



Sonoma Coast Municipal Advisory Council July 21st, 2022 MAC Meeting, 5:30 pm – 7:30pm

Members

Bodega/Valley Ford
Beth Bruzzone
Alternate: Che Casul

Timber Cove
Scott Farmer
Alternate: Annie
Cresswell

Sea Ranch/Annapolis
Marti Campbell,
Chair
Paul Plakos

Kashi Band/Pomo
Indians Abreanna Gomes

Fort Ross
Wanda Swenson
Alternate: Caroline
Madden

Jenner
Jill
Lippitt
Alternate: Elizabeth
Gallagher

Bodega Bay
Brian Leubitz
Ginny Nichols
Alternate: Carl Osier

Clerk: Cindy Culcasi
Staff: Elise Weiland
Leo Chyi

In accordance with AB 361, Governor Newsom's March 4, 2020 State of Emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Resolution 21-0399, the Coast MAC meeting will be held virtually. The meeting will be on Zoom and on Facebook live, links below. After the event, videos are available both on Facebook and on YouTube under **Sonoma County 5th District**. Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/supervisorlyndahopkins>

Zoom:

<https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/96886698062?pwd=TTRLVxUeXR2TTZsN3Z6ZlpTOXE4UT09>

Passcode: 678087

Or One tap mobile :

US: +16694449171,,96886698062# or +16699009128,,96886698062#

Meeting Agenda

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

A. Approval of Agenda

B. Statement(s) of conflict of interest: if any, from Council members

C. Correspondence

D. Consent Calendar

Approval of May Minutes

E. Public Comment

Comment from the public regarding matters of general interest not on the agenda, but related to the Sonoma Coast MAC business. Pursuant to the Brown Act, the Sonoma Coast MAC cannot consider issues or take action on any requests during this comment period. Due to time constraints, comments will be limited at the discretion of the Chair.

F. Regular Calendar Items

a. MAC election and engagement

- i. Approval of Amendment to term limit bylaws change. The current bylaws state: "Section 3. Terms. A membership term is a two-year period. The River MAC members may be reappointed. Members may serve a maximum of two terms (four years in total)." Because many of our smaller communities find it difficult to meet this requirement, Supervisor Hopkins and your MAC Chairs suggest that this be updated to "Section 3. Terms. A membership term is a two-year period. The River MAC members may be reappointed."
- ii. Fall election postcard and information

- b. Discussion of latest Local Coastal Plan (LCP) process and community feedback items. Community feedback items are attached.

- G. Council Member and Staff Reports**
- H. Call for Agenda Items**
- I. Adjournment**

**Sonoma Coast Municipal Advisory Council
Marti Campbell, Chair
May 19, 2022, 5:30 – 7:30
Online Zoom/Facebook Meeting**

Meeting Called to Order – 5:33 pm

Cindy Culcasi

Pledge of Allegiance

All

Roll Call – Present

Marti Campbell – Chair

Brian Leubitz

Scott Farmer

Ginny Nichols

Wanda Swenson

Jill Lippitt

Beth Bruzzone (arrived late)

Caroline Madden (alternate)

Liz Gallagher (alternate)

Absent

Abreanna Gomes

Paul Plakos

Che Casul (alternate)

Carl Osier (alternate)

Annie Cresswell (alternate)

Approval of Agenda

Scott Farmer moved to approve the agenda and Brian Leubitz seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

Statements of Conflict of Interest: if any, from Council members

Clerk Cindy Culcasi asked if there were any conflicts of interest. There were none.

Correspondence

Cindy Culcasi asked if there was any correspondence. There was none

Consent Calendar

Approval of March Minutes

Chair Campbell asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made by Scott Farmer and seconded by Wanda Swenson. The motion carried 6-0.

Public Comment

- Cea Higgins – Ms. Higgins had a process comment regarding the MAC. Before the MAC there was the Bodega Bay Collaborative which was formed by group of non-profit representatives who felt the coast was not getting funding and adequate attention from the County and they wanted to get more representation for the coast. After looking at some ideas, with the help of Supervisor Hopkins, the Coastal MAC was formed. When larger issues/projects were brought before the MAC, the thought was that subcommittees would be formed in addition to advisory committees made of local citizen/local experts on the topics. She noted when an issue is brought before the MAC, a well-rounded view of issues is not being presented, but only the views of proponents, developers, the County, etc. so people are not being totally informed. More independent experts should be invited to discuss issues that go back to the original intention of the MAC.
- Richard Charter - Mr. Charter stated we are all here for the same reason to ensure that wise choices are made for our world class coastline. Updating the Local Coastal Plan (LCP) is an important process that happens infrequently and is currently in focus. He asked that the MAC facilitate public participation in the LCP process as was promised at inception. He added that the MAC should listen carefully to local voices and not just Permit Sonoma.
- Carol Sklenicka - She echoed what Cea Higgins and Richard Charter just stated. Ms. Sklenicka watched the LCP meetings with interest, but felt they were preplanned. She would like to see a robust forum for discussion of the important issues for the LCP, and also other discussion regarding development projects and issues like the recent bike event discussion.

Regular Calendar Items

Supervisor Lynda Hopkins (Questions/Comments follow the Staff Report later in the meeting)

- COP 23 (United Nations Climate Change Conference) – Supervisor Hopkins attended the conference in Scotland, along with Leo Chyi. She said it was an amazing conference that included people from all over the world, including local, state, and federal governments focusing on climate change and advancing solutions. There was very little happening at the national/international level. She noted that the US made a splashy entrance, had a fancy pavilion, but talked out of both sides of their mouth. It was disappointing. At the local, grassroots, and state level, lots was happening. Supervisor Hopkins had great conversations with many local governments from around the world, including conversations with some California high level officials. There were conversations by grassroots organizations, e.g., women, indigenous, and youth, among others, making themselves heard. They were pushing for investments, and meaningful mitigation for many small island nations. There was conversation on protecting our eco-systems to allow them to recover on their own. Sonoma County set aside \$10 million for climate change mitigation and adaptation. There are grants available for climate mitigation and adaptation, so if anyone has any ideas, please contact Supervisor Hopkins's staff and they will connect you to the right department who will be applying for these funds. They are also looking at ways to protect the Coast, and there will be conversations with our State Legislators about marine protected areas.
 - Additional ideas along the Coast:
 - Fare free transit

- Enhanced transit services and coastal tourism-based shuttles. The lower Russian River shuttles are looking to be continued for 2022.
 - Is this the model to get people out of their cars to use mass transit?
 - Tourism Impact Funds are coming before the Board of Supervisors (BOS) next week. This includes \$25,000 to support the Bodega Bay Grange; \$30,000 to support the Redwood Trails Alliance.
 - The Leave No Trace Resolution is also coming before the BOS in mid-June. This resolution is a 3 county (Marin, Mendocino, and Sonoma) resolution and is coming before the BOS in June. This will support better destination stewardship in trying to reduce trash along the Coast.
 - The Bodega Bay Fisherman's Festival - Supervisor Hopkins's office worked very hard this year because the previous parking area was not available due to cultural resources of our native tribes. They wanted to protect the cultural resources and also provide a solution. Funds were provided by the County for a shuttle which sounds like it went very well. Going forward, the County is looking to use Regional Parks for parking and use the shuttles from there.
 - Supervisor Hopkins noted one of the number one issues she hears from residents, including coastal residents, is about permits and going through PRMD. There is an additional level of scrutiny along the Coast. PRMD is currently going through a performance management review. If anyone has any names of people that can be interviewed as part of this process, e.g., contractors, residents, anyone doing services, please forward their names to be interviewed as part of this process.
 - The Pavement Preservation Fund (2 year roads funding plan) is coming up next year. Supervisor Hopkins likes to start early since the list of roads to be fixed is long. She looks forward to working with the Coastal MAC to prioritize the list so they can be included in the Roads Preservation Plan. The focus is not only vehicular roads, but also bike and pedestrian access. Supervisor Hopkins hopes to hire an intern this summer to help focus on safe routes to school.
- Discussion Points:
- Are there bike lanes that need to be striped?
 - Are there crosswalks needed?
 - She would like to work with the Coast MAC to get kids and families either to schools or the parks more safely either walking or on bicycles. She hopes to brainstorm at a future meeting.
 - Supervisor Hopkins responded to Cea Higgins and Richard Charter. She would love to work with the Coastal MAC and the standing committees to address these issues and invite members of the community to more formally. She wants to make sure that the MAC is fulfilling its original function. At some point, we'll have hybrid meetings with the opportunity to join the meeting in person. Sometimes that empowers people when they attend in person and have an opportunity to be heard in person. Supervisor Hopkins would love to work with Chair Campbell. Chair Campbell will follow up separately also.

Broadband for the Coast

Chair Campbell introduced the topic and noted there are two presentations.

Calvin Sandeen, Broadband Analyst for the Sonoma County Economic Development Board

Upcoming Broadband Initiatives and Opportunities

The presentation starts at 21 minutes in Zoom -

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ogbl#search/jason/WhctKXXHvjnHMZvJfgMswJLVJTFcqPmGcCzSRc snQJZRChngNMcxLTWgHwBQmBRZRPJpZV?projector=1>

This is a special project called “Access Sonoma Broadband”. This project started as a grassroots initiative about a decade ago when the community came together to address the broadband issues. The project is housed under the Economic Development Board since this is a project that is needed to make our communities thrive and is a major component of economic development. One of the biggest issues is the digital divide (the gap between those who have access to modern communications technology and those who don’t).

Mr. Sandeen shared a map of broadband availability along the coast showing there are large areas with no access to broadband (24 minute mark on Zoom)

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ogbl#search/Jason.Wilson%40sonoma-county.org/CqMvqmWWijJKqsNGFZjJBGrHvjbsWlrlbkZzJjFhrLXVDzWLWDkzkgSGxBBcbPWbBbhPzhSRxjB?projector=1> . These are areas that will be included in grant availability and state planning. The broadband strategic plan describes what is going on in the County and where the gaps are. Mr. Sandeen said his group has talked to the district supervisor, county departments, residents, and businesses and others to determine the key recommendations for the County to consider (at 26 minutes on Zoom)

Mr. Sandeen discussed the Access Sonoma Broadband Action Plan which explores the creation of a publicly governed broadband entity (see their website <https://sonomaedb.org/current-initiatives/broadband>). This resulted in the creation of a Broadband Governance Structure Analysis. This was brought before the Board of Supervisors (BOS) in the summer of 2021 and, as a result, they were allocated \$3.315 million to support the project, which included project planning, implementation, and start up initiatives. The funds have been used to work with legal counsel and with various governance structures throughout the County. This included existing structures, new ones that they might create, and private structure models with options for private sector ownership. They plan to bring a list of options for the BOS that they can consider. Based upon what they hear from the BOS, they will create a business and financial plan that they can use to acquire funding for the business infrastructure. The State has created the “Statewide Middle Mile” (Senate Bill 156) to create a legal framework and establish a state-owned open access middle mile broadband network. This includes, for example, regions that are underserved by high-capacity fiber optic cables. The identified middle mile route includes Hwy 1, 101, 116 and other routes. Deployment will start in 2023 until the funds are exhausted. There is a Loan Loss Reserve Account that helps local government’s ability to secure financing for some projects, in addition to other funds available for specific types of projects. Additionally, there are Federal funding opportunities available.

Community speed tests are available for the community (both State and Access Broadband) to run to ensure accuracy. The data is shared and included in the project planning.

Questions/Comments

- Carol Sklenicka - Ms. Sklenicka asked if Access Sonoma Broadband can look at the total cost of broadband on the coast. The cost of cell phones and the need to also have a land line are expensive, as is the cost of broadband. Chair Campbell asked Calvin Sandeen if they make an analysis of the reliability of the broadband, and also the cost. **Calvin Sandeen** responded that affordability and reliability are both components of what goes into the study. The State, based on the speed tests, validate the information. The feedback is based on the community. If one person shares this feedback, it may not be enough to change any of the issues so the County pushes communities taking the speed tests so there is sufficient data to validate.
- **Scott Farmer (MAC)** - Rep Farmer asked if we rely on the County to represent us on the last mile. **Calvin Sandeen** – The last mile may be represented by the private sector, a local water district, special services district etc. It is open access to anyone that is willing to make that additional investment for the last mile.
- **Scott Farmer (MAC)** - Rep Farmer asked about the middle mile and the last mile and how they connect in the Timber Cove area since Frontier (the local broadband provider) most likely wouldn't connect (handshake of the fiber optics) the two. Would the County take care of this issue? **Calvin Sandeen** responded that the entity leading the State on the middle mile is called Golden State Net. There is oversight by California Department of Technology and the CPUC (California Public Utilities Commission). His group is working with Golden State Net to understand the technical features of the middle mile. There will be a place every 2500 feet where another provider can come in and connect their infrastructure. Also included are specific designs on what the handhold (connection between two different providers) will look like and where they will be. **Rep Farmer** pointed out that when Verizon installed the fiber in the Timber Cove area, they said they would install connectors, but did not install them initially although they agreed to, and then the connector was never installed. He asked if the County could speak for the community and identify and keep locations that the community would share with the County.
- **Ginny Nichols (MAC)** - Rep Nichols asked if there was anyone reviewing the architecture that has been proposed to be able to connect and how many locations can be served? **Calvin Sandeen** noted there was a legislative process through the CPUC where parties provided feedback. The State asked broadband consortia, local agencies, private sectors, etc. for feedback on the architecture and the technical features. The architecture was developed with both private and public input. There are online reports that go into more detail that can be shared with the MAC along with feedback from industry experts.
- **Chair Campbell** had two questions
 - It appears the time for comment is already over. Is that true?
 - Is it too late for providing comment from the communities since some may not have provided input during the past discussions?
 - **Calvin Sandeen** responded it is not too late for comments. This is still a dynamic plan, so there may still be time to discuss a location for a connector. The design of the equipment even if already put in the ground is still dynamic. There may be disconnects between what is needed and what is installed, but once, e.g., this project is pushed on Hwy 1, there will be more time to ensure that the project is designed appropriately.

- Part of the region that Chair Campbell represents is Annapolis. Annapolis doesn't have a downtown since it is a dispersed community. Annapolis Road has ATT fiber installed and they have bad connectivity along the road. She asked if they could turn to the County infrastructure for assistance to improve this issue. **Calvin Sandeen** noted that this issue is part of the analysis that his group is going through. They will work with the BOS to create a business plan and pilot projects. It is up to the BOS how this rolls out, but they are looking to serve the entire community. Mr. Sandeen's group will be working with the communities and other groups to make sure the process is as effective as possible.
- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** - Ms. Lippitt wanted to confirm her understanding of the project; bring fiber optics cable up/down the major roads; after complete, you hope to attract private companies like, for example, Verizon to bring to cable to households in the area and take it the rest of the way. She represents Jenner, which has satellite and point to point Motech, both of which are very unreliable and expensive. She also represents Muniz Ranch which is a 5-mile road with houses not very close to each other along the way. She noted it is hard to imagine a provider hooking to the cable on Hwy 1 and bringing it up the road to very few households. **Calvin Sandeen** responded that they are looking at issues right now where local communities or governments can get involved to make deployment viable and feasible for companies financially. This could include subsidizing the private sector on the last mile or creating a public owned last mile. The state will own the middle mile. They are looking for more direction from the BOS on this issue.
- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** – Is it possible to create like a sewer district to fund this over time, e.g. a payback that would show up on your property taxes? **Mr. Sandeen** said that is a viable model that could be used.
- **Scott Farmer (MAC)** thanked Calvin Sandeen for all his good work on the middle mile.
- **Leo Chyi (Staff)** asked for more information regarding the program. Is it fully funded? Will it be done by 2026? **Calvin Sandeen** said that Golden State Net isn't sure if the existing funding will build the entire State open access network, but they are creating priorities for communities, so they use the funding respectively for the communities with the largest gaps. The direction the Access Sonoma Broadband was given was to keep their plans dynamic and work with what the state is doing since their plans are dynamic also.
- **Cindy Lima (Public)** – Ms. Lima is a resident of Jenner and has experience with HughesNet and Motech and said they are not being reliable or fast. What can Ms. Lima do to help facilitate better broadband beside just doing a speed test? **Calvin Sandeen** suggested a couple things that can be done
 - Participate in the state legislative proceedings and be a voice for your community.
 - Find your own path on how to get involved by staying up to date on research.
 - Get together with your community and say we want to build this ourselves and how are we going to do it? Research the issues just as we are doing. Participate in the Regional Broadband Consortia (Sonoma, Marin, and Mendocino Counties) quarterly where our County Supervisors are the oversight committee.

Bryan Hughes – Board Member of the Russian River Alliance – Discussing Guerneville Downtown Free Mesh Networks Project

Mr. Hughes applied for TIF (Tourism Impact Fund) Grant in January and was awarded a \$30,000 grant.

Presentation starts on Zoom at 1 hour and 7 minutes

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ogbl#search/jason/CqMvqmWWijJKqsNGFZjBGrHvjbSWIrlbkZzJjFhrLXVDzWLWDkzkgSGxBBcbPWbBbhPzhSRxjB?projector=1>

The \$30,000 grant was to bring free Wi-Fi to all of downtown Guerneville. The goals included disaster preparedness, equitable access to the internet, and economic development. When looking to implement the project, Mr. Hughes found that the state of Vermont has been doing this for a decade. He reached out to the Vermont Council of Development. He was referred to Rob Fish, the Deputy Director for the state of Vermont for their infrastructure. After working with Rob Fish, Bryan Hughes was able to develop a model to deploy public WiFi. A network was developed that had 10 access points throughout the town and included Johnson's Beach, much of the downtown and other areas. He worked with business owners to install the access points around town. The network is a mesh network, The various access points talk to each other, and the network covers a service area in Guerneville. This type of network requires very little IT support. Two of the backups are Starlink backhauls with solar and battery backup which can function when the electricity and Comcast internet is down. In the case of a Comcast outage, the network will operate through Starlink. The backup is part of disaster preparedness. This network will probably be available by the end of June. The grant was awarded in March/April, and the network will be live by June. This is modeled exactly how Vermont has been doing this process for the past 10 years. Operation will cost about \$8,000 per year.

Elise Weiland (Staff) suggested that Bryan Hughes apply to ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) to obtain a grant. If the grant is approved (May 24), the funds will cover Bodega Bay, Cazadero, Bodega, Forestville, Jenner or Monti Rio. The grant will pay \$360,000, about \$8,000 per person. The project demonstrated that public Wi-Fi can be deployed to a rural community for about \$13 per person.

Chair Campbell noted this is very exciting.

Questions/Comments

- **Scott Farmer (MAC)** - Rep Farmer asked about the 2 critical components to deploy the Wi-Fi; strong backhaul and line of sight. Does that mean line of sight in the mesh? **Bryan Hughes** noted that line of sight can be obscured by trees, but not by mountains. Up to 350 feet, there is about 90% connectivity, but that drops fast with more distance between sites.
- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** asked if Jenner was cut due to the line-of-sight issues. **Bryan Hughes** responded that this was because when the site survey was done, they were unable to determine if there was fiber that is accessible in Jenner. If there is a business in downtown

Jenner that has Comcast service and modem, that will work to create the free public WiFi in Jenner. Jenner is a challenge, but that doesn't mean it is impossible.

- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** - Rep Lippitt has heard that there is fiber on Hwy 1 in Jenner, but it has never been utilized for anything. **Bryan Hughes** responded that it is possible that fiber runs through Jenner, it just doesn't service Jenner. **Calvin Sandeen** added the fiber goes to the Post Office which is the terminating point. **Bryan Hughes** said it may be possible to deploy WiFi, but they haven't been approved yet for the grant. He also responded to a question regarding the security of the network. There will be rules for a network. A person won't be able to run Netflix or Hulu. You'll be able to make phone calls or use VoIP. He noted it's always good to run VPN (Virtual Private Network). Free VPN is available on apps and for laptops. The public WiFi should be able to support Zoom, but not stream Netflix, etc.
- **Cindy Lima (Public)** – Ms. Lima would like Jenner to be included. **Bryan Hughes** said the first step is getting the ARPA Grant. If they get the grant, it's in the budget, and the fiber is there, there is a good chance that Jenner will be included. At that point, with the model and the grant, he believes they can start to deploy a lot more areas with free public Wi-Fi.
- **Ginny Nichols (MAC)** asked if Serena del Mar and Carmet will be included in the future. Mr. Hughes noted the only reason this is happening is because of Supervisor Hopkins and Elise Weiland (Staff). This will be one step at a time.

Chair Campbell thanked Calvin Sandeen and Bryan Hughes for their presentations.

Judy Rosales (Executive Director) - The Sonoma Coast Collaborative on Community Based Vegetation/Wildfire Management Throughout the Region

The presentation starts at 1 hour and 37 minutes on Zoom

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ogbl#search/jason/WhctKKXXHvjnHMZvJfqMswJLVJTFcqPmGcCzSRcsnQJZRChngNMcxLTWgHwBQmBRZRPJpZV?projector=1>

Ms. Rosales is the Executive Director of the Sonoma Coast Ridge Forest Council which is the umbrella organization of the Sonoma Coast Collaborative. They provide the non-profit for the group, their collaborative partners, and individuals. They started out as a small group of people; Brook Edwards who was managing the Jenner Headlands at the time, Shanti Edwards from Sonoma Land Trust, and Craig Hayes from Muniz. They started talking in 2017 after the Creighton Ridge Fire. After a couple years, the group was formalized and called the Sonoma Coast Collaborative and they started talking to people up and down the Coast about fire prevention, fire safety, and forest health issues.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ogbl#search/jason/CqMvqmWWjjJKqsNGFZjJBGrHvjbsWlrlbkZzJiFhrLXVDzWLWDkzkgSGxBBcbPWbBbhPzhSRxB?projector=1>

The Collaborative is a partnership between private landowners, public land managers, tribal representatives, and fire agencies that work across boundaries increase the scale and pace of wildfire resiliency and forest restoration work. Ms. Rosales showed a map of the 91,000 acres and 3,000 people that the group covers along the Coast. This is one of the largest forest landscapes in the County of Sonoma. There is a long list of collaborative partners (listed in the presentation) that work together to do fire prevention planning. There is a plan to form a Steering Committee to help focus the work of the

Collaborative in a strategic, efficient and equitable way. They want to continue to facilitate meetings between the Collaborative and members. Last July a meeting was scheduled and 40 people showed up from up and down the Coast and they discussed how to address the various issues. They will continue to facilitate these meetings going forward. They are also working together on grants. One of the first grants they received was the County vegetation management grant. The grant was used to do a shaded fuel break along Fort Ross Road, which included 9.3 miles of roadway. They are partnering with areas such as Muniz Ranch and Cazadero to apply for other grant opportunities. As the Coast Bridge Forest Council, they have done a lot of education over the years. Last year Cal Fire Battalion Chief Marshall Turbeville did 4 of the same presentations regarding how to prepare for the fire season to some of the communities along the Coast.

One of their close partners is Timber Cove and the Sea View Community. One of their main access roads, Sea View Road, is in the Coastal zone. Most of the east side of the road isn't, but most of the west side is. No fuels management can be done in the Coastal zone without applying for a permit, which can take years. Ms. Rosales is talking to the fire chief about how to get a permit, Supervisor Hopkins has discussed the issue, the Local Coastal Plan is being reviewed so this effort can be streamlined. They are looking at how to streamline CEQA, streamline the Coastal Permits, and look for ways to continue this work. This process is a roadblock to doing this work.

Judy Rosales added that they are looking at Annapolis also. She noted that Chief Bonnie Plakos will help facilitate this process.

Questions/Comments

- **Scott Farmer (MAC)** - Rep Farmer thanked Judy Rosales for working very hard and long on this issue. People are aware and they are mobilizing.
- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** - Rep Lippitt also thanked Judy Rosales for her work.

Council Members and Staff Reports

Staff Report – Leo Chyi

- **Reef Campground** – There appeared to be some confusion regarding this issue. Elise Weiland (Staff) clarified that the Regional Parks won't be taking over the Reef Campground. The Reef Campground is part of Fort Ross State Park and they have been closed due to a large culvert failure. The State Parks are working on fixing the issue and the campground will open in the fall. The campground signed an agreement with the Fort Ross Conservancy to manage them.
- **Vacation Rental Update and Timeline** – There is a lot of discussion at the County regarding vacation rentals, but at the moment, the Coast is not directly affected by the inland policy. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) recently approved a 45-day moratorium on new permits for vacation rentals, but this does not impact the Coast. The Coastal Commission does require the County to amend the Coastal zoning ordinance to require a license for a vacation rental. This is recommended by the Planning Commission, and it is under review by the Coastal Commission currently. Nothing will happen until this is certified by the Coastal Commission, so permits are not required. The 24-hour vacation rental hotline will not be implemented until the operational changes (licensing) is required on the Coastal zone was well. PRMD would like the same

operational policies to apply to the Coastal zone as it does inland, but they will not take place until the Coastal zone ordinance is updated.

- The Planning Commission has been hearing about vacation rentals.
- To update the licensing program, no changes would occur until the licensing program is complete and approved for the Coastal zone was well. This is a ways away.
- The Planning Commission will be making recommendations to the full BOS on August 2.
- **Local Coastal Plan (LCP)** – The Planning Commission met a couple of times last year to discuss with additional meetings in early 2022. Anyone could go back into their calendar (see link: <https://permitsonoma.org/boardscommissionsandcommittees/planningagency>) and review what was discussed about the LCP in the various meetings. The Staff is now working to revise the draft from the feedback received. On May 27, the plan is to share the updated LCP with the public. The draft will use tracking changes so that people can see what was changed and updated. There will also be a matrix to show all the comments received and how they were addressed. On June 22, an agenda will be released for the June 29 meeting. The Planning Commission will send the final draft to the BOS for the August 30 meeting. If the BOS moves the plan forward, it will be reviewed by the Coastal Commission. If everything goes as planned, the Coastal Commission will hear the LCP on November 16 to November 18.

Questions/Comments for Leo Chyi

- **Brian Leubitz (MAC)** - Rep Leubitz asked for clarification regarding the approval of the vacation rental policy. Will we need additional legislation to include the Coast? **Leo Chyi** believes that BOS will need to do additional legislation, but he is not sure. He believes that from the land use perspective, they have been clear that the Coast is not included. From the licensing perspective, people thought that could be rolled out right away since this was already an idea that was discussed, but there would need to be a Coastal Zone Ordinance. **Vice Chair Leubitz** noted that some on the MAC thought the Coast would be included in inland measures and the licensing.
- **Beth Bruzzone (MAC)** wanted to clarify the vacation rental program, any rules and any actions for the Coast. This will potentially be part of the LCP along the Coast. She also said she appreciated what Mr. Chyi said about how the LCP has been processed. She noted it has been a fascinating set of meetings and the Planning Commission has prepared a packet with all comments to be shared with the public. Rep Bruzzone reviewed the dates of the approval process just as Leo Chyi did in his update and the ability of the public to continue to submit comments. She asked that Mr. Chyi clarify this issue. **Supervisor Hopkins** responded that she has not had time to review the document yet, but Mr. Chyi had been talking to Staff about it. **Leo Chyi** noted that Beth Bruzzone is correct, and the dates are not Brown Act requirements, but the Planning Commission wants the public to have enough time to review everything. He isn't sure how the LCP and the Coastal Ordinance both move forward. The Plan is a high-level document, and the Ordinance is the implementation at the right zoning and parcel level of the Plan. He isn't sure how the LCP would interface with the vacation rental work that is currently happening. He would think it would happen through the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, but they would know that technicality more than he would. **Beth Bruzzone** said the Leo Chyi has done an excellent job explaining the issues on this huge document.

Questions/Comments for Supervisor Hopkins

- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** was happy to hear in Supervisor Hopkins's Report that road repair was moving forward. Ms. Lippitt included the road repair in her recent newsletter to the community and many responded and asked what they should do. She is looking for what they should do to get organized and present the Supervisor with the information that is needed to prepare for road repairs. **Chair Campbell** responded that she created a Road Conditions AdHoc Committee but failed to call a meeting. She will call a meeting within the next couple of weeks and will have a Roads Repair Report at the next MAC Meeting. **Supervisor Hopkins** stated that the Roads Survey isn't need until next year. She started early so we can work with the Department of Transportation and Public Works at the end of this year. The Supervisor wants to be ready when she sits down with Johannes Hoevertsz (Director) and Janice Thompson (Deputy Director) to say "this is what the community wants" for repaving, etc., and here's what we want for pedestrian and bike improvements as well.
- **Chair Campbell (MAC)** said she would convene the Roads Conditions AdHoc shortly. She wanted everyone to know that most of the July MAC Meeting will be concerned with the final review of the LCP. There may not be time for a Roads Report at the July meeting although the AdHoc will be working on the issues.
- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** said it sounded like the conversation between Cea Higgins and Supervisor Hopkins was helpful in that the AdHoc Committees might include community people. If so, there are many people active in the Jenner community on the issue of road repairs that Rep Lippitt would be happy to bring into the AdHoc. **Chair Campbell** would like the AdHoc to meet first with the MAC members and then determine the right approach, e.g., mechanism for entire community, mechanism for each community, etc.
- **Supervisor Hopkins** shared that she serves on the Fire Services AdHoc with Supervisor Rabbitt. Because of the quorum requirements, the size of the AdHoc is limited. One of the things that they do is hold meetings with the stakeholders. Once the AdHoc is formed, this is a way to include other members of the community to address the quorum limitation.
- **Cea Higgins (Public)** – The inland community that led to the regulating of vacation rentals began with a very thorough mapping survey, which was done by the Russian River MAC and Vesta Copestakes (Lower Russian River MAC) was a big part of that. We have not had a similar survey. There was a fire district survey, but it wasn't complete or accurate. We need to look at density of vacation rentals on the Coast. It has been handled in other ordinances or LCPs. Ms. Higgins believes we need to do the same by the Coastal MAC to understand vacation rental density. This is her recommendation. Also, if reasonable regulations are put into place inland, the Coast has to go through the LCP certification (which has already taken 7 years), and then need to go through updates of the ordinance (probably a couple of more years). We are in the wild west on the Coast with so many vacation rentals. Is there a way to amend the ordinances before finishing the LCP update, since the vacation rentals are a concern now? **Supervisor Hopkins** responded that she has been pushing how quickly we can move forward with the implementation of a vacation rental ordinance. The Supervisor has a map from PRMD (Permit Sonoma) of all the vacation rentals permitted in the area, but she is not allowed to share it. If the addresses can be removed and the map a higher level, she may be able to share it. The information comes from the Treasurer Controllers Office using people who pay TOT (transient

occupancy tax) from rental income. Supervisor Hopkins noted she would like to touch base with Cea Higgins and hear her specific suggestions.

- **Chair Campbell** spoke to vacation rentals. The reason she asked Mr. Chyi to give an update on vacation rentals is because she thought vacation rentals in the Coastal zone was a completely different project than inland. After she sat in on a Planning Commission Meeting, she no longer knew whether it should be part of the LCP and she didn't actually know what the County is doing.
- **Supervisor Hopkins** is hoping that at least a 24-hour complaint hotline can be set up and some kind of modified business license to set fees and perhaps quiet hours. The County Staff and Coastal Commission are going back and forth on if they can move forward with a modified plan. **Leo Chyi** said there seems to be some confusion if this should be included in the LCP or the Local Coastal Program. He believes it just needs to be somewhere in the program in current zoning as the way to address this issue. Number of people, quiet hours, signed contract, etc. could be in the operational standards included in licensing. **Supervisor Hopkins** noted that there is an old and limited noise ordinance in place and perhaps that could be used to report vacation rentals when needed and then it could be seen if the rental was paying TOT.
- **Brian Leubitz (MAC)** - With respect to the maps, the River MAC did a lot of research to create their maps. Mr. Leubitz also clarified that he wasn't commenting so much of the density issue, but that we wouldn't be included in the 5 to 10% moratorium. Rep Leubitz isn't opposed to forming a committee and creating a committee to help create mapping. He thinks the process make take more time since the density is substantially more than 10%. In his neighborhood, the density is probably 30 to 40%. He is happy to get the process started using any existing information from the Supervisor's Office. **Chair Campbell** wants to hear directly from the County that it's time to move forward. There was some discussion between **Rep Leubitz** and Chair Campbell about the timing to move forward. Rep Leubitz is happy to wait until the July Meeting or later.
- **Jill Lippitt (MAC)** did talk to Vesta Copestakes about density, and she said they were not successful in creating a map or a census. Rep Lippitt said she knows that Vesta Copestakes would be happy to talk to her. **Leo Chyi** is pushing for more and better data that can be easily found by people. He'll ask about creating a landing page for vacation rentals on the County website.

Chair Comments/Report – Chair Campbell

Chair Campbell wanted to thank the presenters who spoke earlier in the meeting. She also explained what will happen in the Coastal MAC July Meeting and added that she has had conversations with some of the MAC members to discuss how best to provide an additional forum to comment on the LCP. The meeting will fall between the Planning Commission and the BOS Meeting. She'd like the July Meeting to focus on the consideration of the revised LCP and invite both Permit Sonoma and District 5 representative Eric Koenigshofer. They will listen to comments and questions from the MAC and the public. This process will probably take most of the meeting time. This will be run as a Brown Act Meeting, and it will depend upon the number of people who attend, how much time will be given to the comments. The Chair asked that MAC members advise their constituents of the meeting to read the updated draft, attend the Planning Commission, and urge them to attend. Elise Weiland (Staff) and

Chair Campbell will adjust the meeting date if needed to ensure that Permit Sonoma, our District 5 Planning Commissioner, and Supervisor Hopkins can attend.

Questions/Comments

- **Jill Lippitt** is hoping that Gary Helfrich (Permit Sonoma) will be available to answer questions. Rep Lippitt has asked about putting other community members on the panel who has been working on the LCP for years. The MAC is for people to exchange ideas and hopes that Mr. Helfrich will not just respond with the County line. She is concerned there will be no back and forth of ideas and comments. **Chair Campbell** noted that Elise Weiland is on vacation and will contact Gary Helfrich when she returns. When she returns, Chair Campbell will work with Ms. Weiland on the meeting agenda.

Land Use Committee Report – Brian Leubitz

The Committee went over some of the recent bike ride events that took place. There will be another meeting on June 13. This will be an in-person meeting in Jenner (subject to change to Zoom if COVID is an issue), since there is a project that will be discussed located in Jenner. The project is about demolishing a house. If there are any other projects to add, please let Rep Leubitz know about them.

Water AdHoc Committee Report – Chair Campbell on behalf of Paul Plakos

The Committee has created a questionnaire to send to all the Water Districts in the area and he will send it when he returns from vacation.

Call for Agenda Items – Chair Campbell

- Vacation Rentals Next Steps
- Please contact Chair Campbell or Elise Weiland with any agenda items.

Adjournment

Chair Campbell made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Brian Leubitz seconded. The motion was approved 7-0 to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Culcasi
Clerk

Issues of Concern on the LCP from Coastal MAC Representatives.
Prepared for the July 21, 2022 Sonoma Coast MAC meeting

Scott Farmer, Timber Cove Representative:

Program C-OSRC-11-P1: I wish to underscore the importance that this program indeed establish a coastal permit exemption defining and allowing best practices to reduce woodland fire risk. Make it easy to do the right thing. Time is of the essence.

The passage about High Schools incorrectly states that coast high schoolers from Fort Ross south attend El Molino. El Molino no longer serves high schoolers.

Program C-PF-5-P2: I fully support this addition to the LCP.

Beth Bruzzone- Bodega/Valley Ford CMAC:

1. South Sonoma Coast constituents have many concerns with the LCP. Most important on the list is that as a whole, Supervisor Hopkins constituents feel frustrated and unheard, that their voices do not matter, that NGO's, public-private organizations, parks department and outside influences carry more weight, are more favored than the voting public. I want to lead with this concern because it is something I hear from a wide variety of folks in District 5 on a wide variety of issues. Please note that I am not intending to be inflammatory, I am reporting back to D5 what I am hearing from constituents. This first paragraph directly relates to the last paragraph.

2. Public Access is more important than personal property rights and impact on our residents and our environment. Trespassing is an issue on the ranches and many of our residential communities. I am hearing this from people that live in Valley Ford, Bodega, Bodega Harbour Homeowners Association, Bay Flat/Westside Area and Old Town mostly, but many in the greater Bodega Bay Area have voiced this concern. Public access is ruining our environment. Sensitive habitats are being trampled and eroded. For the first time in anyones memory graffiti and tagging is occurring. Wildlife is being stalked and disturbed by visitors and their off leash dogs without any concept of repercussions or safety. Not much hope for the new tri county campaign to take your trash with you, many see it as moneys that could have gone to something more realistic.....people either have manners and a conscious or they don't. Signage and marketing wont change the behavior of bad actors. In short, the LCP needs to effectively balance local needs with visitors needs, not give visitors the majority of the consideration. Many people have brought up to me that the Coastal Act specifically mentions that personal property rights and the environment shall not be infringed.

3. Lack of consideration of topography and natural limitations on roadways and coastal access regarding carrying capacity. Too many people on the roads at the same time is a really big complaint. In general, the option of a shuttle without a reservation system and visitor parking restrictions is not well received, that the needs and expectations of the visitors to the coast are not the same as visitors to the river. Many people have mentioned Muirwoods as a model of what

could be done, within the LCP, to deal with the overwhelming number of people that come to Bodega Bay and surrounding areas, on popular weekends.

4. The greater Bodega Bay Area is a cash cow for the county coffers via TOT dollars. This concern is in lock step with vacation rental concerns. Too many vacation rentals tax all of our limited resources and are ruining our sense of community. The LCP needs to address this issue and reign in rentals and create meaningful consequences for bad behavior (for all, including property owners and residents) Water use comes up in this part of the conversation as well, many have suggested water monitoring for visitors/renters. It's not uncommon to witness visitors washing their boats and vehicles or letting their children play in sprinklers or with the hose, unconcerned about water shortages.

5. Fire and natural disaster. Lack of capacity to deal with tourists when a disaster occurs, whether we are prevented from leaving due to road encumbrances, or emergency services are prevented from getting to us. Constituents brought up two very real concerns: Earthquake on a heavy use weekend and 900 full time residents need to feed and house 5000 to 10,000 visitors....or....a fast moving wildfire erupts and 5000 to 10,000 visitors are competing with the 900 residents, pets, ranchers and livestock, trying to evacuate or seek safe shelter.

Another equally important, common comment from constituents in my area is the lack of being able to read and digest the Planning Commission's recommendations draft of the LCP for the Board of Supervisors before it was voted on by the Planning Commissioners. PRMD publicly stated that there would be a 30 day complete draft review period prior to the vote. That did not happen. People understood that this massive document was an overwhelming undertaking, and it being late was not the main concern, but that adjustments should have been made to delay future meetings, so that the public had/has adequate time to do their due diligence on the new, revised document, and any further revisions the Board of Supervisors may make to the final draft prior to the Coastal Commission review.

Jill Lippett, Jenner MAC Representative:

Save the Sonoma Coast had done in-depth analysis of the LCP and presented innumerable comments, the bulk of which were adopted by the Planning Commission. These are the outstanding issues still of major concern.

—No stops on construction of onshore facilities you support offshore energy production (eg, wind turbines), Land Use Element, Policy 3LU 3b;

-Provisions for piping in water from inland to support coastal construction, Water Element, Policy

-Lack of mapped ESHA, no accounting for future ESHA due to climate change, OSRC Element;

-No policy re: optimal forest management for sustainable timber harvest, fire fuel reduction, carbon sequestration, OSRC Element;

- Separation of small communities from Bodega Bay sphere of influence (ask Rue or Maggie for specific language and citation);
- Pushing construction of more "Planned Communities", counting their private common land as "Open Space" and "Natural Resource Conservation", ppLU 18-20;
- Re-opening Cheney Gulch to gravel mining, Land Use, pp51-52;
- Allowing vineyards (and their attendant use of pesticides) in the Coastal Zone, Agriculture Element, p AR 10;
- Zoning for Commercial Tourism in Rural Residential areas of Bodega Harbor and "other planned developments", Land Use Element, pLU-24;
- Pushing development of all small communities in the Coastal Zone, from Annapolis to Valley Ford, which will presumably require piped water, Land Use Element, Policies 5f thru 5t;
- Plans to develop a recreational facility at Bridgehaven, where the convergence of Willow Creek and the Russian River comprises critical environmentally-sensitive salmonid migratory habitat, Land Use Element, Policy C-LU 5q;
- No regulation of VRBOs-just a suggestion that standards be developed, Land Use, pLU-39, Program C-LU-5-1p;
- Allowing "substantial modifications of the natural environment" for development of recreational facilities, Public Access, pPA-23;
- Increasing traffic on Hwy 1 through construction of "Scenic Vista Points"-OSRC, p5, and parking lots along the coast-Public Access, pPA-30, Goal C-PA-4;
- Inadequate Glossary to define key terms used in Policy;
- No Zoning document available to ascertain actual physical location of new zoning categories created in LCP draft.

-Richard Charter, The Ocean Foundation, Bodega Bay, 7.15.22 waterway@monitor.net

Local Control Over Onshore Industrial Facilities Needed in the Sonoma Coast LCP Update:

During the 1980's, Sonoma County's elected officials and their constituents were alarmed to learn that the small fishing harbor at Bodega Bay was the prime target for a large industrial facility to support offshore oil and gas drilling then planned near our Sonoma Coast beaches. For this reason, our LCP has since required a vote of the electorate should any such oil facility be proposed here.

Now, fast-forward to 2022, and Bodega Bay is once again on the map of potential industrial facilities that are likely to be built in the next decade or so to bring a subsea electrical power cable onshore into a large shoreline substation to connect with an overland high-voltage transmission line to the San Francisco Bay Area. The potential right-of-way for such a transmission line remained active after the Bodega Bay nuclear power plant was stopped, crossing the Estero Americano and routed toward Marin. Now, our present LCP Update proceeding offers us a one-time opportunity to similarly keep our local control over subsea cable landfalls, onshore industrial substations, and transmission lines from floating offshore wind arrays resulting from this year's pending federal offshore wind leases off of Humboldt County, and likely, also within a year off of Mendocino County. This is not a step to oppose offshore wind energy development that will occur on the North Coast, we may well want to support the wind arrays, but this current LCP Update represents the only way to maintain strong local control as some of the same big petroleum companies that previously wanted to build major facilities here in Bodega Bay to service their offshore oil drilling rigs are instead now operating as floating offshore wind companies, such as Shell, BP, and Equinor (formerly Statoil). The LCP Update is our best feasible opportunity to keep the future of Bodega Bay, and the rest of the Sonoma Coast, under local stewardship here at the County level.

Photo: Coastal electrical substation for offshore wind

Brian Leubitz, Bodega Bay Coast MAC Representative

cell:(415)495-9015

1) Traffic. Currently the LCP mentions parking and traffic between Jenner and Bodega Bay. Policy C-PA-4a calls for additional parking, but the calls elsewhere in the document for additional services from Bodega Bay to Jenner don't adequately consider the traffic, particularly during weekends. In Bodega Bay, there is no adequate plan to deal with the traffic from the left turn from Highway 1 onto Westside road. A turn lane would alleviate much of that traffic.

2) Water Services & Subdivisions: A revision in the public facilities (C-PF-2i) would encourage larger scale development by encouraging urban (aka Bodega Bay) water systems to grow to meet the demands of new developments. Given the limited water resources available to Bodega Bay, this seems impractical.

3) Noise: Under previous drafts/LCPs, there was a specific noise element. Given the increased development in Bodega Bay and weekend crowds, does the current draft do enough to protect the environment and wild animals from human created noise?

Ginny Nichols, Bodega Bay Coast MAC Representative

Figure C-LU-1 Land Use Map incorrectly shows Sereno del Mar(SDM) in Subarea 8 instead of in Subarea 9. Residents of SDM are in the Bodega Bay Fire Protection District (BBFPD) and vote in Bodega Bay.

Figure C-PF-1 Facilities Fire Map Series shows Sereno del Mar in BBFPD.

These two maps should be consistent and show SDM as a part of Bodega Bay. Therefore SDM should be in Subarea 9. The request is to update the map Figure C-LU-1 Land Use Map to make them consistent.