, that Recology is collecting excess material, material that's not there and there will be an ability for businesses to reduce their services. I do not believe that's true, we are not incentivized to provide access free services. That would be a cost to us, secondly I did take a look at what would happen if every commercial and multifamily business reduced their recycling and organics by one size or one day a week, and their rates were still significantly higher than Recology's without any reduction in service. I

urge the Council to take another look at the rates and what this is going to do to your businesses. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will go back out to zoom, if there's anyone on Zoom that would like to make a public comment, seeing none of this time I will come back to chambers. Go ahead.

Hello, councilmembers, my name is Roberto Cardenas. I typically do not comment on Council meetings, but as a fellow Sebastopol resident and Recology employee, this is a topic that hits home. In many ways. As many know. Recology hires union workers such as myself which is allowed me and many of my colleagues to provide for families for the past five years I've been with Recology, I drive the street sweeper for the last two years. And even have the pleasure of servicing my committee of Sebastopol as a sweeper driver, within that time, I have built great relationships with my neighbors and fellow community members of the routes I service. I hope I can continue to be the bridge between my community and Recology and service Sebastopol for many years to come. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, next I will go back out to Zoom, if there's anyone on Zoom that would like to make a public comment, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none I will come back to the chambers.

Hello, my name is Mike Lockwood, I'm the operations manager for Recology Sonoma Marin. I just want to say one thing, I'm very proud standing here tonight that we had no operational complaints. Our service is excellent, nobody in the community had anything to say about that. And that's something to stand up and be proud of. The other thing is, the Ukiah recycling that we just shrug it off, it's down the road, let me tell you, recycling doesn't get hold North from Ukiah. It comes back to the Bay Area, it's 130 miles, it is and 65. And the last thing is, your community, your businesses, they are the life of Sebastopol, and you guys are destroying them. You guys are crushing them with these costs, and you don't need to do that.

You have about 10 seconds.

The last thing I'd like to see, it was brilliant only allow one minute, that way everyone could only say half of what was on their mind.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go back out to Zoom, if there's anyone on Zoom, seeing none I will come back into chambers. Before you go, okay. I was going to say, he was blocking. Go ahead with your public comment, please.

My name is Danielle, I own retrograde coffee roasters, elevating eight years on Main Street in downtown Sebastopol, six of those years I've been a certified green business thanks to ambrosia's help. Getting there. Ultimately higher compost and recycling cost discourage diversion from landfills get Sebastopol businesses are required by city ordinance and state law to compost. These rates unfairly penalize businesses already meeting these requirements. At retrograde we divert nearly all waste, including tracking food waste every single month, less than 1% of food that comes through our door goes into the compost bin. I'm very familiar with what my business needs for our compost and recycling services. For the consultant to suggest that businesses do not currently have the right size bins which Recology already does is an insult to our intelligence. SCRR is suggesting downsizing dramatically, which is an incorrect or solution. Our dumpster is full everything will pick up, I put trash, compost and recycling in it myself multiple times a week.

Danielle, that's one minute. Thank you for your public comment. Logan, can I ask a favor? You're blocking, thank you. Thank you. Next I would go back out to Zoom, if there's anyone on Zoom. Seeing none I will come back into chambers.

Hello, I am a resident and owner from Sebastopol for 21 years. Retired Teamster, and I just don't want to see us make a decision at the cost of employees. A promise by a

company is not the same as a contract it's backed by the union. Let's protect the people to provide services for us so they may have the same opportunities I've had to live and thrive in the communities that they've helped build. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. I see no hands on Zoom so I'm going to come back into chambers.

Thank you so much, I'm Emily Harris, I'm the waste zero manager at Recology, a company I'm proud to work for and be employee owned. I also wanted to just request that the current plan is being proposed we look into closer. It just doesn't seem like the scoring is quite adding up properly, just wanting to ask again that is looked at closer. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment, I will go back out to Zoom. Seeing no hands raised, I will come back into chambers.

My name is Steve Finkelstein, I've been living here for the last three years. And it's great but whatever decision you guys make I'm sure you'll make the right one but I want you to know, and I haven't heard in the discussion and maybe I just didn't hear it. If with PG&E, you have low income, you're entitled to a discount. When you show that discount to Recology, they match it. So they offer you a discount as well. Whichever company you pick, make sure that that's also included in the deal, otherwise anyone who's sitting with Recology is not going to be sitting with the new company and that makes no sense at all. So ask them, whoever you choose that you get the discount. To the low income folks.

Thank you, Steve. For your public comment, let me go back out to Zoom. Michael, can you unmute yourself, please? Can you see the timer?

Yes, I can.

Go ahead, please.

Really quick, this reminds me of when I helped with measure J. When you have social justice groups, environmental groups, business groups and labor groups all seeing the same thing. I urge the city Council to please listen to the community represent, and delay this and let's make the right decision by looking at all the facts and looking at the community that your present. So that we make the right decision for our community.

Thank you.

Thank you Michael for your public comment, next I will come back into chambers.

A minute,? Okay. My name is Dan, I'm a front loader driver in Sebastopol for over 23 years. And Windsor came in and started following us, following us, I had a problem with the guy who was following me zipping around in his wife's car, his racy car, I say that because the license plate is [ Inaudible ] and he said he'd be the first one to stand up and say, I did it, he kept running red lights, he kept blasting to red lights. I stopped him and say, what's your problem and he said, I'll be the first one to admit, so I'd like to hit the floor right there and see if he wants to stand up and admitted today. I don't think he will, but that's okay.

You have about 15 seconds.

Okay. I'd hate to lose you guys. I really like being out here. Like I said, I've enjoyed 23 years out here. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go back out to Zoom if there's anyone on Zoom, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none I will come back into chambers. If there's any further public comment on this item.

Good evening. My name is Kevin Walbridge, I'm the founder and managing partner of Sonoma County resource recovery. I appreciate the opportunity to provide a proposal. I understand the passion. This is my whole life, all I've been is in the waste business. I ran the waste business for a number of years. I know it's personal and I know all of you appreciate the service you provided. Waste professionals, the drivers in this room, go out every day and do the best they can to take care of their customers. My company feels the

same way. We've been doing this for well over 100 years. Me and my partners, we service over 21 communities in the Bay Area. We service 200,000.

You have about 30 seconds.

We founded the company to address a solid waste problem that existed, and that's the same time Recology showed up as well. There was a problem, we try to do our part is all but, I know they try to do their part to solve it, and that's why we exist, we're a small company, based in Sonoma County, all our employees are in Sonoma County. And I thank you for your consideration. Any questions of anybody. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will go back out to Zoom. Marie, can you unmute yourself, please?

Thank you, can you see the timer?

Yes.

Go ahead with your public comment, please.

I'm a Sonoma County resident, and I just want to echo what everyone's saying. I do think it's, I want to urge the Council to consider delaying this. And taking a deeper dive into the rates. Because as the consultant and the council referred to them are garbage rates, and that's what is compared on the agenda is the garbage only. Not recycling compost as others have stated. So I think it's extremely incomplete and misleading, and again, just elaborating on the criteria. I think it's also concerning that the Council seems like their mind is very made-up going into this meeting. I hope they hear the public comment coming to everybody, coming from everybody, it's an overwhelming message of support. So I just want to say that, thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back into chambers.

My name is Brian pop well, I'm a waste zero specialist with Recology. I urge you to listen to your constituents, it's been overwhelming. The amount of comments that have been in our favor. And I just recommend that you delay this proposal. Thank you.

Thank you, Brian, for your public comments. I will go back out to Zoom, if there's anyone on Zoom, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none, I will come back into chambers if there's anyone in the chambers that would like to make a public comment. Seeing none, public comment is closed on this item.

I'm going to turn to my colleagues, we've now been going for well over two hours. Is there a desire for a break you Mark know? No. All right, then we're moving along. So, we're back up to the dais. For councilmembers discussions. And possible motion.

Anyone?

I just want to understand a little bit better about the ramifications of voting. Say we both know or something like that versus making a motion to delay, what does that mean? In terms of, you know, city staff, and labor for renegotiation, what are the consequences?

I'll take part of that and Mary has more to add. The current agreement is in place until June 30th. An agreement needs to be in place before that, well before that in order for service to continue. Without interruptions. I don't think one or two week delay is going to be the difference, there is some point in which a decision needs to be made. You know, the existing agreement may be possible to be extended. We have no idea. That's just something I'm throwing out. Mary could talk a little bit more about the staff, staff impact.

If you're asking to delay the item, staff would have to, it depends on what the direction of the Council is. Bringing it back in two weeks is not feasible. We would not be able to do that. If you're asking us what you want us to evaluate, it would be hard to answer without knowing what you want staff to do.

Say, for example, we have this massive constituency of Recology. What would it take to reconsider that? Does that mean that if we were to vote no or something like that, do you now automatically reconsider? We did 10 months worth of work. And it feels difficult to

make a change. What is the consequence of a straight up no vote versus a delay, and reconsidering our thoughts?

As the city attorney stated, we do have a contract that expires June of this year. So, we wouldn't want to, I mean, we've done our due diligence, we believe we've done our due diligence. If you'd like us to do more of a deep dive, I would like to ask the consultant as well to see how much time that would want to take. Are you asking us to re-evaluate both proposals? As if we were starting new?

What we have to do that? Could we just pick the other one?

You cannot pick the other one tonight. We have not done any negotiations, nothing whatsoever.

I understand. Okay. So that would renew a very arduous process.

It would be the negotiations. If you're asking us, if you're not willing to recommend what staff is and asking us to negotiate with Recology, it would be a time-consuming process. We would see if we can negotiate with them and I'm not speaking for you. Renegotiate if we could extend the contract for a few more months, the current contract to see where the negotiations had.

Okay.

Other comments? Down on this end? Down on this end? No?

Can I jump in really quick and ask the consultant? Assuming we would have to do renegotiation, Garth. I mean if the Council determined not to go with the staff recommendation tonight, and wanted us to look at renegotiating, I'm assuming that's going to take a couple months.

That's about right.

I want to verify that before we move forward.

That's accurate.

Garth, can I ask a question? One of the commenters just brought up about the discount.

Oh, yes. Yes, low income discount, would be for the same current process, provide evidence of being enrolled in PG Andy's care program and get a discount. I believe it's the same 15% in the agreement.

Okay. I'm happy.

Yes, go right ahead. Vice Mayor.

Let me just get here. Did you want, you want me to go? Okay.

I could say a few things. I think I can say a few things. I wish each and everyone of you who spoke to us tonight had done the deep dive. Had done the interviews, had tried to negotiate with Recology. I wish you had that experience. And you don't. So you don't know. What that experience was like. I feel solid with our decision to go with SCRR. I have so much respect for the process. And our goal was to obtain the best service at the best rates. And we believe, as an ad hoc committee, that we have done that. And I just wish that you all have the information that we had to work with. And like I said earlier, I voted to continue with Recology, because of the comments people had sent us, because I believe their service is great. They have been great. But if we had gone with what Recology had proposed, we'd see a whole another room, plus more and more of people complaining about the 50% plus increase rates that Recology was going to impose. I believe that SCRR will work with businesses to help right size their containers and to work with them. I feel confident that they are going to do this, and if needed I will help with this process as well. There is no way I want to see hot mic go having to pay \$3000 a month. That's just not okay. I believe something can be done about that, so that's not a fact. And I see our SCRR manager shaking his head. So, we have a contract, and that contract is ready to go. Right? And that contract is before this council. The idea of going back or delaying, in order to negotiate again with Recology, for me, is a nonstarter.

I'll go ahead and jump in. Yes,  
I will go ahead, but go ahead.  
I don't want to take,

I just wanted to add the second part of that is, it's a nonstarter for me but I respect my colleagues. And if they want to take it in that direction, I'm just not going to vote for that. Thank you.

Councilmember Maurer, vice Mayor?

It's a nonstarter for me, too. I wish all of you could have the same experience that we had, it was disappointing going back and forth, back and forth, coming back to meetings and still having the same numbers and knowing that there was just no way that I could say oh, yeah, let's go ahead and increase greater than 50%. It was not in my opinion, a present process which is why we brought it back to the Council and asked the Council to decide what we should do. And again, I do respect everyone here and what that is and is, but for me, I am solid. I believe that SCRRE will work with our businesses. I'm a business owner. I stand, we have dumpsters. I fully expect that we're going to have some kind of increase. But at the end of the day, sitting up here and having to make a decision that's best for everyone in the city, it's hard. And a couple things that I learned along the way, in our talks initially with Recology was the larger residential been users were actually subsidizing the smaller bins. That was an actual statement to us which was surprising to me because of prop 218. And I thought, how can that be? How can we have one group subsidizing another and I was told it was because it was decided to encourage residents to use less trash, so we had larger been users paying for smaller been users, subsidizing. And prop 218 does not allow for that. As we sit up here and we have to make decisions, we also need to look at the laws out there and the regulations, and that is something that sat with me. Because I just, you know, it's disappointing, basically. And to Council member Maurer's point, I wish that you all could have had the same experience. Because I truly believe that SCRRE will work with us. I do believe that. They have been responsive, they are out here today. I do believe that they will work with us, and I'm a firm supporter of them.

Thank you, vice Mayor, and I'll go ahead and weigh in. The points that I definitely want to drill home are the proportionality as the vice mayor said. Providing equitable services, you pay the same for the type of services that you get, that is very important to me. As is trying to get to zero waste and the point about zero waste is not just about, it's not just about reducing the overall. Amount of things, it's like this particular contract does do that, by incentivizing just not having as much waste to begin with. The other point I want to leave home is the fact that there will be people who will be very disappointed, I'm sure, but whatever decision we make. I want to bring, focus back to the staff. Because we are all sitting up here, got elected for various reasons, perceived to be biased, whatever the case is. Staff are not. Because your tax dollars goes to their wages, to provide the services that are as unbiased as possible. They have nothing to lose in any of this. So, when I found out that staff was behind the recommendation, that they may double down on that, I want to respect my colleagues and the fact that this obviously was not an easy decision, was protracted by many, many, many months. So I am supporting to make the switch, unfortunately. I do not have the wording before me, otherwise I would make a motion, but in the family do not want to make a motion to cut off others discussion and comments. So I'm going to put it out but I would make the motion if there's no more discussion. Councilmember Hinton?

This is a super tough one for me. I did vote to go out for the RFP process. Because frankly, Recology blew it, and I'm looking at my old colleague, Logan Harvey from city of Sonoma. And I'm sorry. 57% was not okay. And we had to go out for an RFP. So we



did that, I voted for it, and now we have the results of it. And you guys have been spreading flyers since Saturday to our business community. I'm super frustrated. Because I didn't want to be here either. I just got to say it. Ambrosia knows this, this is not personal. I mean, you really put us on the front page of the paper and in a difficult position. And, I can't dish my colleagues who have spent 100 hours, right? That's respectful. They just haven't been spreading flyers since Saturday. 100 hours. I'm upset. To say the least. We have heard from only a few people supporting what the city is recommending, and a ton through a PR campaign with form out letters from this community. And I agree because I met with business owners today, that the business community, it seems, a lot of them are going to pay more. They're frustrated. I'm frustrated. I want to find a solution. I've got to say to the ad hoc, while I respect them, I'm super not comfortable with the length of the contract. I am very interested in learning how we might not, if the real cost to pick up debris boxes is what it is, that maybe that's not an exclusive deal. And to say, when you didn't sit on the subcommittee, the first we saw of most of this was at the same time as the public did. That was last Friday. So, I feel like coming off the holidays, it's really hard to digest. I wasn't spreading flyers on Saturday, I was out of town trying to read this and asked the city to send me a printed version because it's 176 pages. So, I would support waiting. I'm not sure I would support a full, I don't think, I think we have questions. I have questions, I have not got answered prior to tonight, and I've asked a lot of questions. I believe in good jobs. I believe in union jobs. My daughter is part of the nurses union. I get that. I understand that the other shop is not a nonunion shop, obviously they're not Teamsters. So I just have a lot of questions. I would be in favor of delaying without opening up the whole bid process to get my questions answered. I will be voting tonight, I want to make a statement to my colleagues I don't know what's going to happen. I feel like there's been missteps. And I'm not, I'm not happy. And I have been very public about my comments over the years. About Recology, and the great things you guys did with recycling and working with us on events, working with the students. It's been a pleasure. But when you came to us, when we try to negotiate with you with a 57% increase, what was our options? But to do what's best for this community and go out to bid. And that's, if you're the only bidder, you get to set your prices. If you're bidding again somebody else the pencil gets sharpened. Pencil got sharpened, but I still have more questions, and that's where I stand tonight. I would want to, for the community, it's a consistent message with me, I gave the fire department more time, too. I know we have a deadline. I know we don't have a lot of time. But I do have more questions, and so it is hard for me to take a vote on a contract at this moment. But I also haven't done the 100 hours. In respect to the people that have. So I just, I'll just say that. I'm still mad at you guys.

So, are there other discussions before a motion is made? I'm looking down here.

I just want to chime in a little bit. I understand how much work you've put into this, and it weighs heavily on my thoughts. And I know that it was important to send this out to bid to get Recology to a place where they were putting in something reasonable. I'm still super curious, as I have done a lot of research, I'm still super curious how accurate and how the businesses prices are going to be in the future. There's a W no, the devil you don't, and, I highly respect the colleagues that have done a lot of research, and I do believe that they will, they've come to see good things in the new candidate. But I don't know that candidate, and I couldn't find anything about him, and I spent, I don't know, 20 some hours researching and trying to figure out why it's better and trying to, and maybe the process is bad. How do I not know what you guys know that tipped the scales? Because I don't see it, I can't find it. I looked hard for it and I can't find it. So, when I look at these business people coming up in the entire community, I still, I have still more

questions. And if I can get some more information about what I don't know, that would be really helpful, because as I said, I try really hard to know and I haven't found it.

Can I ask for Garth to respond to that? To respond to what Councilmember Carter and Hinton said?

I guess what I'm asking is what are your thoughts on delaying.

Oh. As your technical adviser, the only thing I can say is that you're close to the end of the existing term. And pushing forward, will put you in a position of having a shorter transition if you do vote to go with SCRR. Having a bit more breathing room could help with that, I do know that Recology, when you extended by six months from the end of December 2024, to mid 2025 had suggested that they would consider another short term extension. So that is one possibility. I think in terms of taking time to do additional thinking and evaluating and answering questions you would want to try to keep that short, because even at the time Recology was adjusting they can't continue under the existing structure for much longer. That was part of their concern and not offering longer-term extensions of existing rates. Time is of the essence overall in terms of coming to a decision around the new contracts. You may have some variables that can help you address those questions or concerns, but you wouldn't want to take too much time with that unless you could get a longer term extension of existing services.

Thank you, other comments or emotion?

I guess my concern with the delay is, that a delay gives SCRR less time to make the transition, less time to educate the businesses. Less time to write those adjustments. So, that is a concern with delaying.

Additional comments? Motion? If not I'll make the motion. According to the recommendation of staff, I move for the authorization of the execution of the solid waste collection agreement for garbage, recyclable materials, organic waste, collection services for Sonoma County resource recovery, and select one of the two options regarding solid waste in the agreement and two, authorize the execution of services with R3 consulting incorporated to provide the city with consulting services during the transition of solid waste collection services to SCRR. The funding for this contract will be paid by SCRR, and will have no fiscal impact on the city of Sebastopol budget.

I'll second that motion, with the exception that we have not decided on option one or two. And that needs to be discussed.

My thought was that that would come.

No, we need the motion to include that, and then it will be brought. If the motion passes, that's what will be brought back at the next meeting for adoption. But we need the motion to decide, so we know what to bring back.

Got it. My thought on that is option two to provide people a ramp-up time period. That would be part of my motion.

So this item needs to come back in two weeks, one month? When does it come back?

The resolution would come back in two weeks, is whatever option you choose tonight we need to put that within a resolution.

That can give the ad hoc committee sometime to possibly get some questions answered from the Council?

It good. If we adopt a resolution that's not final, but, if you want answers, you should wait. It would be quite awkward to move forward and then back out in two weeks.

Can I just point out, a few members of the public brought up as part of the contract that is misquoting the deal with Windsor, and I assume that would be corrected? As part of the motion. I don't know if it has to be per the motion.

I believe the assertions were that the contract, excuse me, the permit with Windsor does not allow for this to be hauled there. We have to look into that, I don't know if Garth has more information about that.

And the transfer facility that's suggested in the agreement is not SCRR's transfer facility, and I believe that was the facility that the commentor was referencing. It's a different facility, a facility owned and operated by Pacific sanitation. I would ask that Kevin Walbridge speak to that more directly. I know that Pacific sanitation is the transfer facility that's listed in the agreement.

The people that commented did not read the full document. The Windsor facility references Pacific sanitation. We do have a permit, it was never intended to dump Sebastopol there, they're correct. It's in our use permit that we can't use that but we can use Pacific sanitation. It's roughly a mile from our existing facility. That's the Windsor facility that's referenced, not the SCRR yard.

Good evening. Sorry my voice has come and gone. We do have a permit and we have an LE a permit for a transfer facility at our Windsor location. Right now there is nothing being translated there. Currently it is permitted to have Windsor material only. In the event that we go ahead and build the facility, to transload the recyclable materials ourselves, we will go ahead and ask for an amendment for the use permit to include Sebastopol's material. If appropriate.

So I think we have a motion on the floor that I stated with requirement picking one option or two, and part of my motion is option two.

And I seconded that.

Roll call?

Assuming no further discussion, correct?

My understanding is once there's a motion and a second.

You can have discussion. You can still have discussion on the motion.

Then I don't want to block discussion. Are there further discussion, comments?

I'll just make a discussion that I have asked for a bit of a delay to answer some of these questions or to consider a shorter term contract. I just want to reiterate that. Again, I know we've got a motion on the floor, here. But that would make me feel a lot more comfortable, and I have to say I believe it would make the community feel more comfortable. For those of us that just learned about the details of this contract when this became public. I just want to reiterate. And that's the end of my comment.

Garth? This, we discussed the reason for the 15 year, right? At some point?

The 15 year was the recommended term length included in the RFP, in the draft agreement. My understanding is that setting it at a shorter term length would affect the business terms of the deal, and I don't believe that SCRR would be positioned to agree to the terms and conditions if the term were a shorter term. I would let them speak for themselves on that, but it was posted and published in the RFP and the draft agreement as a request for a 15 year term when it went out in June.

Right.

Further discussion before we do roll call? Seeing none, discussion?

I don't need to discuss this further. I feel wildly underinformed. And it would really help to have some delay, and I trust my other councilmembers worked so hard for 10 months, but, I still don't feel great about the decision. That's all I have to say right now.

If there is no other discussion, go to roll call.

Thank you, Mayor. So moved by Mayor Zollman, seconded by Councilmember Maurer to approve the solid waste collection agreement with Sonoma County garbage recycling organic waste collection services and authorizing the execution of a professional services agreement with R3 consulting group provide the city with consultant services during the

transition of the solid waste collection services with the recommendation for option two.

Councilmember Carter?

No.

Councilmember Hinton?

No.

Councilmember Maurer?

Yes.

Vice Mayor McLewis?

Yes.

Mayor Zollman?

Yes.

Motion passes 3-2 with Councilmember Carter and Councilmember Hinton voting in opposition.

We will be taking, council, either 10 or 15 minutes. Excuse me, five or 10 minute break. 10. 10. I'm hearing 10, break, five or 10 minutes. 10. All right. Seven, I guess we're taking a seven minute break him a thank you. [ The event is on a recess. The session will reconvene at 8:43 PM. Captioner on standby. ]

Seems like we're okay with I.T. Thank you, I.T. is ready, Mary, are we ready? So, yes. As I said before, after we completed agenda item number eight, I said that there would still be able to be a reassessment of the remaining agenda items. I'm going to turn it to our wonderful Madame clerk, because she can eyeball what needs to absolutely get accomplished, because I always assume at 10:30 one of us can pull the plug and that is likely to happen. Given those parameters, Mary, which one do we think absolutely need to be covered?

I'm going to ask the city manager to weigh in as well. For my opinion, first of all, the city Council and city staff assignments, we need to get those done. We have regional assignments that meetings are being held, all that. I would like to get those done tonight. The pilot program can wait, that is not have to be done tonight if we cannot get to it. The fire stipend policy, you adopted the policy at the last meeting, there is no budget item, I think we would be able to do that within a few minutes. The recruitment process, I don't know how long that I do might take. Are the chiefs in attendance? Do you know approximate, how long? 10, 15 minutes? The four leaf contract from planning we should get that done, because it is dealing with the Barlow hotel and we need to get a contract in place. And the MOU, that is just a ratification of what has been approved. That one should not take very long as well. So, in my opinion the pilot program can be held and the consent calendar items, if we don't get to those, we can postpone those to the next meeting, there's nothing on there that would hold anything.

Okay, great. With that, my preference would be to address number nine, first, and then we can go through them. Except for item number 10. Is there disagreement with that thought for my colleagues? Looking to my right, my left. Not seeing any. We're calling agenda item number nine, this is the discussion in consideration of city Council and city staff city assignments. This item is to discuss the mayor's recommendations for city Council committee assignments and the responsible party is our city clerk.

Thank you, Mayor. At the last, at the December meeting we had discussed the committee assignments, the councilmembers had put in what committee assignments they wanted, the mayor has reviewed all of those and what is in the staff report is what is being recommended. I would ask the councilmembers to ask you if there's any questions if they would like to see any changes, or if not we can go out to public comment and then come back and ratification of those committee assignments.

Thank you, Madame clerk. Are there questions, comments, concerns?

I have one. And that is, I'd like, to talk about this, about her taking the primary position, primary liaison position for the social service groups. And I would take the alternate, because she's been asked directly by Rotary to take that, and so I'd like to pass that on to her. And she said she'd be willing to accept that. The other is that I noticed that our new councilmember, Phill Carter, doesn't have any positions with the County except for the mosquito group. And I don't know if, I think he would like a position in accounting. But I don't know if he wanted the Sonoma waste. That's something I wanted to bring up. I just noticed he didn't have any other, he didn't have any positions and I think it's something that he has expressed an interest in.

Okay. Councilmember Carter?

That's correct, but I haven't done my homework. I'm not really up on what I have or don't have.

I have it right here. Councilmember Carter has the mosquito group, he's the alternate for Sonoma clean power, he's an alternate for zero waste, he's an alternate on the library, and he's on the budget committee and the climate action committee. So, he just doesn't, besides the mosquito group which is not a very large role, he doesn't have any County positions. And so,

Okay.

I'm pointing that out to Mr. Carter.

I would certainly enjoy an accounting position. And that was the waste?

Zero waste Sonoma, I've been on it for two years.

Zero waste fits the whole persona. That would be great.

I could be the alternate.

I see, thank you, I appreciate that.

You're welcome.

Well, thank you to you both. And vice Mayor. I forgot. Vice Mayor.

I just had a question and maybe I'm misremembering, I thought I put myself in for the alternate, but I'm shown as the alternate above for health action coalition.

As a reminder, map your neighborhood is now under health actions.

That's what I forgot. They are now under health action, so it would be all the other stuff. Thank you.

Great. Councilmember Hinton?

I just wanted to confirm I did tell Councilmember Maurer that I would think the nonprofits in, but, I know that there is a monthly meeting and I'm wondering what time it is, and I want to say that for now, if it's lunch or during the day, I can attend, but, It's lunch time.

I may have to come back at a later date depending on where my schedule puts me.

It's a lunchtime meeting?

It's okay for now because I'm between positions. And I'm in town for lunch. But if I'm not in town for lunch I may have to come back to the Council.

I'll be the alternate.

You could be the alternate. That's first, and then I did want to point out that the mosquito abatement committee is a pretty large appointment. It's a very, it's a multiple County jurisdictional. So, it is a very large appointment.

I didn't hear that.

It's regional.

So, I believe you're talking service clubs, correct? And those are quarterly.

Okay, so, quarterly would be great. Yeah, okay, sorry.

I just don't know what time they are. I'll find out, I'm happy to take that primary appointment.

Great, thank you.

I just want to say one thing, I put myself as the alternate because I'm not sure I can attend every board meeting for the health action and such. I'm just publicly stating that the alternate, I was happy to do it, and I'll do what I can since we don't have a primary. Unless someone wants to be the primary. I am not certain I can attend every board meeting because of work.

Thank you, vice Mayor, any other additional comments? Seeing done, we're going to go out to her public.

Thank you, Mayor, this is public comment for the city council committee assignments if you'd like to make a public comment I will go to in chambers first. Seeing none I will go out to zoom if you'd like to make a public comment on the city Council and city staff committee assignments, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none, public comment is closed.

Thank you, coming back to the dais for additional discussion or motion.

I'm happy to make the motion to approve the appointments for city council and city staff committee assignments with the changes discussed.

I second that.

Terrific. Mary are you okay with following along with those?

If I'm incorrect, please let me know. The motion was moved by Councilmember Hinton, and seconded by Councilmember Maurer to approve the 2025 city council committee assignments with the changes as follows. Councilmember Hinton to be the primary to the service club, Councilmember Maurer would be the alternate, Council member Carter would be the primary with Councilmember Maurer being the alternate. Councilmember Carter?

Council member Maurer?

Yes.

Vice Mayor McLewis?

Yes.

Motion passes unanimously.

Thank you, Mary, moving along we decided we could put item number 10 on a future agenda. That moves us down to agenda item number 11, authorization to implement a volunteer firefighter stipend policy. This is important, that's the reason it's underlined. There is no budget impact with this item as there is funding budgeted in fiscal year 2024 25 fire department budget in the amount of \$124,000. Responsible department is fire city manager. City manager, did you want to say something?

Very briefly, if you have questions or he feels I'm overlooking something basically, this is an important step to improving public safety.

I'm sorry,

I apologize, thank you for the reminder. This is an important step, it will improve coverage. At our fire station. It will improve engagement of our volunteers, and public safety was the number one issue identified by our residents in the survey we did last year. This implement the policy that you approved at the last meeting. We do have the funds available and this year's budget to cover this cost with a little bit left over. And I appreciate the collaboration with the fire department and the ongoing commitment of our volunteers to serve our community. I would just open it up to any questions that you might have or if Dave wants to make a comment, if that's okay with the mayor.

Sure. Chief.

As Don had said, we worry approved the policy, it's just implement in that policy, for that round-the-clock coverage. It's really as simple as that.

Great, are there questions from my colleagues? Seeing none, then I think we're going out to public comment.

Thank you, Mayor, this is public comment on the implementation of the fire -- volunteer firefighter policy. If you like to make a public comment I will go to in chamber first.

Seeing none I will go out to zoom, if you like to make a public comment on the implementation of the policy, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none, public comment is closed.

Thank you, further discussion from my colleagues? Turning to the right, turning to the left, not seeing any.

Just move to authorize the implementation, authorize and implement the volunteer firefighter stipend policy.

I'll go ahead and second. I'm sorry. All right. So, it's been seconded. Mary? Roll call, please.

Thank you, so moved by Councilmember Maurer, seconded to approve the volunteer firefighter stipend policy. I'm sorry, to, the volunteer firefighter stipend policy, Council member Carter?

Yes.

Council member Hinton?

Aye. Vice Mayor McLewis?

Yes.

Mayor Zollman?

Yes.

Motion passes unanimously.

Item agenda number 12, the consideration of Council approval to initiate or permit process to hire, fire captains positions, again, this is important to note there is no general fund budget impact as funding for the positions are funded through measure H funds in the amount of \$117,217. Again the responsible parties are fire and city manager.

So I'm going to start in reverse this time and asked Dave if you could give a brief comment or two about the benefits of adding the captains, because I got a little bit, and I'll explain the financial aspects of it.

So the fire captains, they provide the supervision that the fire station we currently have two full-time 40 hour fire engineers. These are what we refer to as the chauffeurs, they drive the apparatus, make sure that the firefighters at the end of the hose they have water in their hose lines and for their safety. The fire captain provides the first level supervision in the station and at the emergency scene, they're the ones that are dictating what rescue or how we're performing rescue, how we're fighting the fire, with the firefighters providing that supervision at the emergency scenes. Day in and day out they're working beside the paid staff that's there, providing the direction of the day, they're handling complaints, they provide that level of supervision, currently, that is being performed by myself and I would argue that we definitely need a mid-level supervisor in there. Standard practice across the country is that they are usually a tenant or fire captain that complements the fire and will engineer and I would like to lament that locally. It's definitely needed based on the call volume that we have, we've surpassed the ability of the two firefighters and engineers in the station.

In addition to the firm or improvement in public safety, this item represents our commitment to meet the taxpayers expectations in supporting measure H, adopted last year. Because that's how we're going to be funding these positions. This is also something of hopefully an interim step. This preserves some of the measure H dollars if they retain an independent fire station and consolidation does not occur is we're hoping that it will. Keeping money essentially aside for that scenario if we were more confident or fully

confident about consolidation occurring, we would most likely be recommending hiring a third captain at this point, for reasons explained in the report we feel like we need to be cautious about taking that step at this point. I need to apologize for confusion in the item. The fire ad hoc discussed this in the budget committee as well, but basically the difference between, the recommendations, one is that we approve the record of two full-time fire captains to be funded with measure H, and the second item is to approve the budget amendment for this year. So we can get that locked in and happening. The third item, this is a recommendation is really more of another option, that we could open recruitment for three positions, usually I've learned when we do that, we would set the money aside as if we were going to hire, and that's a step that I don't think we're ready to recommend taking. I think our intent and this is reflected in the comment for the committee's is that we do want to get to three, but we want to wait a little bit longer until we're more certain of the consolidation and the related financial impacts before we commit to a permanent third captain position. We don't want to hire three and not sustain it in the long run. I think in either scenario we're not going to make the final hiring decision until later. Two for now, keep the third one in our pocket, when we're ready we'll come back with that action at that point. And I want to turn it to the fire ad hoc. If you have anything you wanted to add.

I think my intent from the fire subcommittee was that I understand we can recruit with the possibility of having three and higher, this item authorized hiring two, and then a third could be hired up to, I believe, three months following the recruitment. So,

Was it three or six? Is it six?

It's six. Is it six?

So, yeah. It seems like with this proposal that we'll be funding one recruitment source, with two hires for sure happening, and then bring it back to the Council when we get further down the road with a possible decision to add the third. Just to make it clear, I don't think the third is a foregone conclusion at this point. I don't want anybody to rip misinterpret that it is. But we did say that we would go out with the recruitment for three, that's my understanding of my position, anyway.

I was going to say, I am supportive of three but understanding our budget and the long-term thing, that we would go out for two right now, I want to do, it was important to me that you all understood that if we came back later for another, that you're hearing it now and it wouldn't be a shocker later like him away are we asking for one more? We just did too, but the intent and what we would desire is three but we know things are shaking out. Not to be long-winded but just wanted to put that intention out there and explain.

Thank you.

Yes, thank you, are there other questions? I have one, but go ahead.

One comment if I might, the, the Fire Chief from gold Ridge put a very articulate message about that which we just cut and paste and put in the agenda report. If the Council or members of the public are interested in that dynamic that would be a good place to look. Anyway. Happy to answer the questions.

And their other questions? Go ahead.

Just a question that we could actually go out, recruit for two, but then maintain a list of those people and higher off of that list so we don't need to recruit for three, but we could recruit for two and then hire two, and possibly use that list to hire a third later.

That's our understanding. If they were actually available. We have to get the budget approval, but yeah.

Okay. Great. I'm going to ask you this fiscal thing, it's mentioned a couple times here, even with the two. You're stating that with the two we're going to have enough money



for, as you said, possible capital expenses and debt service obligations. Is that true? I need to hear you vocalize that if that's true.

Yes.

So that is true and as it's been discussed tonight, we're not formally down the road enough to determine with those additional potential expenses, the capital expenses in debt service, that's the reason why we're not going with three at this point.

We want to make sure financially, that we're solid. Given our situation.

Great. There is no more discussion. Is there a motion?

We need to do public comment.

Sorry.

Is so this is public comment on the recruitment for two firefighter captains, if you'd like to make a public comment I will come to in chambers first. Seeing none, I will go out to zoom if you like to make a public comment for two fire captains, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none, public comment is closed.

Terrific. Now back up to the dais. Comments?

I wanted to point out and I was looking for where it said it in the staff report, but I wanted to point out to the full Council, that part of our situation is that we only got funding for two captains originally in measure H, because other departments, fire chiefs put in for three, and our interim Fire Chief at the time only put in for two for us. So also, that's why we're coming from a conservative position, although we recognize three would have been best, we're just trying to play the cards we've been dealt. I just want to make that.

Thank you for putting that out there, that was a comment that I made in the budget from the budget committee and the fact that not trying to throw shade on anyone but I want the public to know. This is a situation we're in based upon a former fire chief made the recommendations to the County, and now we can't un-recommend that. I wanted to make it very clear that that's where I see our situation.

And you are correct.

Thank you. So, are there further discussions? Motion?

I'll make a motion.

Second.

I'll make a motion that we approve the recruitment of two full-time fire captains, funded from measure H, and we approve a resolution for the budget amendment of 117 thousand \$217 for two fire captain positions salary and benefits and related costs for the remainder of fiscal year 24-25. Oh, actually, are we doing that? Because then it says or. So, yeah, that would be it.

That was the motion. Unless you wanted to go or, which is a different motion. That's the recommendation.

I think vice Mayor seconded.

Thank you. So moved by Councilmember Maurer and seconded by Vice Mayor McLewis to approve the initiation of the recruitment process for the fire captain positions for the positions to be funded through measure H funded to the amount of \$117,217 for the remainder of the FY 24-25 and approve the resolution for the budget amendment for those two fire captain positions salary and benefits and related costs. Councilmember Carter?

Yes. Councilmember Hinton?

Mayor Zollman?

Motion passed unanimously.

Perfect, moving on to number 13, consideration of approval of contract for 4Leaf and reimbursement agreement contract scope of work is, yes, thank you. Contract scope of

work is for the Barlow development agreement and application processing. Item is required as contract approval level is above the signing authority for the city manager. Again, this is important, thus the reason is underlined. There is no budget impact as the contract will be funded by the developer. Responsible department to planning. So, turning to our general manager.

Thank you. Economic development is a team sport. Requires multiple departments from within the city to collaborate and right now our emerging team captain on this is our new community development director, and she's available on zoom to present the item to you this evening. And I'll turn it over to any, should be brief and happy to answer any questions after she's done.

Thank you, and good evening Mayor and members of council. As both the mayor and city manager just explained, this is a report that has two items that typically would not come to council but, the 4Leaf contract, it's budget together with budgets for former contracts, this fiscal year add up to a sum that would exceed the city manager's signature authority so we're bringing that to council, as for the reimbursement agreement this is a cost recovery item that would normally not come to council, it's not legally required but we felt that it was for the sake of transparency best to bring it to council. And with that, background if this is within the written staff report that was published online for the public to review, we're wondering if you would like the full presentation or just to look at the recommendation slide before you go to questions for staff or to the public if there's members interested in commenting.

I'll leave it up to my colleagues, whichever version they would like to hear. Is it just the recommendations? I'm seeing a nod, yes, let's go to the recommendations.

Are you able to see the slide?

Yes.

Perfect. So staff is suggesting that council discussed staff report take public comment and take action based on considerations. Option one would be to approve the proposed resolution by reference, and this adopts the reimbursement agreement and authorizes the 4Leaf contract, and option two, decide not to pursue exempt financial compensation for the anticipated project review. Available for questions and to answer any questions you have following public comment, thank you.

The question is, I don't really know if this is a thing or not, but, is there conflict of interest? In doing this?

You mean that the developer is reimbursing the cost, does that create a conflict of interest?

Yes.

It does not. It's similar to our normal fee schedule where people pay a fee for the speed to provide, any type of services. It's just, in this case there so many costs, there is not one specific fee for it. So a reimbursement agreement is more appropriate, and the agreement does provide, just because they're providing these costs it has no impact on the city's authority to review the actual project, or guarantee that the city will approve the project.

Thank you.

Additional questions before we go out? Seeing none, out to the public comment period

Thank you, Mayor. This is public comment on the contract approval for 4Leaf Barlow developed agreement and application if you like to make a public comment, I go to in chambers first, seeing none, I will go out to zoom, any, can you please stop sharing so I can see the zoom panel, please? Kyle, can you unmute yourself, please? Thank you, Kyle, can you see?

I'm not even sure this is public comment. I need to state that audio entirely cut out when Sandy began speaking and I haven't heard a single thing since that moment.

Okay, thank you, Kyle. We're looking into it with I.T. Are we getting audio? Talking from here, or talking from zoom? Can you make a couple of statements to see if we can hear you?

Certainly. This is a project that's reviewing the 4Leaf contract to review the Barlow planning entitlement process, and to review a reimbursement agreement that requires the Barlow to compensate the city for any costs it incurs as a result of processing the project.

Are you hearing anything? Oh, I'm going to mute you for a second, were you able to hear any of that?

I heard that speaker. But, I hear no audio coming from council since Sandy began giving her comments.

Can you hear us now? Hello?

Kyle, can you hear Vice Mayor McLewis?

Just a silent room.

Would you like me to comment on the question that council submitted earlier?

I'm less concerned about this, more than I'm concerned about the recording of a public meeting.

Can you hear me okay? Okay, I'm going to have one of the councilmembers to see if those microphones.

Can you hear me now?

I can hear you. I've heard all your questions and I'm participating via zoom.

And Kyle, can you hear?

I can hear now, yes.

Okay, great. So, should we go back? To have Councilmember Maurer, could you restate your question again so that the public can hear?

My question was about whether or not this presents a conflict of interest.

And I'll say again, it does not. This is similar to how we charge fees for any applicant to cover city's cost, the reason that here is a complicated project, so there's not one specific fee, so there's a reimbursement agreement. And the reimbursement agreement has clear language in that them signing the agreement doesn't guarantee that the city will approve the project, and that the city retains all of its discretion to review and approve the project.

Thank you. So, how do we do the timing? Should we restart the clock for Kyle to make his comments?

Yes, we'll that go back to open public comment. Kyle, do you want to make a public comment? Seeing none, I will come back into chambers, if there's anyone in chambers that would like to make a public comment. Seeing none, I will go one last time to zoom, if there's anyone on zoom that would like to make a public comment, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none, public comment is closed.

Thank you, Mary. Further discussions for my colleagues? And or emotion? Seeing none, I'll go ahead and make a motion to adopt a resolution improving a reimbursement agreement with Aldrich for the funds to be used for city staffing and contract consulting services to cover the city's cost for the product processing and authorized city manager to enter into not to exceed contract at \$20,520 with 4Leaf incorporated for planning consulting services.

Second.

Thank you, so moved by Mayor Zollman, seconded by councilmember Hinton. To approve the contract for 4Leaf for the reimbursement for the Barlow developed agreement.

Councilmember Carter?

Yes.

Councilmember Hinton?

Yes.

Councilmember Maurer?

Aye.

Vice Mayor McLewis?

Yes.

Mayor Zollman?

Yes.

Motion passes unanimously.

Approval of memorandum of understanding with the best of all police officers Association SPOA for a one year agreement January 1st 2025 to December 31st 2025 in approval of the budget amendment for \$168,300 for negotiated items responsible party assistant city manager, Mary.

Thank you, Mayor, this is for the negotiations we have worked with the negotiations for the Sebastopol Police Department union, we have come to an agreement for a one-year contract. It was a 5% pay raise with a one-time bonus, and some shift change schedules. This is ratifying the Council's decision, so we are asking for your approval of the one-year MOU for the Sebastopol police officers Association.

Thank you, Arthur questions from my colleagues? Looking to the right, looking to the left, seeing none, public comment?

Thank you, Kyle, can you unmute yourself, please?

Sure can.

Okay. Zach, do we have the timer? If not, Kyle, I will, there you go. Go ahead with your public comment, please.

Sounds great. It's been really interesting to watch council go from a mode of fiscal emergency, nothing on consent calendar that is anything, some significant dollar amount to a place where I think basically since the election we spent a significant amount of money. Here's another case where we're spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, this isn't just a one-time thing.

Reporter: Increasing the budget allocation to this department by over \$100,000. In fact, if you look at the dollar amount that you and spending since the election, it's very concerning considering the sales tax measure, which already got cut in half, which was directed towards things like infrastructure, and yet, all I'm seeing is salary increases. Management salary increases, staffing salary increases, and I'm really wondering when we're going to get to the part where we're spending the sales tax money that we haven't received yet and we're spending it on things like infrastructure, like was determined to be the case by the planning of that sales tax. So, again, just pointing out, here, you're making decisions about spending more money while we're still in a fiscal emergency, and you're spending that money on salaries.

Thank you, Kyle, for your public comment. Next I will come back into chambers, if there's anyone in chambers? Seeing none ever go back out to zoom, if there's anyone on zoom for public comment on this item, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none, public comment is closed.

Thank you, coming up for discussions and or a motion? Looking to my right, looking to my left, seeing none, I'll go ahead and move the approval of memorandum of understanding between the city of Sebastopol, Sebastopol police officers Association for the period of January 1st, 2025 through December 31st, 2025. I'll second.

Thank you, so moved by Mayor Zollman, seconded by councilmember McLewis to approve the memorandum of understanding with the Sebastopol police officers Association for a one year agreement and approving the budget amendment of 168,300. Council for Carter?

Yes.

Councilmember Hinton?

Aye.

Councilmember Maurer?

Aye.

Vice Mayor McLewis?

Yes.

Mayor Zollman?

Yes.

Motion passes unanimously.

Mary, I'm going to defer to you because you also help is on the agenda review committee. Which of these would you like to have us address, and in what order going back up to agenda item number nine or consent calendar. What is your preference?

We did nine.

I'm sorry.

We did eight and nine. So 10.

O, the pilot. 10. So, Mary, what is your preference?

Excuse me, if we can I would like to do the pilot program, and then we could do the consent calendars, and then I hate to ask chief if we could do your presentation after that, if that's okay, if we have time. So if we could do the pilot program for the sponsorship for the two interns.

Yes, thank you. So this is calling agenda item number 10, the consideration of additional funding for the pilot program for high school college internships at the amount of \$2500. This item is to continue the pilot program for high school internships and requested additional funding to continue the internships from January 2025 to June of 2025.

Responsible party, our city clerk, Mary.

So back in October, the city Council approved a pilot program of having two interns from the high school who are also enrolled at the college to come in and do an internship for about four months at that time. Both interns came in, one has been working for the police department, and the other one has been working for the finance department. Both have submitted letters as to why they see the value of this internship and how that will help them moving forward in their careers. The school has asked us if we would be willing to consider either two new interns or continuing. There are no interns that have asked to be, that have come forward for the second semester, so the two current interns have asked if the city Council would consider renewing the internships. So the Council could either recommend approval of the two interns for an additional four to five months through June of 2025, 10 approved one of the two internships or could deny both internships. That, staff is recommending, based upon the finance department that they would like to continue the internships.

Thank you. Questions from my colleagues? Turning to my light, turning to my left, not seeing any. Public comment, Mary.

This is public comment on the continuation of the pilot program through June of 2025 for an additional \$2500. Kyle, can you unmute yourself, please?

So, I appreciate the looking into doing internship programs, and I think there's a lot of value to them. Where I get concerned is when we start talking about things like compensation. When we start talking about interns performing the work of city employees, right? Because if we're offsetting work that could be done by a city employees by interns, essentially we're taking jobs away from potential city employees. So, I would hate to see this as some sort of a method of cost reduction by having folks that are not unionized, that are not receiving benefits, performing the labor of the city. A

stipend model might be more appropriate approach to this, and also, what I really want to see is some sort of summary of how the pilot went. How effective was it? What was the staff's conclusions about it? How much staff time was being utilized in the training and maintenance and oversight of these interns? What is the student's perspective on these things? How did the students feel about the way they were being treated by the city working in the city, was it, how, what was that value to them? So it's great to have it as an agenda item, but really a deeper analysis on how this is going to go, especially if we're looking at a more long-term plan or something like this.

Thank you, Kyle, for your public comments. Next I will come back into chambers. Seeing none, I will go back out to zoom. Seeing no hands raised, public comment is closed.

Thank you. Discussion from my colleagues? Councilmember Carter?

Yeah. I do understand that the internship is a benefit, somebody will be more engaged, the younger crew become more engaged, so this is a little bit more than just a way for us to alleviate, this is a public benefit. But the commentor did make a point that I would like to add, just in general. Whenever we adopt some of these things, it should come with some kind of, did we do okay? Is this good? I don't know how to create that mechanism without creating too much work, but maybe at the conclusion of the hiring, there can be an outgoing message or something like that, so that the process improves and every internship thereafter becomes more productive for both the school, the student and us. Just so there is some kind of methodology for getting better with any of these efforts.

And I'll just jump in, too, I definitely appreciate those comments. Right now, I think both of them wrote a very well constructed letter about their experience and how much value they derive. Coincidentally, to be able to visit all the different clubs and actually saw one of the interns and she expressed her gratitude and how much she actually appreciated working in the program. So, that's in the status. Mary, did you want to --

I wanted to add that we did also meet at the end of the internship with the two students as well as with two of the faculty members that oversee the program to see if there's anything we can improve upon, if there was any issues that had come up, was this beneficial to them? Which is why you have the letters and the staff report, and we could again, we'll do it on the next one, are there any issues, like an exit interview, basically.

Thank you, I just wasn't, I didn't do the homework.

I appreciate that but getting that out in the public.

It's great. Any additional discussion and/or motion?

I just want to say I'm glad that we are doing this, having a teenager, I think it's good for the giver generations to be involved with these and to have a lot of civics classes don't even exist anymore. I think it's a great exposure, for them. I'm in support of it.

I 100% agree. Vice Mayor, did you want to make a motion?

I'll make a motion, let me put my glasses on. Let me see, sorry. That the city Council approved continuation of

I'll second.

Thank you, so moved by Vice Mayor McLewis, seconded by councilmember Coleman to the continuation of the pilot program for the internships and budget additional funding of \$2500, customer Carter?

Yes.

Councilmember Hinton?

Aye.

Councilmember Maurer?

Yes.

Vice Mayor McLewis?

Yes.

Mayor Zollman?

Yes.

Motion passes unanimously. If we can just get the consent calendar items and then we can do the presentation.

That's, that's where I was going. Now we're going to take the matters of the consent calendar, and the matters on the consent calendar, I will read them in an abbreviated form, but also to educate the public, consent calendar item number one, approval of the city Council special meeting, closed session meeting minutes of December 16th. Number two, approval regular meeting minutes of December 17th, number three, approval of city council special meeting closed session meeting minutes of December 20th, 2024. Number four, receipt of 2024 minute orders reference orders and resolutions. Number five, approval of 2025 city Council meeting schedule. And, number six, approval of cities publicly available pay schedule. Adoption of resolution revising the cities publicly available pay schedule, effective January 1st, revised January 7th for Captain position.

That is what is on the consent calendar. Would any of my colleagues like to pull anything from the consent calendar? Going to the left, going to the right, not seeing anybody, let us go ahead out to public comment.

This is public comment on the consent calendar, if you like to make a public comment, I will come to public chambers first, seeing that I will go out to zoom if you'd like to make a public comment on the consent calendar, please raise your hand virtually. Seeing none, there is no public comment.

Great, bring it back up here for a motion.

I'll move to adopt the consent calendar.

Second.

Thank you, so moved by Councilmember Maurer, seconded by Mayor Zollman items one through six, Councilman Carter?

Yes.

Councilmember Hinton?

Aye.

Councilmember Maurer?

Yes.

Vice Mayor McLewis?

Yes.

Mayor Zollman?

Yes.

Motion passes unanimously, now we just have number seven, informational presentation.

Calling agenda item number seven, informational presentation, government specific equipment annual report out, the responsible department is our police. Chief?

Good evening, Mayor, minimize Bayer, I'm here to present the annual report regarding government specific equipment. On generate 21st 2022, a simile bill for 81 was signed into law by the governor. That particular bill deals with specifically defined military commit being used by law enforcement agencies. Typically, those types of equipment deal with chemical agents and launchers, armored rescue vehicles and less lethal weaponry. The passage of the bill required a city ordinance to be adopted by all cities within California. We added and past chapter 8.70, which was added to our municipal code on April 5th, 2022. The bill requires, as does our city ordinance, an annual report on how the equipment was used, and also provide for an opportunity for public feedback, gathering complaints and the cost for the annual use of those equipment. The only equipment that we have in our possession that applies to this bill are some Remington 870

shotguns, which have been painted blue to distinguish this from our regular shotguns, and they fire a less lethal, what are referred to as bean bag rounds. The official parlance of those rounds are known as flexible baton rounds. They're used to de-escalate situations, particularly with people who are decompensating, maybe acting out violently and they have armed themselves. It allows us to keep our distance from them, to not exacerbate the situation and buy us some time, and it provides safety to the subject, to the bystanders, and to the officers should we have to fire the weapon. If necessary, they can be fired from 20 to 75 feet to disarm, temporarily stun or gain compliance from the resulting pain from the subject to safely take them into custody. The impact is basically equivalent to getting hit with a fastball from a little leaguer, which would not feel well. Since the last report we had two deployments during 2024. Both of those involved pointing the weapon at subjects who had armed themselves with edged weapons and who were going through some mental health issues. Both of those instances resulted in successful arrest without having to fire the weapon, and without having to use additional force. Which is exactly why we have this tool and exactly what they're designed to do. We've had these weapons many, many years prior to the passage of this bill. In the 15 years or so that we've had those weapons, we've never had to fire them. We've always been able to gain compliance simply by displaying them, and we hope that continues. Information regarding the annual report which was contained in the staff report as an attachment, the report is going to be posted to the website along with an email link for feedback concerns and complaints. We did not receive any complaints this past year regarding our possession of these weapons, or their usage. And we had an open house on December 20th, which was well attended, where we gave a presentation to the public on the weapon, showed them and talked to them about what we did. And overall, I think it was well received. With that, I'll open it to any comments or questions.

Comments or questions for my colleagues? Looking to my left, looking to the right, I do have some and to try to expedite things I did take them to our teeth and he did respond back. Things I wanted to note for the public is that my question was, does the noticing of the demonstration of our weapons need to be before or after the demonstration? And also, does it need to be specifically noted that there would be this type of demonstration? Because my comments were, last year, we had the annual report, and then we had the educational piece, which was you, Laura, myself, and one other person. And the response back from you was that you had processed this with other chiefs and that there wasn't any specific way that this needs to be put out into the public, and that you feel like you met the obligation by having the open house this year. Is that fair?

That's correct, and there's quite a few disabilities as well as Sheriff's departments for counties that, by virtue of them doing the report at a public meeting such as this, they believe that meets the requirements. So, in essence, we've gone above and beyond.

And the second thing as far as the demonstration part, you indicated the fact that there is no specific requirement to actually demonstrate the weapons, is that correct?

Correct.

When I was at the open house, which was great, I saw you demonstrate the Taser, but not the actual BB gun. So, thank you for pointing that out. And that you did mention, moving forward into the future, there will be an attempt to explicitly notice when you will be conducting the demonstration and explain what might be experienced.

That is accurate. We can do a better job of that.

Fine. And you touched on the internal audits part, that they will be uploaded on the website, and that there will be an email address should people like the people who had the encounter for the two incidents, if they did have questions, problems, they could email you.



Absolutely. And that should all occur by the end of next week.

Great. And then, noticed, and that you also have no intent to secure any more of this type of military type weapons.

No, we do not. And the ones we have are sufficient and I anticipate them lasting for many, many years.

Great, thank you, I have no other comments. Were there additional comments? Mary, do we need to do anything?

Public comment.

Public comment.

Thank you, Mayor, this is public comment on the informational presentation from the police department, if you would like to make a public comment, Kyle, can you unmute yourself, please? Can you see the timer?

No, but that's okay.

Ahead of your public comment, please.

I want a reason concerns about the use. While they're labeled as less lethal, bean bag rounds can cause serious injuries or fatalities. Research has shown that they can lead to internal bleeding, fractures, or even death when they had vulnerable areas like the head or chest. This particular troubling in mental health crises where individuals may not respond effectively to commands increasing the risk of harm. Using beanbag shotguns often escalate the situation rather than de-escalating it, someone in a crisis may perceive the weapon as a threat, leading to heightened fear or aggression. These tools are simply not designed for individuals experiencing psychosis, disassociation, or other mental health challenges where pain compliance may not even work. Additionally, the troubling reliance on force based tools in situations that require communication, patience, and mental health expertise. Officers often don't receive the comprehensive training needed to use beanbag shotguns safely and appropriately, and mistakes can have devastating consequences. When we rely on these weapons, we risk seriously legal liabilities, financial costs, and further erosion of public trust. There are better alternatives, expanding crisis intervention teams, that include trained mental health professionals and providing officers with de-escalation training are proven strategies that save lives and protect our community. We need to shift our focus away from force and toward compassion and understanding.

Thank you, Kyle, for your public comment. Seeing no further public comment, public comment is closed.

And chief, since I have you up there, I think you did say in the staff report that because of conversations that were heard last year, you did state in here that it is stated with the weapon that we have that it could lead to, I forget the wording, can you help me out? It's somewhere in here that you typed, that you did additional. That it could be lethal.

We absolutely emphasize, many of the points that the speaker addressed, and these can, if used improperly, if the targeting areas aren't stressed during the training, we make that perfectly clear. And we do everything we can to avoid a tragic incident, and we've been successful at that. And we do emphasize de-escalation training, both with during the training with this particular munition, and in any type of force training that we do. Is the first place we go is to try to de-escalate the situation.

Thank you, thank you Councilmember Maurer for help me figure that what I was looking for. Is there any other comments?

I, also attended the open house and appreciated it.

Appreciated you being there, both of you.

Great. Mary, is there anything else we need to do on this item?

No, thank you for the presentation.

My pleasure.

So, Mary, where does that leave us?

That leaves us with the second public comment period. This is for public comment for anyone that did not speak at the first public comment. If you would like to make a public comment, go to enchantress first, seeing none, I will go out to zoom, Kyle, can you unmute yourself, please.

Yes, I can.

Go ahead with your public comment, please.

So, I'm really hoping, I love seeing as much public dissipation as we had, but, what I really am hoping that we can do is get to a place, when it comes to specifically with a paid consultant, that when we have presentations and that we've got agenda items that are specifically, having dollar amounts and facts and things that are going to matter to the public in terms of these fiscal decision-making, that we can actually get to a place where we're not missing information. Right? I understand that we have folks that are spending 100 hours working on some sort of negotiation, but you've got to remember that at the end of the day, there is still a decision it's going to be made by a body and there's going to be the public that needs to have at least enough understanding of what is happening in that decision to know and trust that the leaders are making informed decisions. There's a multiple times in which I've seen consultant presentations that are lacking in specifics. Lacking in specifics that are really, really important to the actual decision being made, and while you may be privy to that information and you may have enough of the conversation to be able to make that decision, the public needs to know that information as well. And to withhold that information, or to omit that information and for whatever reason, even if it's just lack of detail, that's got to change. It really does. Because, I don't necessarily want to see two hours being spent on something just because there's not enough information in an agenda item, and that's exactly what we saw tonight. We've seen it before, and we need to stop seeing it, because that is what's driving the public away from participating in decision-making, because they don't feel like their voice gets heard when you are privy to the information, you are convinced that you're making the right decision, but you haven't done the job to convince the public that it's the right decision. And that's what needs to happen. Thanks.

Thank you, Kyle, for your public comment. Next I will go to Robert, Robert, can you unmute yourself, please? I can hear you, can you see the timer?

I can.

Go ahead, please.

I just wanted to comment, there was conversation about the compassion and de-escalation of the police force. I was just very recently involved in an accident in the city limits, and, the other driver became aggressive and belligerent. I tried to call 911 to see if I could get somebody to come and help control it, they said they couldn't do it, because we need to call the nonemergency number. Fortunately, a friend of mine was with me and she called the nonemergency number, which caused the individual involved to become very aggressive toward her. Fortunately, when officers arrived, just in the nick of time, so to speak, he quickly, this is late at night, he quickly assessed the problem, and separated him from my friend, and de-escalated the situation very, very calmly. It was almost like it hadn't happened. He moved so well and did such a good job of de-escalating. And separating us. So, I really appreciate the police force, I first-hand can attest to their skills in de-escalating situations. Thank you.

Thank you, Robert, for your public comment. Next I will go to said one. Can you unmute yourself, please?

Hello?

Hi, there, can you see the timer?

I don't see it, but I don't think I'm going to be very long.

Okay, go ahead with your public comment, please.

Sure, this is Woody Hastings, here. This is a general comment. It was not on the agenda tonight, just about public participation and adequate, adequate public participation protocols. And I really am just chiming in to back up what we heard from Kyle about really inadequate, in general, seeing inadequate, in my view, improper protocols and snap decisions like occurred tonight, where, on a very important issue were a lot of facts and a lot of community input that, in my view was very meaningful and very not cookie-cutter was genuinely, community input that the Council should have taken into consideration, and, I had to redo my comments but I was expecting to get at least two minutes, at least two minutes on this very complex issue, and I was not able to get even two minutes. I had to, on-the-fly, cut it down, so it ended up being garbled and the first thing I meant to say was, one minute is not enough on an item like what we had tonight. So, that's my comment. Thanks very much, I fully respect the hard work everyone is doing. I understand what it's like to be an elected official because I've been a staff person for elected officials, but just really, try to improve your public participation. You've done some really good stuff, Sebastopol has been really good especially through COVID, really appreciate all the good ability to comment online, but, there is some improvement it's needed. Thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Mary, can you unmute yourself, please?

I just wanted to,

I was going to ask if you could see the timer.

I can, thanks. I just wanted to thank Vice Mayor McLewis and Councilmember Maurer for all their work. I know they did an amazing job, and an incredible amount of work, and thank you very much. And I also want to thank our new mayor for being so concerned with transparency, and adding info about the cost to the city. That's all new, and thank you.

Thank you for your public comment. Next I will come back into chambers. Seeing none, I will go back out to zoom one last time for public comment. Seeing none, public comment is closed on the second period.

Thank you. We have not reached 10:30 so I think we should move through the rest of the items, calling agenda item number 15, the city manager and city clerk reports.

First, see if Mary has anything she wants to offer. Okay. So, next meeting, you'll have the reports from each of the departments as part of your packet. The one thing tonight I wanted to call out in particular is we are making progress on selection of a police chief. I'm not yet ready to say that an announcement is imminent because it's not, but we are making good progress. We want to be very thorough, do a lot of due diligence on this, and with Mary's help and our HR team, that's what we're doing. I'm hoping to have more news for you in the coming weeks. On that. And with that, I'd say we had a slow holiday season, except it wasn't. At least for quite a few of us. And we've had some turnover at City Hall and the public works I wanted to make you aware of. An email went out earlier today, we have somebody new at art front counter, handling support for the community development department but also as a face to the public, and then we have some turnover in public works as well. We're putting some patches together, there, to help keep things moving along. Until we're able to fill those vacancies. That's all I've got, happy to answer any questions if you'd like.

I did forget an announcement, sorry. Review tomorrow morning but the January 2024 city Council meeting is at 5:00 for interviews for design review, planning commission, and public arts committee.

Okay, Mary. Living on to agenda item number 16, city council reports. Committee, subcommittee meeting reports. Turning to my colleagues and vice Mayor.

I've just attended innumerable amounts of fire ad hoc meetings, I can't even. I don't want to take everyone's time, but we've been meeting weekly for multiple hours, as an ad hoc with the city and with gold ridge as well. Those meetings usually end up being about three hours. Or more. We've both been doing that, and then, the wedge committee will begin meeting again later this month, so that will be happening. But I wanted to also point out, Sebastopol world friends has, I'm looking for it right here, they have their friendship dinner on January 25th, so they were hoping and Temple. That's a Saturday, where they have their sister city friendship dinner, and they celebrate the Ukraine and Japan. So, hoping that people come out, and it's also the 40th anniversary this year for Sebastopol world friends. So, just letting everyone know that's happening.

Thank you. Other reports? Councilmember Maurer?

The first I met with several people at the Luther Burbank farm to discuss ensuring farm safety and the proposed Apple Blossom Trail. And next was a Russian River watershed Association meeting, and we heard a very impactful presentation by a research meteorologist named Dan Kahan from San Diego University. And so I wanted to report out what his findings are. He said we can expect warmer, wetter, and drier weather, that the planet is warming substantially since 1980, and we are in unfamiliar territory regarding our historical experience. That the atmospheric composition has changed, which affects the energy balance, so the terrestrial radiation, which cools the planet, but the greenhouse gas emissions are trapping it, he said even if we reduced, we would continue to warm. Because the greenhouse gas emissions continue to live on. And there are nine less cold days a year, that's half as many cold days since 1950, and they're predicting increasing hot spells, up to 50% loss of the snowpack by 2090, and landscapes will be drier earlier in the summer and drier later in the fall, and rising sea levels as oceans expand, large ice and snow melting. He sees a cascade of tragedy as climate continues to warm, including extinction of species, and it's an extraordinary, rapid change and the ecosystem can't adapt that fast. We must invent ways to sequester carbon at large scale, and he called it a wicked problem. And you probably know this, but it was impactful to me to hear this from this scientist, that this whole thing. I'm just passing that along.

Councilmember Hinton?

So I just wanted to follow up with Jill, that we've been doing fire ad hoc's, two this week, one next week, one the following week, previous weeks. Number two, I wanted to, the Rialto asked me to point out it got caught in a lot of our spam that they're holding a big open house on the 14th at 7:00 p.m., they wanted to make sure the council was invited and that we all knew it. So I wanted to make sure that was on everybody's calendar. I will not be able to make a friendship dinner.

What's the date?

The Rialto theater 7:00 p.m. on the 14th. It's the next Tuesday, a week away. Catered, I think it's their 50th. It's a big deal. And then, last thing, I want to make a request about resourcing the agenda. I know that I agreed with the decision to move forward. The big one. But I would like to see us not cherry pick the agenda items and jump all over the board. We are ending, we had plenty of time tonight, but I would like to see, if we have to move something forward to then go back to the original format, because I do worry that there might be somebody else anticipating when an item might come up, and it felt really confusing for me, and I can imagine it's confusing for the public. So, request for the future to just follow. A pattern or something. Anyway, thank you.

Thank you, and duly noted. And yes, in addition to the regular meetings that I attend, through the Child care planning Council, I mentioned this before about the disturbing amount of unhoused and foster care students. And have worked with other marginalized electeds and allies to put together a request of our higher up electeds, especially given the political climate that we're facing now, to make sure that they can firm up the federal funding streams that we now have for these children, and to hopefully look for more different avenues to get these children services. And that might take the form of a press release, so we'll see how that all shakes out. I had a very interesting conversation with our superintendent director to talk about these exact same issues, and just a little bit on the library, I know people are sick about hearing it, but if people look at the budgets for the library, especially the renewal of the most recent, they do have an abundance of resources, so I continue to work with those who are interested to talk about a financial request. Because just putting out there publicly, the libraries, thinking about using tentatively a substantial amount of money, tax measure, tax money to go to a certain city, and they do not seem at this point to have a consistent policy about how other municipalities could seek the same. So we're continuing to work on that, so those are my comments. And if that's it, I think we could just adjourn and I don't think I need a motion so we are hereby. Oh, sorry, Phil. I keep calling on him before him and he was like, I didn't want to do that again. Phil, are you all right?

I'm all right.

I know, the last couple times I called on you and you were like, what are you calling on me for, I haven't had my meetings. So, yes, I look forward to reporting. Soon.

We look forward to hearing about it. All right, then I think we are adjourned, thank you, thank you, everyone, thank staff. [Event Concluded]