

Board Members present: Melinda Bell, Hilary Avalon, Ellen Leshner, Mike Goebel, Mary Kay Patton, Jackie Cato, Nichole Vogler; Members present: Jerri Carter, Jim Derich, Jim Mayo, Liz Newton, Michael Gradl, Fran King, Mike McGuire, Colleen Madden and Cherry Grisham. Board Members Mike Goebel and Nichole Vogler had to depart the meeting before it ended, but a quorum was present for all votes.

1. Approval of minutes from Board Meeting March 28, 2023. Hilary moved to approve. Mary Kay 2nd. Discussion. Minutes approved.
2. Membership Committee update. Hilary asked to skip to Agenda Item #5 to allow time to find the notes from the various committee meetings, and the Board meeting returned to items 2, 3 and 4 later. A committee of the DBNG met to discuss membership and the notes from the Membership Committee Meeting that took place on March 29 are as follows:
 - a. Present: Hilary, Melinda, Ellen, Jackie, Jan. Eric was originally a member of this ad hoc committee but he resigned today so this meeting took place without him.
 - b. Discussion about the purpose of DBNG, what constitutes membership, who should be a member, whether we need members vs interested parties, the purpose of voting, and the importance of prioritizing including every stakeholder and maintaining openness to people with an interest in Dillon Beach and DBNG. Many households/properties are de facto represented by the adult children of the current owners, as the owners are elderly, and we must be sensitive to that and not reject interested parties simply because they are not listed owners of properties in DB.
 - c. Point of order: there are many people on our older list of interested people who did not "reaffirm" their "membership" at the time the new Board was formed - should we still consider these people "members?" Solution: we can opt them in since they so affirmed by letter, email or other direct correspondence (to Melinda) that they were interested in joining the Dillon Beach group email list to get pertinent info on the area from Melinda, etc.
 - d. Melinda mentioned that she does get more responses from individuals when we utilize USPS/paper correspondence vs email, but it is expensive.
 - e. Jan mentioned that these people are definitely assuming they are members since they so requested 4 years ago via the process the DB working group was using at that time. Jan mentioned that DBERT members are also likely members of DBNG - or if they are not, they should be.
 - f. Everyone agreed the more members, the better.
 - g. Discussion about best ways to contact as many people as we could to confirm their membership.
 - h. Discussion about a new automatic membership (from old lists to present - without a formal affirmation) with an opt-out process. This would grandfather in past members automatically and give them the ability to remove themselves, if they do not want to be a member.

- i. Melinda stated that the septic issue is an important issue we could use to springboard the outreach to every member - to tell them they are automatically a member and discuss the septic issue with them to get their feedback.
 - j. Action: Melinda will send all current lists to Hilary who will compile them into one denotated list (so we know how they were added). Ellen will get a list of homeowners in DB so we can compare the two lists and determine who we have and who is missing from the group who should be in it.
 - k. Discussion about the process of determining representation in membership for parcels/business entities/individuals. DBNG is sensitive to the ability of individuals who own multiple parcels to sway the outcome of group votes by entering more than one vote "per person" if the group allows "one vote per parcel." Such as DB Resort or Lawson's Landing - those entities own many parcels each and could ostensibly corner the vote and overrun elections if we allowed one vote "per parcel."
 - l. Determination: there should be one member/representative and one designated alternate per entity, and entities that own more than one parcel should still only get one vote. For example, if John Doe owns 5 parcels, John would become the "member/representative" of those 5 parcels and have one vote. If he is unable to attend a meeting, John Doe can designate one "alternate" of his choosing. Either one or both of them can attend every open meeting, but the entity is only entitled to one vote. For the purposes of robust representation and voting rights, DBNG will accept proxy representation by a process to be determined, but will be something like the member/representative sending an email (to Melinda or Hilary or the meeting host or the person they wish to hold their proxy) stating they wish to designate an individual as their proxy, and in the email, the member/representative can state how they desire to vote, as well, if they want. These emails can be filed in a folder entitled "proxies" within the DBNG email account and kept for a period of time.
 - m. These recommendations will be brought to the Board at the next meeting.
3. Wastewater Feasibility Committee. Hilary and Jackie gave a report after the recent field trip to visit the Marshall area water treatment/sewer system. It was interesting to see their facilities, although the feasibility of installing a similar system in Dillon Beach is questionable because the layout of our town is very different from Marshall, and the location of available land to place the water treatment facility is much more distant in DB. The County was represented by Arti Kundu. The Questa engineer was in attendance, Norm Hantzsche, as well as representatives who manage the Marshall system. A member of the Marshall community was present and he is very happy with their sewer/wastewater system. It was determined at this Board meeting that DBNG should undertake its own survey of the stakeholders in DB to find out what they think about the wastewater issues in DB Village. A committee of the DBNG met to discuss wastewater/septic/sewer feasibility and the notes from the meeting that took place on April 7, 2023 are as follows:
 - a. Present were: Jan, Ellen, Mary Kay and Hilary and Mike joined later.

- b. Discussion about Cullen's thoughts and why he does not want to be on this committee - he feels like his concentration is not up to the task. He recommends we have an expert in the field as our advocate in the process with the County. He recommended Mike Freitas in Watsonville, CA. Jan is going to ask Cullen if he can give us Mike's phone number and Hilary is going to do a search for Mike Freitas and we will hopefully be able to contact him for a discussion.
- c. Initial discussion centered around whether or not the County has proven any kind of wastewater intervention is actually necessary in Dillon Beach. General consensus is that the County is responding to the State of California which wants to decommission and remove all old redwood box style septic systems - which Marin County is referring to as "cesspools" (we believe they are using the incorrect term for these redwood boxes; Cullen Wilder said a cesspool is open to the air and the redwood boxes are underground).
- d. Cullen believes additional testing is necessary to determine if we indeed have a problem with the septic systems in the Village. Mike stated that additional tests could yield results that may not be as favorable as the ones obtained by Questa. Also, if we decide to initiate additional tests of any sort, the DB community would have to fund them. First step would be to speak to Mike Freitas and see what his expert opinion is.
- e. Members of this committee believe most stakeholders in DB would be interested in solving any environmental issue stemming from septic system problems in DB. Based on feedback we have received, it seems the owners in DB find the Questa Report to be confusing - too long, not clear on what the problem is, not clear on what the solution is, not clear on the costs to the community members. We would like to create a straightforward document to send to everyone to clarify the situation, but we are also not clear on some things. For example, is there really a problem we have to solve here? The data in the Report indicates there are some instances of higher levels of nitrates but at no time does the nitrate level enter the level of danger. This would seem to indicate that there is no problem to solve.
- f. Cost is a consideration for basically every stakeholder. Our feeling is that everyone would be willing to participate in a community sewer solution if there was no cost to them; however, even if the initial project could be covered by the County with no cost to the homeowners, there is a projected annual fee of around \$1,000 per house going forward. Most homeowners do not spend that now on their septic systems.
- g. Arti is pushing for some kind of project. Arti has stated that there is grant money available and that she would like to apply for grants on behalf of Dillon Beach, but before she can apply, we have to have 75% acceptance/approval from the community. No one on the committee thinks it will be easy to get 75% of the stakeholders in DB to agree unless the project becomes much easier and cheaper to complete, and we would first have to have proof that a septic/wastewater project was actually necessary.
- h. This committee believes it is necessary to understand the feelings of the community members and answer all their questions. We believe creating an

internal survey for DBNG would be helpful. We plan to distill the info in the Questa Report, include that in our communication with the DBNG list and collect feedback. Hilary will put together an initial paper and email it to this committee for input. Hilary will reach out to Arti with the info we collect and question her about the County's objectives.

- i. It is the feeling of this committee that to continue to work with the County to discover the best path forward is not a problem. Hilary will speak to Arti and confirm that DB maintains our ability to decide against a project at any point.
 - j. The next gathering on the topic of Wastewater will be the "field trip" to Marshall that was organized by Arti. That is on April 19th at 10 am. Hilary and Jackie are planning to attend (and we will carpool - anyone else who wants to jump in, please let us know). Report following the field trip.
4. Short Term Rental (STR) Committee update. It was decided in the Board Meeting that DBNG should conduct a survey by email of our community members to discover how people in our community feel about STRs in DB. This survey email will be forthcoming to the membership. A committee of the DBNG met to discuss STRs in DB and the notes from the STR Committee meeting that took place on March 29, 2023 are as follows:
- a. Hilary, Ellen, Jackie and Mary Kay were present for this committee meeting.
 - b. Marin County is one of many counties in California that have placed a moratorium on short term rentals. We do not know why this is happening, but it appears to be connected to the ongoing discussion about "affordable housing" statewide. We have heard that at the beginning of covid, some places were still renting when it was not allowed and that the County received many complaints about that activity. We are concerned the County may have considered all complaints to be about the vacation rentals in general, instead of the timing of the renting (during Covid). Ordinarily, people are tolerant of STRs and renters are respectful.
 - c. Mary Kay said the STR moratoriums are happening in communities all across the state. Santa Cruz started a groundswell to add rules to STRs, instead of having a moratorium in place. She had heard that in communities that are regular neighborhoods, full time residents were unhappy with how renters were behaving in AirBnBs in their neighborhoods and started a movement to hold owners responsible for what their renters do while renting the homes. Concerns we have: 1) the County has already come to a conclusion and is pursuing a certain outcome and we will not convince them to change course; 2) the County will lump all communities into one category and treat them all the same - Dillon Beach is unique; 3) we do not know what problem the County thinks they are trying to solve and they may be going in the wrong direction with this (for instance: limiting STRs in Dillon Beach is not likely to create any additional long-term rentals, and most certainly no "affordable" housing); 4) required STR identifying signage on properties may invite burglary and other crime on those properties.
 - d. What is the problem the County is trying to solve? How can we guide them to a reasonable and fair solution - assuming there is a problem in the first place.

- e. Our understanding is the County reaction is complaint-driven. What is the data on the complaints received, if any?
 - f. There have been some crimes lately (theft, break-in, hit-and-run), but we do not know if these crimes are attributable to an increase in rentals. There are many potential causes of an increase in crime.
 - g. What we would like to see: 1) If a problem exists, we would like to see regulations that are community-specific, not one-size-fits-all regulations; 2) owners should be held responsible for what renters are doing in the rented properties; 3) address the parking problem as what it is - a visitor parking problem, not a renter parking problem; 4) address unfairness of allowing existing permits while new permits are locked out; 5) disclosure of County data - where are they getting their data on the problem and how are they defining the problem in Dillon Beach? What are the complaints they are getting and from where are they coming? Are they investigated? Are they valid? Was this problem created during covid? Did it exist before and does it exist now?
 - h. Would we like to create our own survey to collect data and opinions from the members of DBNG? Are most people in DB in favor, neutral, or against STRs in DB? What would they think if there were solid rental guidelines in place? Noise control, etc? Would the stakeholders in the DB area like to see a limit on the number or percentage or number of overall rentable days of STRs in DB?
 - i. Ellen said she has been living full time in DB since 1986 and has experienced only a handful of complaints about renters in all that time - this is probably an indicator of the level of the "problem" the County is addressing.
 - j. Hilary will bring these ideas to the meeting with Kathleen Kilgariff on April 10 at 5pm on Zoom.
5. Traffic and signage. Marin County Public Works has recently installed new signs to direct traffic. This is to address the community complaints about large vehicles driving into the Village and causing property damage and public safety problems. It is the feeling of the DBNG that the new signage is insufficient to solve the traffic problems. This was mentioned to county representatives at the most recent meeting with them (Supervisor Rodoni's office). Jim Mayo said that he is aware that Marin County has some other signs in the works and is planning to install them in the Village in a continued effort to redirect traffic away from the tiny Village streets and down to the Beach and Campground. Melinda will find the sign requests we had made before and recontact Supervisor Rodoni's office to go over what is in the works and what we would like to see done. Even though we would like more signage, it is completely understood by all stakeholders that the problem is not necessarily a lack of signs but that Google Maps and other GPS navigation software erroneously directs drivers into the Village instead of to the Beach and Campground. Board member Nichole Vogler has reached out to Google hundreds of times with no responses from them. It is suggested that she reach out to Rhonda in Supervisor Rodoni's office and have Supervisor Rodoni reach out to Google in the hopes he will elicit a response.
6. PGE new pole interferes with views. PGE installed a new power pole that is disrupting views for several homes. Discussion. The new pole is replacing an old pole that was

rotten but also the new pole is approximately 10 feet higher and so it affects more people more profoundly than the old pole. DBNG should take a stand against this kind of thing because the Community Plan allows for preservation of views at the Coast and the new pole is out of compliance with the Community Plan with respect to visual impact.

Perhaps DBNG should contact Sup. Rodoni's office about this pole, even though it is already installed, because we want to get ahead of this kind of thing in the future.

7. Website and MailChimp progress. Hilary is working on getting MailChimp functioning. MaryKay will update the website with all new information. Please contact her with any ideas and requests for what you would like to see on the DBNG website.
8. Approval of January 31, 2023 Annual Member Meeting and Board Meeting Minutes. Hilary moved to approve. Jackie 2nd. Discussion. For the record, all notations previously requested by past Board members have been made, both versions of the voting have been included in those minutes, and it has been noted that the meeting covered two meetings in one. Minutes approved.
9. Appointment of Replacement Board Members. Jan McHale and Eric Davis have resigned their Board positions. The DBNG at its discretion per the Bylaws may appoint replacement Board members when positions are vacated. Two members of the DB community have been nominated to the two vacant positions: Michael Gradl and Mike McGuire. Hilary moved to approve both nominees. Jackie 2nd. Discussion. Both appointments are approved. It is noted that even though most current issues are affecting the Village and not OMA, DBNG would like to recruit another Board member from OMA when the next opportunity to vote for Board members arrives so OMA has representation on the Board.
10. Next meeting is July 25, 2023 at 5pm on Zoom.

Adjourn 6:33pm