

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
MINUTES FOR MEETING OF: Tuesday – July 16, 2024
SPECIAL MEETING START TIME: 4:00 pm**

MINUTES FOR Regular City Council Meeting of July 16, 2024
As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of August 6, 2024

Please note that these are action minutes only. Detailed raw transcript is attached to the minutes and made a part of the public record. These action minutes are 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.

The public is advised that pursuant to Government Code section 54957.5 all writings submitted to the City and City Council are public records and will be made available for review.

4:00 pm City Council Regular Meeting, In Person – Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA/Virtual Format (Zoom)

Call to Order: Mayor Rich called the Regular Meeting to Order at 4:05 pm.

Roll Call:

Present: Mayor Diana Gardner Rich
Vice Mayor Stephen Zollman
Councilmember Neysa Hinton
Councilmember Sandra Maurer
Councilmember Jill McLewis

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager Don Schwartz (Zoom)
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley
Administrative Services Director Ana Kwong
Building Official Steve Brown
GHD Consultant Toni Bertolero
Fire Chief Shepley Schroth-Cary
Interim Planning Director David Woltering
Police Chief Ron Nelson
Public Works Superintendent Dante Del Prete

SALUTE TO THE FLAG : Mayor Rich 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)). None Required.

PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS: NONE

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 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:

Oliver

Kate

Mayor Rich responded to public comment.

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 the consent calendar items; 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 three minutes on the entire consent calendar and request at that time that an agenda item or items be 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 or Mayor Pro Tern.

Councilmembers 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 or Mayor Pro Tern.

Mayor Rich asked if any Councilmember wanted to remove a consent calendar item. There were none.

Mayor Rich opened for Public Comment(s). The following member(s) of the public provided public comment.

Linda

Mayor Rich responded to public comment.

MOTION:

Councilmember Maurer moved and Councilmember Hinton seconded the motion to approve Consent Calendar Item Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

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

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmembers Hinton, Maurer, McLewis, Vice Mayor Zollman and Mayor Rich

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

1. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes for Meeting of July 1, 2024 – Special City Council Meeting – Closed Session (Responsible Department: Assistant City Manager/City Clerk)

City Council Action: Approved City Council Meeting Minutes for Meeting of July 1, 2024 – Special City Council Meeting – Closed Session

Minute Order Number: 2024-156

2. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes for Meeting of July 2, 2024 – Regular City Council Meeting (Responsible Department: Assistant City Manager/City Clerk)

City Council Action: Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes for Meeting of July 2, 2024 – Regular City Council Meeting

Minute Order Number: 2024-157

3. Adoption of Resolution Approving an SB 1 Proposed Project List for Fiscal Year 2024-25/ Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, the City must adopt a resolution approving a list of projects proposed to be eligible for receiving fiscal year funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA), created by SB 1. The projected revenue in Fiscal Year 2024-25 RMRA funding from SB 1 that the City would be eligible to receive is \$194,800 (Responsible Department: Engineering)

SR 116 ADA Curb Ramps and Bodega Avenue Pedestrian Crossing

Bodega Ave. Guardrails Replacement

City Council Action: Approved Adoption of Resolution Approving an SB 1 Proposed Project List for Fiscal Year 2024-25/ Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, the City must adopt a resolution approving a list of projects proposed to be eligible for receiving fiscal year funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA), created by SB 1. The projected revenue in Fiscal Year 2024-25 RMRA funding from SB 1 that the City would be eligible to receive is \$194,800

Minute Order Number: 2024-158

Resolution Number: 6601-2024

4. Approve the Funding Agreement for use of FY 2020-2021 CDBG funds for the Youth Annex ADA Project/The amount of the grant is \$50,000 and this project is included in the Fiscal Year 2024-25 Capital Improvement Plan adopted by Council on July 2, 2024. Although the total CDBG funding is \$50,000, only \$45,000 is available to the City since CDC staff has used \$5,000 for their administrative and environmental review. (Responsible Department: Engineering)

City Council Action: Approved Funding Agreement for use of FY 2020-2021 CDBG funds for the Youth Annex ADA Project/The amount of the grant is \$50,000 and this project is included in the Fiscal Year 2024-25 Capital Improvement Plan adopted by Council on July 2, 2024. Although the total CDBG funding is \$50,000, only \$45,000 is available to the City since CDC staff has used \$5,000 for their administrative and environmental review.

Minute Order Number: 2024-159

5. Approval of Waiving of Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance Number 1150 to approve a Development Agreement for the Hotel Sebastopol at 6828 Depot Street (Responsible Department: Planning)

City Council Action: Approved Waiving of Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance Number 1150 to approve a Development Agreement for the Hotel Sebastopol at 6828 Depot Street

Minute Order Number: 2024-160

Ordinance Number: 1150

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).

6. Information Presentation from California Intergovernmental Risk Authority (CIRA) (Vice Mayor Zollman/Councilmember Hinton) This will be a short presentation from the City's Risk Authority (CIRA) on CIRA Services & Resources and Protecting the assets of CIRA members which the City is a member. CIRA partners with member agencies in developing and implementing risk management best practices and prioritizing pool resources to those exposures with the highest potential for loss.

Vice Mayor Zollman and Councilmember Hinton introduced the item and introduced speakers.

Amy Conley and Erike Young, CIRA Representatives, provided a short presentation.

Mayor Rich opened for questions of the speakers. Mayor Rich asked questions of the speakers.

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

Linda

Mayor Rich thanked the presenters.

City Council Action: No action required. Informational presentation only.

Reference Order Number: 2024-161

PUBLIC HEARING(s):

7. Public Hearing - To consider the Proposed Operating Budget for fiscal year 2024-25 (Responsible Department: City Manager/Administrative Services Director)

Actions Include:

Review of FY 24 25 Budget and Direction to staff on recommended changes

Creation of Ad Hoc Committee for Sebastopol Cultural Community Center (SCCC) Building

Assessment (As approved in the CIP for \$85,000)

Creation of Ad Hoc Committee to explore Specialized Assistance for Everyone (SAFE) Program

Setting Date for Mini Goals Setting Session prior to the Mid Year Budget Review

City Manager Don Schwartz presented the agenda item and provided a presentation.

Mayor Rich opened for questions of staff from the City Council. The Council asked questions of staff and committee members.

Mayor Rich opened the public hearing. The following members of the public provided comments:

Oliver

Robert

Kenyon

Linda

Resident

Kyle

Aaron

Skip

June

Tanya

Mary

Phil

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Rich closed the public hearing.

Mayor Rich called for a break at 6:55 pm and reconvened the meeting at 7:34 pm.

City Council Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to Staff:

The Council conducted straw votes on the following:

City Council Budget

\$2,500 reduction in contract with PCA for video for council meetings. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$4,000 reduction for legal hearing notices. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$3,500 reduction in cost for Shuttle Fare program. Schwartz explained that Sonoma County Transit, knowing the city's financial difficulties, simply cut the cost of this program. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$36,800 shift of the Homeless Outreach contract to the Police Department, which has lead responsibility for this role. Vice Mayor Zollman disagreed; APPROVED 4 to 1.

\$10,000 shift of costs for public communications to city manager's office. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$7,186 increase in benefits which may occur with new councilmembers. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$10,000 increase for contract support for basic goal-setting session. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$4,000 increase to fund membership in the Government Alliance for Racial Equity and organizations such as the NAACP, Latino Service Providers, etc. DENIED 4 to 1, Vice Mayor Zollman: no.

City Manager Budget

Additions include:

\$52,000 for continuing with Bob Leland of Baker Tilly, possible management review of Administrative Services to improve financial reporting, estimating expenses for capital projects, etc. APPROVED BUT REDUCED TO \$32,000 on a 5 to 0 vote, with the option to come back at midyear.

Equipment, Technology, and Vehicle Reserve fund: \$23,000 for analysis of financing needs for City fleet and identification of opportunities for operational improvements. APPROVED AT \$20,000 on a 5 to 0 vote.

\$10,000 for facilitator for performance evaluation. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$6,000 for payment for prior work for Relaunch program. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$10,000 shift of contract costs for public communications from City Council to City Manager. APPROVED 5 to 0.

City Attorney & Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Budgets

City Attorney Budget—No significant changes.

Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Budget

\$10,000 in reduced ballot measure expenses to reflect current plans. APPROVED 5 to 0.

Administrative Services Budget

\$114,600 in reductions for new server, cost allocation study, creation of Section 115 trust, and ballot measure expenses. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$10,000 increase for software maintenance. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$25,000 shift of expenses for property tax services from non-departmental budget. APPROVED 5 to 0.

\$3,000 increase for one person in City to attend Marin-Sonoma Leadership Academy or other training. DENIED 3 to 2 (Vice Mayor Zollman and Councilmember McLewis; No).

\$30,000 for classification/compensation study. APPROVED 4 to 1 (Councilmember Maurer: No).

\$10,000 to update 2022 staffing study to reflect organizational changes. APPROVED 4 to 1 to bring back at midyear. (Councilmember Maurer: No).

\$2,400 for training and certification from the California Intergovernmental Risk Authority (CIRA). APPROVED 5 to 0.

Planning Budget

\$91,800 in reimbursement of staff time for revenue-generating work on development projects (\$21,000) and grants (\$70,800). APPROVED 4 to 1 (Councilmember McLewis: No)

\$50,000 for monitoring of ownership housing units, from the Housing Linkage Fee fund. DENIED 4 to 1 (Vice Mayor Zollman: No)

\$22,000 for monitoring of rental housing units from the Inclusionary Housing Fund. APPROVED 3 to 2 (Councilmembers Hinton and McLewis: No).

Senior Center. The city is reducing its contribution to the Senior Center by \$38,250 and eliminating financial support for operations. APPROVED 5 to 0.

Community Cultural Center. \$58,300 to cover six months of operating expenses as it attempts to become self-sustaining. APPROVED 4 to 1 (Vice Mayor Zollman: No).

Ives Pool. There were no changes to the proposed budget. APPROVED 5 to 0.

Fire Department Budget

\$156,223 reduction in salary by not filling the fire chief position. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$136,799 in contract expenses for fire chief contract with Gold Ridge Fire Protection District. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$95,000 increase to fund costs related to fire consolidation with Gold Ridge. This includes \$50,000 for attorney fees, \$15,000 for public education, and \$30,000 for LAFCO, APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$40,000 increase in firefighter expenses to expand coverage. APPROVED 5 TO 0 as Placeholder Only)

Shift \$40,000 from retention voucher program for firefighters to expand coverage. APPROVED 5 TO 0 as Placeholder Only

\$20,000 increase in equipment to replace essential radios. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

The budget includes \$11,000 to continue the Map Your Neighborhood program. APPROVED 4 TO 1 (Vice Mayor Zollman: No)

Placeholder of \$100,000, due to the need to be flexible with consolidation. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

Police Budget

\$122,830 reduction in expenses for improvements in Police Department building and equipment, which will be funded by the Police Endowment. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$20,000 increase to fund assessment and initial improvements of City's Emergency Operation Center and emergency responsibility. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$4,465 increase with the shift of remaining FY23-24 warming center funds to Police Department from Fire Department. APPROVED 5 TO 0

\$10,000 add-on for a warming/cooling center. APPROVED 4 TO 1, Councilmember McLewis: No

\$11,500 increase due to the shift of traffic engineering to Police Department. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$8,000 increase to a total of \$16,000 to increase capacity for towing recreational vehicles. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

Two police positions, carried over from last year's budget. APPROVED 4 TO 1. Vice Mayor Zollman: No

Building Budget

The building budget was APPROVED 5 to 0.

Engineering Budget

\$163,000 savings from consolidation with Public Works. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$11,500 reduction and shift of the traffic engineering contract to Police Department. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

Additional \$5,000 to support solid waste hauler procurement. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

Public Works Budget

\$218,213 reduction due primarily to retirement of the Public Works Superintendent and consolidation of Public Works and Engineering Departments. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$72,000 reduction due to a shift of a laborer to focus on water and sewer systems. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$66,000 in reimbursement from grants and City's Building reserve fund for projects. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$64,000 reduction in maintenance-related contracts. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$26,000 reduction in maintenance services and supplies. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$52,000 increase in contract services with the shift of West County Community Services contract for Park Village to Public Works. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$20,000 addition for Libby Park fencing materials. APPROVED 5 TO 0.

\$5,000 addition for more reflective sign poles to improve pedestrian crosswalk. APPROVED 5 TO 0

MOTION:

Councilmember Maurer moved and Councilmember McLewis seconded the motion to: Provide direction to staff for amendments to the Proposed FY 24 25 Budget and directed staff to return the budget to the next City Council Meeting for consideration of adoption.

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

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmembers Hinton, Maurer, McLewis, Vice Mayor Zollman and Mayor Rich

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Provide direction to staff for amendments to the Proposed FY 24 25 Budget and directed staff to return the budget to the next City Council Meeting for consideration of adoption.

Minute Order Number: 2024-162

Creation of Ad Hoc Committee for Sebastopol Cultural Community Center (SCCC) Building Assessment (As approved in the CIP for \$85,000)

Item to be continued to future meeting

Reference Order Number: 2024-163

Discussed Creation of Ad Hoc Committee to explore Specialized Assistance for Everyone (SAFE) Program

Vice Mayor Zollman moved and Mayor Rich seconded the motion to create an ad hoc committee and with the obligation to return to the Council for addition of scope and timing to be returned to Council with the recommendation that the Vice Mayor and Mayor as committee members,

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

VOTE:

Ayes: Vice Mayor Zollman and Mayor Rich

Noes: Councilmembers Hinton, Maurer and McLewis

Absent: None

Abstain: None

Motion Fails

City Council Action: None -Motion Fails

Minute Order Number: 2024-164

MOTION:

Mayor Rich moved and Councilmember Maurer seconded the motion to direct staff to set a date for Mini Goals Setting Session prior to the Mid Year Budget Review.

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

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmembers Maurer, McLewis, Vice Mayor Zollman and Mayor Rich

Noes: Councilmember Hinton

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Directed staff to set a date for Mini Goals Setting Session prior to the Mid Year Budget Review.

Minute Order Number: 2024-165

REGULAR CALENDAR AGENDA ITEMS (DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION)(CONTINUED):

8. Discussion and Consideration of Placement of ballot measure onto the November 2024 Election; Polling Results (Responsible Department: City Manager/Consultant/Outside Legal Counsel)

City Manager Don Schwartz presented the agenda item and provided a presentation.

Mayor Rich opened for questions of staff from the City Council.

Mayor Rich opened for public comment. The following members of the public provided comments:

Aaron
Robert
Linda
Kyle

City Council Discussion, Deliberations, and/or Direction to Staff:

Mayor Rich moved and Councilmember Hinton seconded the motion to:

MOTION:

1) Adopt the proposed Resolution calling for the placement of a general tax measure on the ballot for the November 5, 2024 general municipal election for the submission to the qualified voters of an ordinance to enact a general transactions and use tax (sales tax) at the rate of half -cent; and requesting that the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors consent to the consolidations of this election with the statewide general election to be held on the same date; and modify the proposed resolution and ordinance to refer uniformly to a half -cent tax; with modified language:

Terminate 12 years from operative date

Staff read the question:

Sebastopol Public Safety, Roads, City Services Measure: To maintain Sebastopol's City services such as 911 emergency medical/police/fire response, wildfire/emergency preparedness, maintenance of streets/roads, parks/trails, library, youth and senior services, retaining/attracting local businesses; and for general government use, shall the measure establishing a ½ cent sales tax generating approximately \$1,520,000 annually terminating 12 years upon operative date, requiring audits, public spending disclosure, all funds used locally, be adopted?

2) Appoint, by motion, up to two members of the City Council to prepare the argument to be submitted in favor of the measure, and a rebuttal against any arguments submitted against the measure: Appointed Mayor Rich and Vice Mayor Zollan

3. Directed staff to return with a Council policy on allocation of funds if the sales tax measure passes.

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

VOTE:

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

City Council Action:

1) Adopt the proposed Resolution calling for the placement of a general tax measure on the ballot for the November 5, 2024 general municipal election for the submission to the qualified voters of an ordinance to enact a general transactions and use tax (sales tax) at the rate of half -cent; and requesting that the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors consent to the consolidations of this election with the statewide general election to be held on the same date; and modify the proposed resolution and ordinance to refer uniformly to a half -cent tax; with modified language:

Terminate 12 years from operative date

Staff read the question:

Sebastopol Public Safety, Roads, City Services Measure: To maintain Sebastopol's City services such as 911 emergency medical/police/fire response, wildfire/emergency preparedness, maintenance of streets/roads, parks/trails, library, youth and senior services, retaining/attracting local businesses; and for general government use, shall the measure establishing a ½ cent sales tax generating approximately \$1,520,000 annually terminating 12 years upon operative date, requiring audits, public spending disclosure, all funds used locally, be adopted?

2) Appoint, by motion, up to two members of the City Council to prepare the argument to be submitted in favor of the measure, and a rebuttal against any arguments submitted against the measure:
Appointed Mayor Rich and Vice Mayor Zollan

3. Directed staff to return with a Council policy on allocation of funds if the sales tax measure passes.

Minute Order Number: 2024-166

Resolution Number: 6602-2024

9. Discussion and Consideration Fire Ad Hoc Committee Duties/Tasks/Duration of Committee (Responsible Department: Fire Ad Hoc Committee/City Manager)

Item not heard/will be continued.

City Council Action: None / Item Continued

Minute Order Number: 2024-167

10. Consideration of Creation of City Council Ad Hoc Committee for Purpose of Evaluation of Proposals and Conducting Interviews with Proposers for Services Related to the City of Sebastopol's Solid Waste Collection Agreement (Responsible Department: Assistant City Manager/City Clerk)

Item not heard/will be continued.

City Council Action: None/ Item Continued

Minute Order Number: 2024-168

The following items were not heard due to Council protocols and ending the meeting by 11:30 pm.

~~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.~~

~~CITY COUNCIL/CITY STAFF REPORTS/COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/FUTURE MEETINGS: _____~~

~~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)~~

~~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)
Council Communications Received (Information/Meetings/Correspondence Received from the General Public to Councilmembers)~~

~~**CLOSED SESSION: NONE**~~

ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING

July 16th 2024 City Council Regular Meeting will be adjourned to the City Council Regular Meeting of Tuesday, August 6, 2024 at 6:00 , Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street.

Mayor Rich adjourned the City Council Meeting of July 16, 2024 at 11:35 pm to the next City Council Meeting of August 6, 2024 at 6:00 pm, Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street.

Respectfully Submitted:

Mary Gourley
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk

Attachment:
Raw Zoom Minutes

City Council Meeting - July 16, 2024

PLEASE STAND BY FOR REALTIME CAPTIONS.

HELLO TEST

I CAN HEAR YOU.

TESTING TESTING 12.

I CAN STILL HEAR YOU.

SO LOOKING FOR A THUMBS UP FROM STAFFS.

CAN WE MAKE SURE ALL THE LAPTOPS ARE MUTED? I'M STILL HEARING THE ECHO.

SO COUNCILMEMBERS LET'S MAKE SURE OUR LAPTOPS ARE MUTED. MINE IS. I'M ACTUALLY NOT HEARING ONE. BUT OKAY.

STILL LOOKING FOR A THUMBS UP AND THEN WE WILL GET GOING.

READY TO GO WHEN EVER YOU ARE READY TO START THE MEETING.

ALL RIGHT THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE ARE GOING TO CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER. IT IS ABOUT -- WE ARE GOING TO CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER IT IS ABOUT FOUR COLLINSON TODAY. OUR FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA IS TO DO THE ROLL CALL.

THANK YOU MAYOR.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

COUNCILMEMBER TRAN06

COUNCILMEMBER LEWIS

VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN.

ALL COUNCILMEMBERS ARE IN ATTENDANCE.

NOW WE WOULD DO THE SALUTE TO THE FLAG. PLEASE RISE.

I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. AND TO THE REPUBLIC FOR WHICH IT STANDS ONE NATION UNDER GOD INDIVISIBLE WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL.

MOVING ALONG WITH THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS HERE. OUR NEXT STEP WOULD BE PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS. WE DO NOT HAVE ANYTHING THIS EVENING. WE WILL MOVE ONTO STATEMENTS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST. ASKING MY PEERS -- NO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. MOVING ON DENSA PUBLICCOMMENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA. OUR FIRST COMMENT PERIOD AND I WILL TURN TO ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER TO HANDLE THAT.

SO AS STATED THIS IS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS THAT ARE NOT ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT I GO IN CHAMBERS FIRST AND THAT I GO OUT TO THE ZOOM AND RETURN BACK TO IN CHAMBERS. YOU HAVE TWO MINUTES. IT IS A 20 MINUTE LIMIT. IF YOU DON'T GET TO SPEAK DURING THE FIRST 20 MINUTES YOU HAVE A SECOND PUBLICCOMMENT AT THE END OF THE MEETING. THERE IS NO TIMER SO I WILL JUMP IN WHEN THERE ARE 30 SECONDS LEFT.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE -- IF YOU BUY THESE -- MONEY COMES TO THE CITY. WE NEED EVERY PENNY WE CAN GET. SECONDLY I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS. I TOOK THE SURVEY SURVEY. THE OTHER ONE THAT WAS CIRCULATING. CLICKED ON IT WAS GOING TO FILL IT IN LATER. I HAVEN'T SEEN [INAUDIBLE] TO THE STAFF ABOUT THAT. A LOT OF OTHER PEOPLE HAVE THE SAME PROBLEM. I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO SEE WHAT THE RESULTS ARE. ON THE BUDGET CONVERSATION TODAY. THAT WAS GREATLY -- ASKING PEOPLE WHAT THEY THINK IS MOST IMPORTANT IN THE CITY. SO, I GUESS THAT IS MY COMMENT. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU OLIVER FOR YOUR PUBLICCOMMENT. I WILL GO OUT TO ZOOM. CATHERINE CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF?

I WILL JUMP IN WHEN YOU HAVE 30 SECONDS LEFT.

THE CITY NEEDS TO ASK WHY SEBASTOPOL HAS 81 HOMELESS PEOPLE IN THE MOST RECENT COUNT ESTIMATE ONLY HAS 15. WHY DOES SEBASTOPOL HAVE 500 PERCENT MORE HOMELESS PEOPLE THEN [INAUDIBLE] A TOWN OF SIMILAR SIZE AND EQUALLY CLOSE TO SANTA ROSA AND ROLANDO PARK. WHAT IS SEBASTOPOL DOING TO DRAW IN SO MANY HOMELESS PEOPLE WHICH ARE HAVING A HUGE IMPACT ON OUR POLICE FIRE AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENTS BUDGET? I WOULD LIKE CITY STAFF AND COUNSEL TO TRY TO FIGURE OUT WHY OUR NUMBERS ARE SO HIGH COMPARED TO OTHER CITIES. NINE IN -- 33 HEALDSBURG 26 IN WINDSOR WHICH BY THE WAY IS OVER 26,000 PEOPLE. AND 40 IN THE CITY OF SONOMA. WHAT CAN SEBASTOPOL DO TO REDUCE HIS NUMBERS. AND PERHAPS HALF AGAIN NEXT YEAR SO WE ARE MORE IN LINE WITH HOBBY? IT WAS DISINGENUOUS AND MISLEADING TO TELLS SEBASTOPOL RESIDENTS THAT THE SAME VINCENT DE PAUL PROJECT WOULD HAVE A HELPFUL IMPACT FOR OUR HOMELESS POPULATION. THE PROJECT WILL BE JUST LIKE ALL OTHER PROJECTS WERE PEOPLE FROM A COUNTY WHITE LIST GENERATED VIA THE COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM ARE GIVING SPACES. [INAUDIBLE] CONFIRMED THIS IN A JUNE 27th PRESS DEMOCRAT ARTICLE WHICH I'M QUOTING FROM THAT. TIBBETT SAID IT IS VERY LIKELY THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE LIVING IN HORIZON VILLAGE WOULD BE ABLE TO ACCESS HOUSING AT [INAUDIBLE] COMMENTS BUT AGAIN THEY HAVE TO GO THROUGH COORDINATED ENTRY HE SAID.

YOU HAVE 30 SECONDS.

ONCE AGAIN COUNSEL VOTED FOR A PROJECT WITHOUT REALLY UNDERSTANDING WHAT EXACTLY [INAUDIBLE]. AND NOW WE WILL HAVE OVER 50 [INAUDIBLE] HIGH NEEDS INDIVIDUALS WITHIN CITY LIMITS WITHOUT ANY ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR POLICE FIRE OR SOCIAL SERVICES. PEOPLE ADMITTED TO [INAUDIBLE] PROJECTS ARE HOMELESS PEOPLE THAT ARE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO HOUSE DUE TO THEIR LIFELONG MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION ISSUES. HOW DOES SEBASTOPOL GOING TO PAY FOR THE UPTICK IN SERVICES -- THAT IS TWO MINUTES.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLICCOMMENT. I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. IS THERE SOMEONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLICCOMMENT NOT ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA? I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZONE. IF ANYONE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLICCOMMENT ON A ITEM NOT ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. LINDA CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF?

THANK YOU GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLICCOMMENT LINDA.

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR BRINGING THAT UP -- [INAUDIBLE]. MIGHT BE A GOOD TIME TO RECOGNIZE HOW WE GOT HERE. [INAUDIBLE]

LINDA YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS.

[INAUDIBLE]

LINDA THAT IS TWO MINUTES.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A

PUBLICCOMMENT FOR AN ITEM NOT ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA. I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. ANYONE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE PUBLICCOMMENT IS CLOSED.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I WILL RESPONSE A COUPLE COMMENTS. I HAVE A QUESTION FOR STAFF. ARE THE SURVEY AND POLL RESULTS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC ONLINE? I UNDERSTOOD THAT THEY WERE.

THEY ARE PUBLISHED. SO THEY ARE AVAILABLE ON THE WEBSITE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT IS WHAT I UNDERSTOOD. I HEAR CONFIRMATION FROM LAURA -- APPARENTLY

THE INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE RESIDENTS AT HORIZON ARE ALL IN COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM. I'VE GOTTEN CONFIRMATION OF THAT INDEPENDENTLY. AND THEY ARE INDIVIDUALS THOSE WHO ARE AT HORIZON SHINE WERE INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE ALREADY RESIDENTS OF OUR COMMUNITY BEFORE WE WERE ACCEPTED INTO HORIZON SHINE. THEY ARE NOT NEW ADDITIONS. THE CANOPY PROJECT TO MY KNOWLEDGE IS NOT HAVING ANY TROUBLE OBTAINING THE INSURANCE THAT THEY NEED IN ORDER TO COMPLETE THE PROJECT AND OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. WE WILL NOW MOVE ON TO THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS.

I WILL READ THROUGH THEM. AND THEN WE WILL SEE IF WE HAVE ANYONE WHO WANTS TO PULL THEM FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR. THE FIRST ITEM THERE ARE FIVE OF THEM APPROVAL A CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 1st 2024. THAT WAS A SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING. APPROVAL OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 2nd 2024. REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING. NUMBER THREE IS ADOPTION OF THE RESOLUTION APPROVING AN SP1 PROPOSED PROJECT LIST FOR FISCAL YEAR 24 AND 25 PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF SB ONE THE ROAD REPAIR AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017. THE CITY MUST ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING A LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED IN ORDER TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR RECEIVING FISCAL YEAR FUNDING FROM THE ROAD MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION ACCOUNT. CREATED BY SP1. ITEM NUMBER FOUR APPROVE THE FUNDING AGREEMENT FOR USE OF FISCAL YEAR 20 AND 21 CDBG FUNDS FOR THE YOUTH ANNEXED ADA PROJECT. THE AMOUNT OF THAT GRANT IS \$50,000 AND IT IS INCLUDED IN THE FISCAL YEAR 24 AND 25 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. THE NEXT ITEM IS NUMBER FIVE APPROVAL OF WAIVING OF THE SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE NUMBER 1150 TO APPROVE A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE HOTEL SEBASTOPOL AND 6828 DEPOT STREET. I'M CHECKING IN WITH YOU DID I READ THE NECESSARY PORTIONS OF THIS FIVE ITEMS?

YOU DID THANK YOU.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. LOOKING TO MY COLLEAGUES ANYONE WANT TO PULL IN THE OF THESE ITEMS?

I WASN'T AT THE LAST MEETING BUT I DID REVIEW EVERYTHING. I CAN STILL VOTE --

I'M SORRY I WAS SICK FOR THE LAST MEETING. I DID REVIEW EVERYTHING SO I CAN STILL APPROVE --

AS LONG AS YOU HAVE READ THE IMMEDIATE MINUTES.

EXCELLENT QUESTION. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? ANYONE WANTING TO PULL AN ITEM FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR? NOT SEEING ANY REQUEST TO PULL FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR. I WILL TURN TO -- TO HANDLE PUBLICCOMMENT.

PUBLICCOMMENT FOR ANY ITEM ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR ONLY. IF YOU LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLICCOMMENT I GO TO CHAMBERS FIRST. SEEING NONE I GO OUT TO ZOOM. LINDA UNMUTE YOURSELF PLEASE.

THANK YOU LINDA GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLICCOMMENT.

CAN YOU HEAR ME?

GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLICCOMMENT.

I GOT ANOTHER -- [INAUDIBLE] -- SO ANYWAY, ON THE ITEM NUMBER FOUR. I'M SORRY LINDA I HATE TO INTERRUPT. YOU SPEAK UP JUST A LITTLE BIT. WE ARE HAVING TROUBLE HEARING YOU.

CAN YOU START MY TIME OVER AGAIN PLEASE?

I STOPPED IT SO GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT PLEASE.

SO ANYWAY ON THAT THE FIRST ON THAT FIRST ITEM NUMBER ONE I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE SUBJECT WAS. I DON'T SEE IT HERE. AND NUMBER FOUR I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND YOU ALL THAT [INAUDIBLE] AMERICA 'S ABILITIES ACT. [INAUDIBLE]. NONE OF YOUR POLICIES [INAUDIBLE] WORSE FOR MYSELF AND EVERYBODY ELSE. INCREASING THE MICROWAVE RADIATION FROM THE MAN-MADE [INAUDIBLE] MAGNETIC FIELD. CELL PHONES CELL TOWERS AND ALL THE OTHER [INAUDIBLE] . I WOULD JUST LIKE TO MENTION THAT ABOUT ADA. ON NUMBER FIVE NUMBER FIVE WHAT ARE YOU PEOPLE THINKING OF? WE DON'T HAVE THE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR A HOTEL. THE TRAFFIC -- WE DON'T HAVE THE WASTEWATER THE SEWERS THE PIPES -- THE TRAFFIC. SOMEBODY SHOULD BE TALKING ABOUT BYPASS -- BLOOMFIELD ROAD.

YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU PEOPLE ARE THINKING ABOUT. BUILT A B BUILT APPROVING ALL OF THESE PROJECTS THAT THIS TOWN CANNOT SUPPORT.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU LINDA FOR YOUR PUBLICCOMMENT. I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. ANYONE IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLICCOMMENT ON A CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK TO ZOOM. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLICCOMMENT PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE PUBLICCOMMENT IS CLOSED ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. NUMBER ONE APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR MEETING OF JULY 1st 2024. THAT WAS A SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING. CLOSED SESSION. OUR NEXT ITEM SO APPEAR AT THE COUNSEL TABLE I'M LOOKING FOR A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR.

SO MOVED

SECOND

PLEASE HANDLE THE ROLLCALL VOTE.

THANK YOU. SO MOVED BY COUNCILMEMBER MAURER AND SECONDED BY HINTON TO APPROVE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS ONE THROUGH FIVE.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON. COUNCIL MEMBER MAURER. COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS. VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN. MAYOR RICH. MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

WE NOW ARE AT OUR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS PRESENTATIONS. AT THIS POINT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SURE THE PUBLIC IS AWARE THAT AT APPROXIMATELY 6:00 P.M. DEPENDING ON HOW THE DISCUSSION IS GOING UP HERE, THE COUNCIL WILL BE TAKING A MEAL BREAK FOR ABOUT A HALF

HOUR. AND THEN WE WILL COME BACK AFTER THAT HALF HOUR BREAK IN ORDER TO CONTINUE THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING. I WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO GIVE YOU A PRECISE TIME BUT IT IS REALLY DEPENDENT ON WHEN THE NATURAL BREAK IN THE DISCUSSION MIGHT BE. OUR INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION IS OUR NEXT ITEM.

DID WE HAVE -- WHERE DID THAT COME FROM? SOME AGGRESSIVE THINKING WE DON'T WANT TO TAKE THAT BREAK IT ALL. SOME ARE THINKING I DON'T NEED A FULL HALF HOUR.

SO LET'S HAVE A BRIEF DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT. I DID SEND AN EMAIL ASKING FOR RESPONSES. ON A MEAL REQUEST. BUT LET'S JUST HAVE HOW ABOUT A THUMBS UP OR THUMBS DOWN IN TERMS OF TAKING A MEAL BREAK.

THE TIMING IS WHAT MY CONCERN IS.

SO WE HAVE A YES ON THE MEAL BREAK. PLEASE COUNCILMEMBER MAURER WHAT IS YOUR --

15 MINUTES RATHER THAN A HALF HOUR.

YOU WOULD LIKE TO TAKE 15 MINUTES. ANY INPUT FROM OTHER COUNCILMEMBERS? COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS.

I JUST THINK WE ARE HERE I WAS HERE BEFORE FOR 9 HOURS. I DON'T THINK IT IS AND ASK FOR US TO TAKE 30 MINUTES TO EAT. IF WE FINISH EARLY -- I DON'T KNOW. IT IS THE HUMANE THING TO DO IN MY OPINION.

30 MINUTES OR 15 MINUTES. COUNCILMEMBER HENSON PICK

I AGREE. I HATE FOR PEOPLE TO HAVE TO GO HOME. WE'VE TAKEN THESE DINNER BREAKS BEFORE FOR LONG MEETINGS AND WE STARTED WITH THE AD HOC MEETING -- ANTICIPATING A BREAK. I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT. I DON'T THINK I CAN EAT IN 15 MINUTES.

ANY OTHER COUNCILMEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO WEIGH IN ON THIS QUESTION?

I WILL RETRACT IT.

IT SOUNDS LIKE WE WILL GO FOR A 30 MINUTE MEAL BREAK. APOLOGIZE IF IT IS AN INCONVENIENCE TO THE PUBLIC. BUT THE FACT IS WE'VE NOTICED WE GET MUCH LESS PRODUCTIVE IF WE HAVE NOT EATEN FOOD AND WE HAVE NOT HAD A BREAK. YOU WANT THE BEST CITY COUNCIL MEMBER PARTICIPATION HERE AND HOPEFULLY THAT WHAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU.

WE ARE NOW ON THE INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND PRESENTATIONS. THE FIRST ITEM IS ITEM 6 ON THE AGENDA. THAT IS INFORMATION PRESENTATION FROM CALIFORNIA INTERGOVERNMENTAL RISK AUTHORITY. THAT IS -- THE MOVING PARTY IS VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN AND COUNCILMEMBER HINTON. THERE IS A SHORT PRESENTATION. I THINK I WILL TURN TO THE INDIVIDUALS WHO BROUGHT THIS FORWARD IN ORDER TO START THIS PRESENTATION.

THANK YOU. AND I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE WITH A BRIEF AMOUNT OF TIME I'VE BEEN ON COUNSEL I DID NOT KNOW WE HAD A [INAUDIBLE]. I HURT RUMBLINGS OF CERA DID NOT KNOW THE SPECIFICS.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON IS THE PRIMARY. WE HAVE ATTENDED MEETINGS. A BOARD MEETING IN SACRAMENTO NOT TOO LONG AGO. I FELT LIKE IT WAS IMPORTANT TO GET A BRIEF OVERVIEW FROM OUR REPRESENTATIVES FROM -- TO BE ABLE TO SHARE THE INFORMATION WITH MY COLLEAGUES. THIS IS ALL ABOUT INSURANCE AND CLAIMS FROM DIFFERENT PARKS. EITHER

EMPLOYMENT LIABILITY OR OTHER FORMS OF LIABILITY. A LOT OF THE DISCUSSION TONIGHT WILL BE ITEMS LIKE INCREASED COMPUTERS FOR SECURITY. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THERE WAS CONTEXT FOR WHY IT IS WE ARE ASKING. WE ARE TRYING TO BE IN COMPLIANCE. COMPLIANCE HELPS WITH OUR PREMIUMS. IF WE ARE IN GOOD FAITH WITH THEM HOPEFULLY OUR PREMIUMS WILL CONTINUE TO REMAIN THE SAME.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON PICS MATT FOR THE PUBLIC --

OUR PREVIOUS REPRESENTATIVE PRIMARY REPRESENTATIVE WAS OUR FORMER CITY MANAGER CITY ATTORNEY LARRY McLAUGHLIN. WE ORIGINALLY BECAME PART OF THE INSURANCE POOL FOR WHAT IS CALLED [INAUDIBLE]. LARRY SERVED MANY TIMES AS IS PRESIDENT. SO THAT WORKED REALLY WELL FOR US AND COUNCILMEMBERS WERE NOT AS INVOLVED. WE DID MERGE WITH CIRA WHICH IS A BIGGER GROUP. ALL OF [INAUDIBLE] FOLDED IN 2 TO 3 YEARS AGO. MARY GURLEY ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER HAS BEEN CONSISTENT. SHE WAS THE ALTERNATE WITH LARRY AND CONTINUES TO BE REALLY INVOLVED WITH ALL OF US ON THIS INSURANCE. IT IS WE ARE LUCKY TO BE A PART OF THIS INSURANCE POOL. I WILL SAY THEY ARE PICKY ABOUT THE CITIES THAT THEY ACCEPT. AND THEY DON'T ACCEPT BAD ACTORS. SO, I FEEL LIKE FOR A VERY SMALL CITY LIKE OURS IT REALLY IS A HUGE BENEFIT FOR US. AND HELPS US PROTECT OUR LIABILITY AND HAVING THIS ORGANIZATION ASSIST US. ULTIMATELY REDUCING CLAIMS AND SAVING MONEY. HAPPY TO HAVE THEM HERE.

THANKS.

JUST WANTED TO JUMP IN TO INTRODUCE AMY -- GENERAL MANAGER I WILL TELL YOU HOW FORTUNATE THE CITY HAS TO HAVE BOTH OF THESE THE ENTIRE STAFF WE WERE REALLY -- [INAUDIBLE] AND SO I FEEL IT IS A PRIVILEGE TO BE A PART OF THIS GROUP. AMY DO YOU WANT TO TAKE AWAY?

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR THAT INTRODUCTION. MY NAME IS AMY CONLEY THE GENERAL MANAGER OF CIRA. WE HAVE -- ON THE LINE AS WELL. HE IS THE DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER. I WILL START THE PRESENTATION BY PRESENTING THE GENERAL BACKGROUND WHAT CIRA IS ABOUT. SOME OF OUR PROGRAMS. I WILL TURN IT OVER TO [INAUDIBLE] AND HE WILL SHARE THE MEMBER SERVICES WE PROVIDE.

I'M SORRY TO INTERRUPT. AS A REMINDER I'M SURE YOU'VE BEEN INFORMED WE HAVE A HUGE AGENDA TONIGHT. WE ARE HOPING THE PRESENTATION CAN BE APPROXIMATELY 10 MINUTES.

IT WILL I PROMISE. I JUST STARTED MY TIMER. I WILL KEEP IT AT 10 MINUTES.

SO BACK IN MARCH OF 1986 INSURERS THROUGHOUT THE U.S. WERE CANCELING POLICIES. SO MUCH WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA RIGHT NOW. THAT WAS VERY PROBLEMATIC FOR CITIES AND COUNTIES AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS BECAUSE THEY NEED COVERAGE TO PROVIDE BASIC SERVICES TO THEIR COMMUNITIES. SO THESE PUBLIC AGENCIES CAME UP WITH A FAIRLY INNOVATIVE IDEA. AND RATHER PURCHASING INSURANCE TO PROVIDE COVERAGE FOR WORKERS COMPENSATION OR LIABILITY COVERAGE, WHAT THEY DID IS THEY GOT TOGETHER AND THEY POOL THEIR MONEY TO PAY FOR CLAIMS. SO ALL OF THESE DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS GOT TOGETHER. THEY PUT ALL OF THEIR MONEY IN A POT AND THEY USED THAT MONEY TO PAY FOR CLAIMS. THAT IS

WHAT CIRA IS. AN ORGANIZATION THAT WAS CREATED. WE HAVE NOW 53 DIFFERENT MEMBERS. SO ALL OF SEBASTOPOL IS ONE OF THEM. SO IS THE CITY OF EUREKA . ROLANDO PARK. DOWN IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AS WELL. THOSE MEMBERS HAVE GOTTEN TOGETHER TO POOL THEIR FUNDS TO PAY FOR CLAIMS. SO WHAT HAPPENS IN SEVASTOPOL MATTERS TO WHAT HAPPENS IN HEALDSBURG WHAT HAPPENS IN HEALDSBURG MATTERS TO WHAT HAPPENS IN RANCHO CUCAMONGA. BECAUSE ALL OF THAT MONEY IS POOLED TO PAY FOR CLAIMS. RIGHT NOW WE HAVE 53 DIFFERENT MEMBERS. OUR TOTAL PAYROLL IS ABOUT \$420 MILLION. OUR LARGEST MEMBER IF YOU COUNT BY PAYROLL IS THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE. IN OUR SMALLEST IS THE CITY OF AMADOR CITY. WATSONVILLE HAS A PAYROLL OF APPROXIMATELY 42 MILLION. AMADOR CITY HAS A PAYROLL APPROXIMATELY 36 MILLION. ON AVERAGE ARE MEMBERS PAYROLL IS ABOUT 8.4 MILLION. IF YOU COUNT BY POPULATION THE LARGEST MEMBER IS THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA AND THEY HAVE APPROXIMATELY 200,000 RESIDENTS. AND THE SMALLEST OF THE CITY OF AMADOR CITY. THEY HAVE RIGHT AROUND 200 RESIDENTS. THEY ALSO HAPPEN TO BE THE SMALLEST CITY IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. APPROXIMATELY 70% OF OUR MEMBERS HAVE PUBLIC SAFETY. THAT IS GOING TO BE POLICE OR FIRE OR POLICE AND FIRE. SO I'M GOING TO BRIEFLY TALK ABOUT THE PROGRAMS THAT WE OFFER. AND SEBASTOPOL PARTICIPATES IN ALL OF THE PROGRAMS THAT I'M ABOUT TO PRESENT ON. THE FIRST ONE IS THE LIABILITY PROGRAM. WE PROVIDE LIABILITY COVERAGE FOR THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL. THIS BLUE LAYER THAT YOU SEE HERE THAT IS ALL OF THE MEMBERS PULL TOGETHER. SO THE GREEN AT THE BOTTOM IS THE MEMBER DEDUCTIBLE. AND THEN WE POOL UP TO \$1 MILLION. WE THEN PARTNER WITH GROUPS BEYOND THAT TO PROVIDE COVERAGE BEYOND THAT AMOUNT. SO REAL QUICKLY LET ME TELL YOU WHAT THE LIABILITY PROGRAM COVERS. WE COVER AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY. PUBLIC ERRORS AND OMISSIONS LIABILITY. PERSONAL AND BODILY INJURY. AS WELL AS PROPERTY DAMAGE TO THIRD PARTIES. WE COVER EMPLOYEES. ELECTED OR APPOINTED OFFICIALS. OFFICIAL VOLUNTEERS. BOARDS OR COMMISSIONS GOVERNED BY CITY COUNCIL. AND LASTLY ANY ADDITIONAL COVERED PARTIES REQUIRED BY CONTRACT. NOW WHAT WE DON'T COVER IS JUST AS IMPORTANT.

JUST A MOMENT. I HAVE SOMEONE IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM. COULD YOU PLEASE SPEAK OUTSIDE. JOHN COULD YOU PLEASE GO OUTSIDE TO SPEAK WITH THIS WOMAN SO WE CAN CONTINUE OUR PRESENTATION? EXCUSE ME FOLKS. IN THE BACK. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU. OKAY THANK YOU AMY.

SO WHAT WE COVER IT IS JUST AS IMPORTANT TO TALK ABOUT WHAT WE DON'T COVER. THIS IS NOT A COMPREHENSIVE LIST BUT WE DON'T COVER ALL LIABILITIES THE CITY MAY INCUR. WE DON'T COVER AIRCRAFT OR AIRPORT OPERATIONS OR BREACH OF CONTRACT. WE DO NOT COVER DAMS OR DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION EXPENSES. WE DON'T COVER FIXED ROUTE TRANSIT OPERATIONS. THESE ARE ALL ITEMS THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL DOES NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY WAY. SO IT IS NO CONCERN THERE. WE DON'T COVER EMPLOYEE BENEFITS BECAUSE THERE IS A SEPARATE PLAN FOR THAT. WE DON'T COVER EMPLOYEE INJURIES BECAUSE THAT IS WORKER'S COMPENSATION. WE DON'T COVER MEDICAL OR HEALTH CARE OPERATIONS

OR USE OF FIREARMS BY NON-POLICE OFFICERS. NOW WE PARTNER WITH ANOTHER GROUP FOR OUR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LIABILITY. IT IS A GROUP CALLED ARMAGH. IRMA PROVIDE SERVICES AS WELL. THEY PROVIDE ALL SORTS OF RISK MANAGEMENT TRAINING. THEY HAVE A FREE ATTORNEY ADVISE HIGHLINE. THEY HAVE AN EMPLOYEE HOTLINE. AS WELL AS A CONSORTIUM OF RESOURCES FOR THE HR DEPARTMENTS FOR OUR MEMBERS. WE WILL SWITCH GEARS AND TALK ABOUT WORKER'S COMPENSATION. WORKER'S COMPENSATION IS VERY SIMILAR. WE POOL ALL OF OUR MONEY TO PAY FOR THE CLAIMS. WE PARTNER WITH A GROUP CALLED LW PETE THEY HELP ADMINISTER THE CLAIMS FOR US. AND AGAIN THE CITIES HAVE DIFFERENT DEDUCTIBLES BETWEEN 5000 AND \$250,000. AND THEN WE PARTNER WITH GROUPS ABOVE US TO MAKE SURE THAT ALL OF OUR EMPLOYEES FOR OUR MEMBER CITIES ARE FULLY COVERED. NOW THOSE OF THE SELF INSURED OR THE GROUP PROGRAMS THAT WE HAVE TOGETHER. WE ALSO HAVE GROUP PURCHASED COVERAGE AS WELL. SO THIS DOES NOT HAVE ANY SEBASTOPOL MONEY PULL TOGETHER WITH OTHER MEMBERS. BUT THIS IS THE BUYING POWER BEHIND LARGE NUMBERS WHERE WE GET ALL OF OUR MEMBERS TO COME TOGETHER TO BUY PROPERTY COVERAGE. SO SEBASTOPOL HAS PROPERTY COVERAGE THROUGH THIS PROGRAM HERE. WE ALSO OFFER SPECIAL EVENTS PROGRAMS. THOSE ARE VERY AFFORDABLE COVERAGE FOR INDIVIDUALS USING PUBLIC FACILITIES. WE HAVE FIDELITY BOND WHICH IS ESSENTIALLY CRIME. WE OFFER CYBER COVERAGE. AND WE ALSO OFFER EMPLOYEE BENEFITS TO THE EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL. THAT IS GOING TO BE YOUR MEDICAL DENTAL VISION LONG-TERM DISABILITY AND LIFE INSURANCE. SO WITH THAT I WILL TURN IT OVER TO [INAUDIBLE] AND HE WILL QUICKLY GO OVER OUR MEMBER SERVICES.

THANK YOU AMY. I TRIED TO SHOW MY CAMERA. IT IS NOT WORKING. FOR THE MEMBER SERVICES WE DO HAVE A LIST HERE. REALLY WHAT WE TYPICALLY HIGHLIGHT IS MORE THE ON-SITE MEMBER SERVICES. WE VIEW OURSELVES AS AN EXTENSION OF STAFF. AS PART OF THAT WHAT WE DO IS WE DO A RISK ASSESSMENT. AT LEAST EVERY COUPLE YEARS. FROM THAT WE HAVE MORE OF A SCORECARD OF BEST PRACTICES WE LOOK TO HAVE THE CITIES BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN. PART OF THOSE BEST PRACTICES WE HAVE TEMPLATES FOR EXAMPLE THE WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION LAW THE COMES INTO PLACE. ANY OF THOSE PROGRAMS WHERE THEY ARE MANDATED BY THE STATE OR WHETHER THE FEDERAL LEVEL. WE WILL PROVIDE THE TEMPLATES AND THE PROGRAMS FOR THAT AS WELL AS THE TRAINING RESOURCES. A COUPLE OF MORE POPULAR THINGS WE PROVIDE AGAIN AS A BEST PRACTICE WHEN WOULD BE [INAUDIBLE] IS A BASICALLY A POLICY UPDATE SERVICE FOR POLICE AND FIRE. IT INCLUDES DAILY TRAINING AND SO ON. THE GOAL OF MAKING SURE OUR OFFICERS ARE COMPLETELY TRAINED ON THE MOST RECENT POLICIES. AND THAT IN THE EVENT THERE IS SOME TYPE OF CLAIM WE ARE ABLE TO USE THAT AS A DEFENSE AS WELL. THE OTHER MORE USED ITEMS IS ALSO WHAT WE CALL VECTOR OR TARGET SYSTEMS. WHICH IS BASICALLY OUR ONGOING TRAINING PORTAL. WHICH ALLOWS FOR EMPLOYEE TRAINING. INCLUDES ALSO A LOT OF THE MANDATED REQUIRED TRAINING. WHETHER IT BE ETHICS TRAINING THAT IS REQUIRED BY ELECTED OFFICIALS. AS WELL AS THE [INAUDIBLE] SEXUAL HARASSMENT PREVENTION TRAINING AND THINGS

LIKE THAT AS WELL. AMY MENTIONS SOME OF THE LZW CONSORTIUM MEMBERSHIP IN THOSE PROGRAMS. ONE OF THE PROGRAMS WE OFFER IS ACTUALLY A GRANT PROGRAM. IT IS THROUGH THE [INAUDIBLE] THE CITY HAS ACCESS TO GRANT FOR RISK CONTROL SERVICES UP TO \$3500. THAT CAN BE USED FOR PURPOSES WHETHER IT BE TRAINING BUYING EQUIPMENT THOSE TYPE OF THINGS. WITH THE GOAL OF REDUCING WHETHER IT BE EMPLOYEE INJURIES OR POTENTIAL CLAIMS THAT COULD IMPACT THE CITY AS WELL. AND THEN ALSO ARMOR PROVIDES AN ANNUAL GRANT AS WELL. \$2500. THAT CAN BE USED FOR TRAINING AT THE CITY AS WELL. IT IS MORE SPECIFIC TO HR FUNCTIONS. WITH THAT -- WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS COUNCIL MAY HAVE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE WILL BRING IT BACK TO THE COUNCIL TABLE. FIRST OF ALL FROM COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN. ANYTHING TO ADD BEFORE WE TAKE QUESTIONS? LOOKING FROM QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS OR COMMENTS. ANYONE? I HAVE A COUPLE QUESTIONS. ONE IS JUST PROCEDURAL. I DON'T SEE THE SLIDES THAT IN OUR PACKET. I'M HOPING THAT THE SLIDE SET WE HAVE SEEN TONIGHT COULD BE IF IT HAS NOT ALREADY BEEN SENT TO MARY GIRLY AND SHARED WITH US ONLINE.

MARY HAS A COPY.

THANK YOU. IF THAT CAN BE SHARED WITH THE COUNCIL AND POSTED ONLINE THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

AND IF YOU COULD RESEND --

AMY CAN YOU RESEND IT? I DON'T HAVE A COPY.

ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEM.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. VERY HELPFUL SLIDE SET. IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO GET MORE DISTRIBUTION FOR OUR PUBLIC AND FOR US. I HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE EVENTS INSURANCE. IS THE EVENTS INSURANCE THAT YOU SAID AFFORDABLE IS THAT MADE AVAILABLE TO INDIVIDUALS WHO SCHEDULE EVENTS AT OUR PARKS AND ELSEWHERE IN TOWN?

SO AMY CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG. THERE IS SPECIAL EVENT INSURANCE THAT INDIVIDUALS CAN GO THROUGH. I FORGOT THE NAME OF IT. AMY DO YOU HAVE THE NAME?

[INAUDIBLE] -- SORRY. THEY CAN GO THROUGH WHEN THEY APPLY FOR SPECIAL EVENT PERMIT WE HAVE INFORMATION ON THAT PRESENTED TO THEM.

THAT WAS MY ONLY HOPE THAT THAT OPPORTUNITY COULD BE OFFERED TO OUR PUBLIC. I HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE TWO GRANT PROGRAMS. THAT HAVE BEEN MENTIONED. THE 35,000 GRANT PROGRAM AND THEN THERE WAS ANOTHER ONE THROUGH IRMA FOR 25,000. HAS THE CITY TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF THOSE GRANT PROGRAMS?

WE HAVE. THE MOST RECENT THROUGH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN UTILIZING THE GRANT. THIS YEAR WE ARE LOOKING TO UTILIZE IT FOR I BELIEVE IT IS -- IT IS A THREE-PART TRAINING. WE ARE LOOKING TO UTILIZE IT FOR THAT.

THERE WERE TWO GRANT PROGRAMS THAT WERE MENTIONED. ARE WE TAKING ADVANTAGE OF BOTH?

WE ARE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

THE AMOUNT IS 3500 AND 2500.

I KIND OF LIKE 35,000.

WE WOULD LOVE TO BE ABLE TO GIVE YOU THAT MUCH.

EVERYONE BETTER KEEP AN EYE ON ME.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THAT CORRECTION. THAT IS IMPORTANT. I THINK WE ARE DONE WITH COUNCILMEMBER PARTICIPATION ON THIS TOPIC. MARY GIRLY -- COUNCILMEMBER HINTON DID YOU HAVE SOMETHING TO AT ?

NO.

HOPING FOR AFFIRMATION MARY GIRLY IF YOU CAN HANDLE PUBLICCOMMENT ON THIS ITEM.

THANK YOU MAYOR. AMY IS A POSSIBLE TO UN-SHARE YOUR SCREEN? THANK YOU. THIS IS FOR PUBLICCOMMENT ON THE CIRA PRESENTATION. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PRESENTATION. I GO TO CHAMBERS FIRST. I GO OUT TO THE PUBLIC. LINDA UNMUTE YOURSELF PLEASE.

THANK YOU GO AHEAD WITH THEIR PUBLICCOMMENT.

PURCE I WOULD LIKE TO PREFACE THIS [INAUDIBLE] THE FACT I AM [INAUDIBLE] CELL PHONE FREE -- BECAUSE I AM ELECTRIC SENSITIVE. I RELY ON LANDLINE PHONE. FOR PARTICIPATION IN THIS MEETING. SUBSEQUENTLY I DON'T HAVE THE VISUAL INFORMATION THAT YOU HAVE LIKE ON THE COMPUTER. AND SO I WOULD LIKE TO ASK HOW MUCH DOES THIS COST? HOW MUCH IS YOUR SERVICES COST THE CITY? ALSO I'M SURE YOU COVERED IT. YOU KNOW THAT WE'VE ALREADY HAD NUMBER ONE POINT TO MILLION DOLLAR [INAUDIBLE] CYBER [INAUDIBLE]. WHICH WE DID NOT GO AFTER. AND GET BACK OR FIND OUT WHO DID IT. IT WAS LARGELY COVERED THROUGH INSURANCE. THAT WOULD BE I GUESS [INAUDIBLE] I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU COVERED THE LEGAL FEES FOR WHEN THE CITY IS BEING SUED BY [INAUDIBLE] ACLU OR HOUSING DEVELOPERS WERE LIKE THAT? THANK YOU.

THANK YOU LINDA FOR YOUR PUBLICCOMMENT. I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NO PUBLICCOMMENT I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING NONE PUBLICCOMMENT IS CLOSED ON THIS ITEM.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH MARY GIRLY. WOULD ANYONE ELSE LIKE TO RESPOND IN ANY WAY TO THE COMMENTS THAT WE HURT? WE HAVE -- THE SPECIFIC ITEMS. JUST GIVING STAFF THE OPPORTUNITY.

THE ACLU IS NOT THROUGH CIRA. THAT IS ALL I WILL SAY ON THE ACLU. AS FAR AS THE CYBER FRAUD CIRA WAS INSTRUMENTAL IN HELPING US GET THAT MONEY BACK. THAT HAS ALL BEEN TAKEN CARE OFF. ALL THE FUNDS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED.

EXCELLENT. ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS BEFORE WE CLOSE OUT THIS ITEM?

I APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY WE HAVE TO BE PART OF THIS. IT IS HUGE. I'VE EXPERIENCED BEING INVOLVED WITH THE COMMUNITY CENTER FOR SO MANY YEARS. I'M VERY AWARE. JUST APPRECIATIVE. THANK YOU FOR SERVING ON [INAUDIBLE].

I THINK WE ALL [INAUDIBLE] AWESOME.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I THINK AT THIS POINT WE WILL CLOSE OUT THIS ITEM. ANY ACTION WE NEED TO TAKE?

THANK YOU TO AMY FOR BEING HERE AND GIVING US YOUR PRESENTATION. THANK YOU FOR HAVING US.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YOU STUCK TO THE TIMING AND IT WAS ALL CONTENT. BOTH OF WHICH WE REALLY APPRECIATE. SO THANK YOU FOR TAKING VERY VALUABLE TIME HERE.

ABSOLUTELY. THANK YOU.

THAT WAS REALLY INFORMATIVE. GOING BACK TO OUR AGENDA HERE. WE ARE NOW GOING TO TAKE A DEEP DIVE INTO THE PRIMARY TOPIC FOR TONIGHT. THERE ARE A LOT OF TOPICS. THE FIRST ONE UNDER OUR PUBLIC HEARINGS. IS THE PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 24 AND 25. I WILL ALERT THE PUBLIC AT THIS POINT IF THERE IS ANYONE HERE WHO SPECIFICALLY PRESENT EITHER BY A ZOOM OR IN PERSON TO ADDRESS OR PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THE ITEMS AFTER THIS BUDGET DISCUSSION, I CAN'T IMAGINE WE WILL BE GETTING TO THAT ITEM ANY EARLIER THAN ABOUT 7:00 P.M. JUST AS AN ALERT I EXPECT IT WILL TAKE US A COUPLE HOURS TO GET THROUGH THIS ITEM. CITY MANAGER FIRST UP ON THE BUDGET PRESENTATION.

READY WHEN YOU ARE.

AND BEFORE WE DO THAT I JUST WANT TO RECOGNIZE WE DO HAVE THE BUDGET COMMITTEE HERE. THAT INCLUDED OUR CITY MANAGER, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER ARE ADMINISTERED OF SURFACES DIRECTOR AND ALSO TO COUNCILMEMBERS VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN AND COUNCILMEMBER -- I'M SURE THEY WILL BE CHIMING IN WITH THEIR COMMENTS AS WELL AS ALL THE REST OF US. BECAUSE THIS IS OUR FIRST OPPORTUNITY AS A FULL COUNSEL TO LOOK AT THIS PROPOSED BUDGET. PLEASE CITY MANAGER.

I'M PLEASED TO PRESENT TO YOU THE FY 24 AND 25 BUDGET. I WANT TO START BY EMPHASIZING WE WILL FOCUS ON THE GENERAL FUND. IT IS THE LARGEST OF THE CITY FUNDS. THE MOST FLEXIBLE. THE FUNDS MOST CITY SERVICES. YOU HAVE APPROVED THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ALREADY. THAT IS BASICALLY DONE. ENTERPRISE FUNDS WERE LARGELY ADDRESSED IN THE WATER AND WASTEWATER RATE DISCUSSIONS THAT WE'VE HAD OVER THE PAST FEW MONTHS. TONIGHT'S FOCUSING ON THE GENERAL FUND OF COURSE IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR OTHER FUNDS WE CAN ENTERTAIN THOSE. I WOULD LIKE TO STRESS MY APPRECIATION TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE. THE DEPARTMENT HEADS WHO SPENT NUMEROUS HOURS I'M NOT SURE WHY THIS IS NOT MOVING FORWARD.

WHILE WE HAVE A MINUTE I'M SORRY. THE SLIGHT SET WE ARE VIEWING TONIGHT I CAN'T RECALL IF THAT WAS SHARED IN ADVANCE OR POSTED ON OUR WEBSITE. IF NOT CAN WE MAKE SURE THAT IT IS? THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

SO, AGAIN DEPARTMENT HEADS PUT EXTENSIVE TIME INTO THIS AND PREPARING FOR YOUR THE BUDGET COMMITTEE. THE AM INSURED OF SERVICES TEAM -- AND THEN WE HAD ASSISTANCE FROM -- PARTICULARLY ON THE LONG-TERM MODEL AND PROJECTIONS. THANKS TO ALL FOR THAT.

VERY HIGH LEVEL ON REVENUES 14 ALMOST 4 MILLION. 7.6% INCREASE. I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THIS IS WHAT I'VE BEEN CALLING THE DOWN THE MIDDLE APPROACH. IT IS NEITHER CONSERVATIVE NOR AGGRESSIVE. IT IS VERY COMMON FOR JURISDICTIONS TO BE MORE CONSERVATIVE ABOUT REVENUE. I UNDERSTAND THAT HAS BEEN PERHAPS THE PRACTICE HERE AT TIMES. BASICALLY IT CREATES A BIT OF A SAFETY NET. IF WE ARE MORE

CONSERVATIVE ABOUT REVENUE IT GIVES US MORE WIGGLE ROOM. WE HAVE NOT DONE THAT. I WILL CONSIDER THE REVENUES LOOKING OUT A YEAR AHEAD ANYTHING IS GOING TO HAVE UNCERTAINTY. IN THIS CASE WE DO HAVE CONSIDERABLE UNCERTAINTY ABOUT THE REVENUES AS WELL. AND AGAIN IN PRIOR YEARS WE ARE RELYING HEAVILY ON ONE TIME FUNDING SURFACE SOURCES. WE WILL GET INTO THAT SHORTLY.

KEY CHANGES WE HAVE 11% PLUS INCREASE IN PROPERTY TAXES PROJECTED. SALES TAXES WE ARE PROJECTING ALMOST 5% DECREASE. FROM LAST YEAR. COMPARED TO THE ADOPTED BUDGETS. THIS IS THE BUILDING PERMIT FEES. WE ARE PROJECTING A MILLION-DOLLAR INCREASE. PART OF THAT IS A FEE INCREASE. NORMAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY AND THE BULK OF THAT IS FROM ANTICIPATED NEW BUILDING IN THE CITY. PRIMARILY THE CANOPY PROJECT. TALK ABOUT USING ONE-TIME FUNDS WHILE THESE MIGHT LAST A YEAR OR TWO THEY ARE NOT LONG-TERM SUSTAINABLE SOURCE OF REVENUE. AND THEN AS WE NOTED BACK I BELIEVE IT WAS FEBRUARY WHEN YOU SAW THE COST ALLOCATION PLAN. WE WOULD REDUCE THE TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM THE ENTERPRISE FUNDS TO THE GENERAL FUND BY 714,000. THAT IS REFLECTED IN THE BUDGET AS WELL. EXPENSES ARE A TAD OVER 15 MILLION. EIGHT NUMBER 1.3% DECREASE FROM LAST YEAR. THE REDUCTIONS ARE SPREAD ACROSS MOST DEPARTMENTS. THERE'S ALSO A CONSIDERABLE WHAT YOU MIGHT THINK ABOUT OF SHIFTING OF SPENDING FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORGANIZATION. A COUPLE EXAMPLES HERE WE HAVE \$300,000 ALLOCATED TO PRESERVING OUR ASSETS. FROM OUR ROADS AND TECHNOLOGY AND FLEET BUILDINGS EXAMPLES. AND 116,000 TO MODERNIZE SOME OF OUR TECHNOLOGY. WHICH IS QUITE VULNERABLE. IN CASES AND OUTDATED. THOSE ARE EXAMPLES OF INVESTMENTS WE NEED TO MAKE IN THE ORGANIZATION TO KEEP US IN GOOD SHAPE. AND IN THE BUDGET DOES MAINTAIN CITY STAFF. POSITIONS THERE ARE NO LAYOFFS IN THIS BUDGET.

VERY HIGH LEVEL SUMMARY REVENUE ABOUT 14.4. EXPENSES ABOUT 15. DEFICIT OF ABOUT \$670,000 WHICH IS 40% OF THE BUDGET DEFICIT FROM LAST YEAR. WE HAVE AN ADDITIONAL 54,000 OR SO WE WILL TALK ABOUT AT THE END OF THE PRESENTATION. WE WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE ADDING. ANY FURTHER ADDITIONS OF COURSE THE SAME WITH 54,000 WILL INCREASE THE DEFICIT UNLESS WE MAKE REDUCTIONS ELSEWHERE. WE ARE PROJECTING UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE OF ABOUT 2.9 MILLION WERE 19% OF TOTAL CITY EXPENSES.

I'M SORRY CITY MANAGER. I NOTE THAT FLIGHT THAT YOU MENTIONED FURTHER ADDITIONS THAT MIGHT INCREASE THE DEFICIT THAT YOU WILL BE INFORMING US OF LATER.

HOPEFULLY THAT WILL BE FAIRLY SOON.

WE CAN GO TO THE END IF YOU WANT.

PERFECT.

SO THE LONG-TERM MODELS THIS IS WHERE WE RELIED HEAVILY -- SEE INTO THE FUTURE. WE ARE ON AN UNSUSTAINABLE PATH. PARTICULARLY RELYING HEAVILY ON ONE-TIME REVENUES. THE UNASSIGNED GENERAL FUND BALANCE IS AT RISK OF BEING DEPLETED IN LESS THAN THREE YEARS WITHOUT CHANGES. WE DO NEED A LARGE ONGOING SOURCE OF REVENUE IF WE ARE GOING TO BECOME FINANCIALLY STABLE.

OUR STRATEGY IS MULTI-PROMPT INCLUDES A SALES TAX INCREASE OF A QUARTER OR HALF PERCENT. FOUNDATIONAL REVENUE SOURCE. HOTELS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. WE CONTINUE TO WORK ON THOSE. FIRE CONSOLIDATION. HELPS ENSURE OUR FIRE SERVICES ARE WELL-FUNDED. AND MORE EFFICIENT WHEN WE CONSOLIDATE WITH GOLD RICH. LOOKING AT THE ENTERPRISE FINANCING DISTRICT. TO SHORE UP OUR INFRASTRUCTURE AND OUR TEXT CAPACITY. REDUCING CAUSE. AND INCREASING EFFICIENCY. IS ALSO PART OF THE BROAD STRATEGY. I THINK THERE IS A PATH FORWARD TO FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY FOR THE CITY. WE CAN WORK TOGETHER WITH THE COMMUNITY AND GET THERE. I THINK WE HAVE MADE A START ON THAT PATH IN THIS BUDGET CONTINUES DOWN THAT PATH.

THIS SLIDE I RECOGNIZE CAN BE A LITTLE HARD TO SEE. THAT IS WHY YOU HAVE COPIES. PAPER COPIES. WE HAVE SOME FROM THE PUBLIC AS WELL. THIS IS A SUMMARY ESSENTIALLY OF THE COMMUNITY SURVEY WHICH HAD OVER 1000 RESPONSES. THE BLUE ESSENTIALLY IS MORE BLUE REPRESENTS A HIGHER PRIORITY OUR RESIDENTS. I WILL LET YOU LOOK AT THAT AND THEN I WILL TELL YOU THE BOTTOM -- THE NEXT SLIDE. WHEN IT COMES OUT.

SO THE TOP THREE ISSUES PUBLIC SAFETY, MANAGING THE CITY FINANCES AND RESPONDING TO FLOODS AND WILDFIRES. OTHER NATURAL DISASTERS. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT. THEN WE HAD AN OPEN ENDED QUESTION ABOUT OTHER TOPICS. SOMEBODY COULD LIST. REFLECTS THE FREQUENCY OF THOSE TOPICS BEING MENTIONED. I WANT TO MAKE SURE YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO SEE THAT. MAKE DECISIONS ON THE BUDGET.

SO WE ARE GOING TO SHIFT IN A MOMENT TO CHANGES GOING BY DEPARTMENT. IF THAT IS THE WILL OF THE COUNCIL WE CAN STOP AND TAKE QUESTIONS WHENEVER IS YOUR PLEASURE. WE WILL REVIEW THE CHANGES MENTIONED IN THE BUDGET BOOK. SOME OF THE CHANGES ARE SHIFTING FUNDS FROM ONE DEPARTMENT TO ANOTHER. THERE IS NOT REALLY AN INCREASE OR REDUCTION. IT IS TO PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY. PARTICULAR CONTRACT FOR EXAMPLE WOULD RESIDE WITH THE DEPARTMENT. THE RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGING THE CONTRACT IS BUDGET RESPONSIBILITY FOR AS WELL IT HELPS MAJOR CITY MANAGER PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY AND OWNERSHIP. THE BUDGET AND CONTRACTS. AND OTHER EXPENSES. OTHER CASES IT IS JUST A MATTER OF ALIGNING EXPENSES CLOSER TO A DEPARTMENT FUNCTION. AGAIN IT IS A BETTER MANAGEMENT PRACTICE.

CITY MANAGER A QUICK MOMENT CHECK IN WITH THE COUNCIL. ANY QUESTIONS OR SHALL WE PROCEED? NOT SEEING ANY QUESTIONS.

THE BUDGET COMMITTEE CONSIDERED QUITE A FEW ISSUES. BY A LARGE THERE WAS CONSENSUS BUT THERE WERE DISAGREEMENTS. SORRY IF I'M PUSHING THE BUTTON TO QUICKLY. THOSE ARE I THINK I HAVE THEM ALL -- WE WILL TALK ABOUT THOSE WHEN WE GET TO THEM. I WILL INVITE THE COMMITTEE TO OFFER COMMENTS IF THEY WOULD LIKE. THEN WE HAVE MENTIONED ADDITIONAL ITEMS. SOME SUGGESTED ADDITIONS TO THE BUDGET AND IF YOU TOPICS TO COVER AS WE GET TOWARDS THE END OF THE PRESENTATION.

WITH THAT LOOKING AT THE CITY COUNCIL BUDGET. YOU SEE THE ITEMS BEFORE YOU. \$2500 REDUCTION IN THE CONTRACT WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO READ THESE OR HAVE THE COUNCIL READ?

I HAVE A QUESTION FOR THE COUNCIL. IN TERMS OF HANDLING THIS TOPIC THE BUDGET TOPIC. MY IDEA HAD BEEN EVENTUALLY TO GO THROUGH EACH OF THESE ITEMS AND BASICALLY TRY TO IDENTIFY WHICH ONES COUNCILMEMBERS MIGHT BE IN NEED OF FURTHER DISCUSSION ON. MY QUESTION IS WHETHER WE WANT TO DO THIS DURING THE PRESENTATION OR WE WOULD LIKE TO WAIT AND HAVE OUR CITY MANAGER TO THE ENTIRE PRESENTATION AND THEN COME BACK THROUGH. ANY COMMENTS?

I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE OUR GENERAL MANAGER GO THROUGH ALL OF IT. AT LEAST FOR ME I WANT A BIG PICTURE OF WHAT IS HAPPENING.

OKAY. ANY IDEA HOW MANY SLIDES DO YOU HAVE?

PROBABLY 15.

ANY OTHER COUNCILMEMBER --

I'M IN FAVOR OF GOING THROUGH IT. BUT THESE SPECIFIC PAGES NEED A LOT OF DISCUSSION. AND I GUESS THAT IS WHERE OUR DISCUSSION OR CLARIFICATIONS WOULD COME AT THE END OF THE PRESENTATION.

COUNCILMEMBER --

JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE IN THE BUDGET DOES NOT MEAN BY ANY MEANS WE'VE ALL AGREED TO THEM OR VOTED ON THEM. THIS IS A FIRST TIME WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO IF WE DID NOT SERVE IN THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO MAKE COMMENT. THERE'S A LOT OF COMMENTS TO BE MADE.

COUNCILMEMBER LEWIS

I AGREE.

SO IN TERMS OF PROCESS. WE WANT I'M SORRY COUNCILMEMBER MAURER.

UNDERSTOOD THE COUNCIL THAT DOES NOT THAT IS NOT A COMPLETE LIST. SO IT IS A PARTIAL LIST. THERE ARE ITEMS VERY IMPORTANT ITEMS THAT ARE NOT ON THE LIST. SO I WAS MAKING I ASSUMED WE WILL BE GOING DEPARTMENT BY DEPARTMENT.

SO, AND EFFICIENT WAY TO DEAL WITH THIS. TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU ARE GOING TO GO THROUGH EACH ITEM. I'M NOT SURE. THEN WE ARE GOING TO GO BACK TO DISCUSS EACH ITEM. COUNCILMEMBER --

I AGREE. AFTER HAVING READ ALL OF THIS THIS IS NOT ALL-INCLUSIVE. IT IS A LITTLE I DON'T WANT TO PIECEMEAL EVERYTHING AND GO BACK AND FORTH.

SO IN TERMS OF A PROCESS, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON DID YOU HAVE A SUGGESTION?

WE CAN GO THROUGH IT SOME OF THE STANDARD ITEMS I DON'T WANT TO WASTE A LOT OF TIME. IF WE WANT TO USE THE PAGES FROM THE ACTUAL BUDGET THAT IS FINE. BUT AGAIN NOT DISCUSS THINGS THAT ARE NORMAL NORMAL ITEMS I GUESS.

MAKING THE POINT WHICH COUNCILMEMBER HINTON MADE A MINUTE AGO. THIS IS A PROPOSED BUDGET. YOU SEE CITY COUNCIL THAT IS POPULATED BY TWO INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DONE A HUGE DEEP DIVE INTO THE TOPIC. THREE WHO HAVE I GUARANTEE READ ALL OF THIS. BUT ARE NOW JUST REALLY ADDRESSING IT FOR THE FIRST TIME. I'M WONDERING IF YOU CAN CITY MANAGER RESPECT THIS REQUEST FOR AN OVERVIEW. BUT NOT WALK THROUGH EVERY INDIVIDUAL ITEM. INSTEAD JUST GIVE US AN OVERVIEW. CITY COUNCIL, WE HAVE SOME INCREASES AND DECREASES. MOVE ON TO THE NEXT DEPARTMENT. GIVE US AN OVERVIEW AND THEN WE CAN COME BACK AND GO DEPARTMENT BY DEPARTMENT. THAT WOULD ALLOW US TO GO FOR INSTANCE AT THAT POINT 2500 REDUCTION IN CONTRACT. THUMBS

UP OR THUMBS DOWN MOVE IT THAT WAY AND ADD ON ANY ITEMS THAT COUNCILMEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO ADD. TO THOSE ITEMS. IS THAT SOMETHING YOU CAN MANAGE?

CERTAINLY. ONE WAY I WOULD DO THAT IS IF IT HAS FIVE DIGITS OR MORE - - MORE SIGNIFICANT TO SOMETHING THAT HAS FOUR DIGITS OR LESS.

COUNCILMEMBER THE CONCEPT WOULD BE FOR AND EVERYONE FOR THE CITY MANAGER TO LOOK AT THIS SLIDE IDENTIFY CALLED OUT THE TWO OR THREE PRIMARY ITEMS. MOVE ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE. NOT ENGAGES IN DISCUSSION ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS. MOVE ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE AND CALLED OUT A COUPLE OF INDIVIDUAL KEY ITEMS. MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE. THEN WE WOULD COME BACK AND GO CAREFULLY THROUGH EACH DEPARTMENT.

IS THAT ACCEPTABLE?

THAT IS GOING TO BE USING UP TIME THAT WE COULD BE GOING DEPARTMENT BY DEPARTMENT BY DEPARTMENT AND LOOKING AT IT CAREFULLY. EVERYBODY WANTS A CAREFUL LOOK. OUR PUBLIC WANTS A CAREFUL LOOK. MY CONCERN IS THAT IS GOING TO TAKE MORE TIME.

WE HAVE A MATRIX IN THE BUDGET. THERE IS A MATRIX FOR EVERY DEPARTMENT THAT SHOWS WHAT INCREASED OR DECREASED.

LET ME ASK THE CITY MANAGER DO YOU HAVE A DEPARTMENTAL SITE. AFTER THE DEPARTMENTAL SLIDE WHAT DO YOU THEN GO INTO?

THERE ARE A FEW ADDITIONS I MENTIONED BEFORE. THERE ARE SOME ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION.

LET'S JUST SHOW US CITY COUNCIL. SHE WAS THE NEXT DEPARTMENT. SHOW US EACH OF THEM. NO DISCUSSION. GO TO YOUR FINAL SLIDE AND THEN WE WILL COME BACK AND DO THE DETAILED DISCUSSION. THAT IS WHAT I'M SEEING OUR COUNCILMEMBERS INTERESTED IN DOING. I THINK THAT IS THE MOST EFFICIENT USE OF OUR TIME. ANYONE WANT TO OBJECT? SO WE NOTE THIS IS CITY COUNCIL. JUST MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE. SHOW US THE SLIDE. THEN WE ARE GOING TO COME BACK AND YOU CAN HELP US WITH DISCUSSION.

NEXT SLIDE IS --

CITY MANAGER PERFECT.

CITY ATTORNEY. AN ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER AND CITY CLERK.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

EXCELLENT

PLANNING

BUILDING

ENGINEERING

AND THIS IS ALL REFLECTING WHAT IS IN THE TRANSMITTAL -- FIRE.

SOMEONE ELSE IS DRIVING THE SLIDES.

POLICE

AND WHAT IS NEXT? PUBLIC WORKS. THIS IS GOOD. IT GIVES US WHAT THIS DOES IS IT SHOWS US ALL OF THE AREAS WE WILL HAVE TO DEAL WITH. NOT DEPARTMENTAL. IN THE NEXT ONE -- THIS IS KEY FOR YOU CITY MANAGER. THE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS. IF YOU COULD COVER THIS WITH US. NOW WOULD BE GREAT.

THE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS IT INCLUDES \$3000 FOR CLASSIFICATION COMPENSATION STUDY. THESE ARE MOST ITEMS WE CAME UP WITH THE LAST MINUTE WE WERE NOT ABLE TO SQUEEZE THEM IN IN OUR

CONVERSATIONS. SO THIS IS A RECOMMENDATION FOR \$30,000. THE BUDGET COMMITTEE AS WELL. TO ESSENTIALLY REVIEW THE CLASSIFICATION OF OUR EMPLOYEES AND THE COMPENSATION OF OUR NEIGHBORING JURISDICTIONS. SOMETHING WE OUGHT TO DO EVERY FEW YEARS. AT \$10,000 TO UPDATE 2022 STAFFING STUDY. WE ARE MAKING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES AND THAT HELPS US FIGURE OUT HOW BEST TO MAKE THEM. WE ARE SUGGESTING ADDING 3000 FOR COUNCILMEMBER TO ATTEND THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES CONFERENCE. LATER THIS YEAR WHICH WILL HAVE SOME RESOLUTIONS OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE. ADDING 10,000 FOR WARMING AND COOLING CENTERS. WE ARE WE HAVE A FEW DOLLARS LEFT OVER FROM LAST YEAR. NOT ENOUGH TO OPEN UP FOR A FULL DAY. AND THEN ADD \$2400 FOR TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION FROM CIRA. THAT COMES TO \$55,400. I WOULD JUST STOP THERE. I'M HAPPY TO GO INTO FURTHER DETAIL OR MOVE ON IF YOU WOULD LIKE.

THANK YOU. THE REMAINING SLIDES YOU HAVE REMAINING SLIDES. WHEN I TALK ABOUT THE TIME OF PLANNING STAFF. I CAN DO THAT NOW IF YOU WOULD LIKE.

I'M LOOKING AT THE COUNCILMEMBERS. WOULD YOU LIKE TO START GOING THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT DEPARTMENTS ARE WE ABLE TO DO THAT OR FINISH THIS? LET'S FINISH.

ONE TOPIC AGAIN ESPECIALLY WITH THE TRANSITION PLANNING DIRECTORS THAT FELT INCOMPLETE AS WE WERE DOING OUR WORK. WE ARE LOOKING TO HAVE THAT DEPARTMENT INCREASE ITS REVENUE. ESSENTIALLY BY SHIFTING SOME OF THE STAFF TIME TO WORK ON PROJECTS WHICH GENERATE REVENUE. AND ALSO TO KEEP SOME OF THE WORK ON GRANT FUNDED PROJECTS --. ALSO A NEED FOR MORE STAFF TIME TO ADMINISTER GRANTS. GRANTS ARE NOT TRULY FREE MONEY. THEY COME WITH ADMINISTERED IF REQUIREMENTS. SOMETIMES THEY CAN BE BURDENSOME. IF YOU DON'T COMPLETE THE PAPERWORK IN THE REPORTING AND TRACKING YOU ARE AT RISK OF HAVING TO FOR GOULD THE GRANTS OR RETURN TO GRANT FUNDS. IT IS EASY TO TAKE THAT FOR GRANTED. NO PUN INTENDED. BUT WE DO NEED TIME TO CLOSE THAT DO THAT WORK PROPERLY.

A COUPLE OF OPTIONS THAT WE HAVE LOOKED AT. TO CREATE MORE STAFF TIME. ONE IS TO REDUCE THE STAFF SUPPORT FOR THE PUBLIC'S ARTS COMMISSION BY SHIFTING THEM TO QUARTERLY MEETINGS. I HAVE NOT SPOKEN WITH THEM DIRECTLY. THERE IS SOME WILLINGNESS ON THEIR PART TO MAKE THAT SHIFT WHICH WOULD FREE UP SOME OF THE STAFF TIME AND ALLOW THEM TO WORK ON OTHER ITEMS. THE CLIMATE ACTION COMMITTEE. HAS HAD SOME SEVERAL CONVERSATIONS. THEY WANT TO LOOK AT REVISITING THE STAFF. DAVID HAS BEEN OUR POINT PERSON ON THIS FROM THE STAFF PERSPECTIVE. MY SINCE THAT FIRST THOUGHT ABOUT THIS IN TERMS OF REDUCING STAFF TIME. THERE'S A LARGER ISSUE AT PLAY IF I UNDERSTAND IT. WHICH IS THE COMMITTEE IS INTERESTED IN HAVING MORE TAXABILITY ABOUT HOW THEY OPERATE IN TERMS OF THEIR MEETINGS AND OUTREACH. COMMITTEE MEETINGS OR MEETINGS PART OF THE COMMISSION OR THE COMMITTEE BUT NOT THE WHOLE. WHAT I'M NOT SURE IS CLEAR I KNOW THEY WERE BRIEFED AT ONE POINT ON THE BROWN ACT. IT SEEMS QUESTIONABLE BASED ON WHAT I'VE BEEN TOLD. IF THAT FLEXIBILITY STAFF TIME WOULD BE MINIMAL, IS COMPATIBLE WITH

OFFICIAL CITY OF ELYSIAN WHERE WE DO NEED TO HAVE MEETINGS I'M SORRY HAVE AGENDAS AND HALF MINUTES. MAYBE SOME STAFF GUIDANCE TO HEALTH HEALTH INSURANCE COMPLIANCE WITH THE BROWN ACT. IF YOU HAVE A STANDING COMMITTEE HAVE CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS AD HOC COMMITTEES ONLY LAST A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TIME. THIS IS REALLY A CONVERSATION THAT HAS YET TO BE COMPLETED. ABOUT WHAT THE COMMITTEE REALLY WANTS TO BE RELATED TO THAT IS THE AMOUNT OF STAFF TIME TO SUPPORT IT. WE LOOKING FOR COUNSEL DIRECTION ON THESE TWO ITEMS. I WILL FLIP TO A THIRD ONE.

CITY MANAGER BEFORE YOU MOVE ON. THE PROPOSED BUDGET WHAT DOES IT INCLUDE? DOES IT INCLUDE SUFFICIENT STAFFING AND MONEY FOR EXPENSES TO CONTINUE THE CURRENT STAFFING AND COVERAGE FOR THE CURRENT FORMAT OF THESE COMMITTEES OR NOT?

I THINK THE BUDGET IS BASED ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT WE WOULD REDUCE THE STAFF TIME FOR THE PUBLIC PARTS. COMMISSION. WE NEED TO ADDRESS THE CLIMATE ACTION COMMITTEE. DAVID PLEASE COME ON UP OR SIT AT THE TABLE.

WE STILL HAVE A LOT TO GO THROUGH IN TERMS OF THE DEPARTMENTAL PIECES. LET'S NOT GET INTO THAT QUITE YET. WE HAVE TO GO BACK THROUGH ALL OF THE DEPARTMENTS. JUST A QUICK THAT WILL BE A QUESTION LATER ON. THINK GOING INTO A LOT OF DETAIL I KNOW THAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN LATER ON. PLEASE JUST GIVE US AN OVERVIEW OF THE REMAINING ITEMS THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE.

JUST SOME FOLLOW-UP ITEMS ABOUT WHAT WE WOULD DO AFTER -- AT THE END OF THE MEETING. OTHER THAN THAT THAT IS IT.

EXCELLENT. THANK YOU FOR THAT. I KNOW THAT IS A CURTAILED VERSION OF WHAT YOU WERE HOPING TO PRESENT. THE GOOD NEWS IS WE HAVE READ ALL OF THESE DOCUMENTS. WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO NOW IS GO THROUGH EACH DEPARTMENT AND WE WILL DEFINITELY BE LOOKING TO HELP US THROUGH THAT DISCUSSION. AS WELL AS OUR BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS. THESE ARE THE ITEMS ON THE CITY COUNCIL DEPARTMENT LIST. I THINK BEFORE WE LEAD INTO ANALYZING EACH OF THE DEPARTMENTS I WOULD LIKE TO JUST GIVE THE CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS HERE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE THEIR INITIAL THOUGHTS ON THIS BUDGET. PERHAPS START WITH OUR BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS. IF THERE IS ANYTHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO OFFER FIRST. OR WE COULD GO ON TO THE OTHER MEMBERS. VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN?

I WILL MAKE A FEW INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS. WE REALLY TRIED I THINK EVERY PAST YEAR WE'VE TRIED TO BE AS TRANSPARENT AND GET WHATEVER IT IS THAT WE KNEW OUTSIDE OUR COLLEAGUES. AND TO THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE. AS FAST AS WE POSSIBLY COULD. AS WITH LAST YEAR ALL OF THIS IS ON [INAUDIBLE]. ADDITIONAL THINK WE TRIED THIS YEAR WAS A ROLLING LIST OF ACTIONS THAT WE HAD AT EACH BUDGET MEETING. WE WORKED HARD COUNCILMEMBER MAURER AND I WORKED HARD TO REVIEW MARY'S NOTES. AND WE TRIED TO GET THEM POSTED UNDER EACH BUDGET MEETING. SO THAT EVERYONE COULD KIND OF FOLLOW ALONG. ALSO THE HOPE IF THERE WERE ANY BIG THINGS THAT ANYONE WANTED TO DISCUSS OR THROW IN THEY COULD THROW IN AND WE WOULD STILL HAVE TIME TO EXAMINE ALL OF THEM. THAT WAS OUR HOPE. WHICH WAS TO BE AS TRANSPARENT WITH THE INFORMATION AS

SOON AS WE KNEW IT AS FAST AS POSSIBLE. I JUST WANT TO SAY THANK YOU TO THE STAFF. VERY HARD-WORKING VERY DEDICATED. THIS YEAR WAS DIFFERENT. SOME DIFFERENT ACCOUNTING PRACTICES. BUT YES I'M GLAD THAT WE DID THIS. UNFORTUNATELY IT DID NOT MAKE OUR NORMAL TIME PERIOD. NOW WE ARE INTO THE MONTH OF JULY. I HAVE FAITH WE WILL GET IT THROUGH TODAY.

EXCELLENT.

SO, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR McLEWIS.

I JUST WANTED TO SAY THANK YOU VERY MUCH TO THE BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE. HAVING SERVED ON THE BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE FOR 5 YEARS IT IS A LOT OF WORK. I KNOW IT CAN BE YOU DO A LOT OF WORK AND THEN WE GET HERE ON THE FULL DAIS AND THEN EVERYBODY WAYS AND. SOMETIMES IT IS LIKE -- IT IS IT CAN BE DIFFICULT. I THANK YOU FOR YOUR WORK. AND TONIGHT IF I DISAGREE WITH SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT IS PART OF IT. IT IS OBVIOUSLY NOT -- I JUST WANT TO BE UPFRONT ABOUT THAT. I FEEL LIKE THERE IS A LOT OF SUGGESTIONS IN THE BUDGET THAT ARE REALLY POLICY DECISIONS. THAT THE COUNCIL WILL HAVE TO WAIT AND PICK TO WHERE OUR VALUES ARE AND WHETHER WE FEEL LIKE WE CAN'T AFFORD THOSE AT THIS TIME. I'M GOING TO SAVE COMMENTS AS WE GO THROUGH LINE BY LINE. I REALLY APPRECIATE ALL THE WORK FROM CITY STAFF AS WELL.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS TO

I JUST WANT TO SAY THANK YOU. THIS IS A TON OF TIME. I DID NOT WATCH EVERY RECORDING. I DID WATCH QUITE A FEW. IT IS HELPFUL WHEN WE MOVE INTO THIS FINAL PRODUCT. AGAIN MAY NOT ALWAYS DISAGREE BUT I TRULY APPRECIATE THE TIME EVERYONE PUT IN. ALSO IN GENERAL TONIGHT WHEN WE WORK THROUGH THIS, FOR ME MY GUIDING LIGHT IS GOING TO BE THE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK. AND THE DECISIONS IN THE COMMENTS THAT I MAKE. THAT IS JUST HOW I'M APPROACHING THIS TONIGHT. I REALLY APPRECIATE ALL THE FEEDBACK WE DID RECEIVE. AND THAT WE PUT THAT OUT THERE AHEAD OF TIME SO WE COULD HAVE A BETTER IDEA OF WHAT THE COMMUNITY IS THINKING. THANK YOU FOR THAT. THAT IS PRETTY MUCH WHAT I HAVE TO SAY.

ECHO THE NOTES OF APPRECIATION. ALSO THE REMINDER TO EVERYONE THAT THIS IS THE DECISION-MAKING BODY AND THEREFORE ALL OF US HAVE TO GET OUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED ON BEHALF OF ALL OF YOU. RELYING ON THE DEEP DIVE THAT OUR FELLOW CITY COUNCILMEMBERS HAVE DONE. BUT MAKING OUR OWN INDEPENDENT ETHICAL AND WELL-INFORMED WE HOPE DECISIONS. OUR GENERAL PROCESS WOULD BE AND I'M LOOKING TO MARRY GURLEY. IT WOULD BE TO ADDRESS QUESTIONS FIRST. AND THEN GO OUT TO THE PUBLIC. AND IN RETURN TO COUNSEL TABLE FOR COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION. IS THAT THE FORMAT WE NEED TO RESPECT? COUNCILMEMBERS ARE GOING TO BE EAGER TO COMMENT.

I THINK YOU SHOULD GO THROUGH AND ASK ANY CLARIFYING QUESTIONS. FIRST. AND THEN GO OUT AND OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AND BRING IT BACK FOR ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS. OF COURSE IT WOULD BE CONTINUED TO THE AUGUST 12 MEETING. BUT THAT WOULD BE MY RECOMMENDATION. ASK WHATEVER CLARIFYING QUESTIONS FIRST. AS WE GO THROUGH THE BUDGET. THEN OPEN IT UP FOR COMMUNITY INPUT.

IN THAT CONTEXT I THINK WE SHOULD JUST GO THROUGH EACH OF THESE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS. THE COUNCILMEMBER MAURER'S QUESTION POINT AND APPROPRIATE QUESTION COULD BE WAS X ITEM INCLUDED IN THE LIST AND IF SO WHY NOT? THAT MIGHT HELP COUNCILMEMBERS TO IDENTIFY ANY ITEMS THAT WERE IMPORTANT THAT HAVE NOT YET SHOWN UP IN THESE LISTS.

I WANT TO APOLOGIZE WHEN I LOOKED AT THIS LIST I PRETTY MUCH KNOW SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT WERE BIG. I WAS NOT THINKING THAT THIS WAS JUST THE CITY COUNCIL THIS WAS THE OVERALL. SO MY APOLOGIES.

WE WISH IT WAS THE ONLY LIST.

THERE ARE TWO ISSUES IN HERE THAT ARE NOTABLE WHICH IS 10,004 A [INAUDIBLE] SESSION. 4004

WE ARE JUST GOING TO ASK QUESTIONS AT THIS POINT.

I KNOW IT IS HARD. WE ARE EAGER TO GET INTO THIS.

WE HAVE THESE ITEMS THAT ARE HERE ON THE CITY COUNCIL LIST. I KNOW THAT THE SON IS MAKING IT HARD TO READ THEM. I DON'T KNOW IF THERE IS A WAY TO REPOSITION IT. BUT LOOKING AT THESE ITEMS THAT ARE ON THE LIST DOES ANYONE ON THE CITY COUNCIL HAVE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS REGARDING THE ITEMS THAT ARE ON THIS LIST? WE HAVE 2500 REDUCTION IN CONTRACT WITH PCA. 4000 REDUCTION FOR LEGAL HEARING NOTICES. 3500 REDUCTION FOR SHUTTLE FAIR PROGRAM. 36,800 BEING SHIFTED TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. 10,000 SHIFT TO THE PUBLIC FOR PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS TO CITY MANAGER. 7186 INCREASE IN BENEFITS THAT MIGHT BE NEEDED FOR NEW CITY COUNCILMEMBERS. 10,000 INCREASE FOR CONTRACT SUPPORT FOR A GOALSETTING. \$4000 INCREASE TO FUND MEMBERSHIP AND VARIOUS EQUITY RELATED ORGANIZATIONS. ANY QUESTIONS FROM ANY COUNCILMEMBERS ON THE ITEMS HERE?

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

I WOULD LIKE TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE \$3500 REDUCTION IN COSTS FOR THE SHUTTLE FAIR PROGRAM. IS THAT GOING TO MEAN THAT WE WOULD BE COLLECTING FROM WRITERS BECAUSE WE ARE REDUCING OUR FUNDING OR SOME OTHER REASON? THAT IS ONE. 2 MY SECOND RIGHT OFF QUESTION IS THE \$4000 INCREASE FOR FUNDING MEMBERSHIPS IN CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS. IS THE INTENT OF THAT THAT WE WILL ATTEND THESE ORGANIZATIONS AND BE ACTIVE MEMBERS AND WE WOULD ASSIGN STAFF MEMBERS OR IS THAT JUST WRITING A CHECK TO BE LONG? THOSE ARE MY FIRST TWO QUESTIONS.

CITY MANAGER WHO WOULD BEST ANSWER?

I THINK THE REDUCTION IN COST FOR THE SHUTTLE FAIR PROGRAM IS BASICALLY NO CHANGE IN THE PROGRAM. THEY RECOGNIZE WE ARE IN FINANCIAL CHALLENGES. THEY WANT US TO BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE. THEY ARE REDUCING OUR FEES. OTHERWISE THERE SHOULD BE NO CHANGES.

NEXT YEAR THERE MIGHT BE TO RESTORE --

THE OTHER QUESTION WAS REGARDING THE \$4000 IN MEMBERSHIP FEES. THE IDEA HERE IS TO BECOME MEMBERS OF THESE ORGANIZATIONS AS A WAY OF A COUPLE THINGS. ONE IS DEMONSTRATING THE CITIES VALUING DIVERSITY. OUR COMMUNITY AND BEING PART OF THESE ORGANIZATIONS AS A WAY OF DOING THAT. A WAY TO SYMBOLIZE A SIGNAL TO STAFF EITHER POTENTIAL STAFF OR EXISTING STAFF YOU ARE VALUED. REGARDLESS OF YOUR ETHNICITY OR DISABILITIES. SO, IN TERMS OF

ACTUALLY ATTENDING EVENTS I WOULD HOPE WE ARE ABLE TO DO SOME OF THAT. TO A LARGE EXTENT THAT DEPENDS ON TO WHAT EXTENT THE COUNCIL MAKES THIS A PRIORITY FOR SPENDING OF STAFF TIME AS WELL AS COUNCILMEMBERS I PRESUME WOULD BE ABLE TO ATTEND EVENTS. SPONSORED BY THESE ORGANIZATIONS.

I HAD A THIRD ONE. DIRECTED AT OUR CITY CLERK. \$4000 REDUCTION LEGAL HEARING NOTICES. HOW CAN WE REDUCE THAT?

THE REASON WE CAN REDUCE IT IS WE DON'T ANTICIPATE A LOT OF ZONING CODE CHANGES THIS YEAR. BASED ON THE LAST COUPLE YEARS IT DEPENDS ON EVERY FEW YEARS WE HAVE A BIG BUILDING CODE CHANGE. FIRE CODE CHANGE. OVER ALL MUNI CODE CHANGE. WE DON'T ANTICIPATE THAT THIS YEAR. WE WOULD BE ABLE TO REDUCE THAT.

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON THESE ITEMS FOR THE CITY COUNCIL? PROPOSED BUDGET. I HAD A FOLLOW-UP ITEM. IN TERMS OF THE \$4000 MEMBERSHIP AMOUNT. IS THAT SIMPLY A MEMBERSHIP FEE OR DOES THAT PROVIDE OTHER SUBSTANTIVE BENEFITS TO THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL --? ATTENDANCE OPPORTUNITIES.

I DON'T HAVE A REALLY DETAILED UNDERSTANDING OF THE BENEFITS THAT COME WITH MEMBERSHIP. I BELIEVE IT INCLUDES INVITATIONS OR AT LEAST NOTIFICATIONS OF EVENTS. THE GOVERNMENT EQUITY ALSO KNOWN AS -- HAS A ROBUST PROGRAM WHICH I BELIEVE WE HAVE ACCESS TO THE RESOURCE TRAININGS AND OTHER MATERIALS. EVENTS PERHAPS -- I BELIEVE COMES WITH MEMBERSHIP. THAT IS ABOUT AS FAR AS WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO LOOK INTO THIS.

FURTHER DISCUSSION AT A LATER POINT. THE WORDING OF THIS ITEM APPEARS TO IN FACT BE A PLACEHOLDER. THE FUND MEMBERSHIP IN SUCH AS -- I WOULD BE CURIOUS ABOUT WHERE THE \$4000 AMOUNT CAME UP AND WHETHER THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR REDUCED AMOUNT THAT WOULD ALLOW PARTICIPATION BY THE CITY AND SOME IF NOT ALL OF THESE.

THE NUMBERS WE'VE COME UP WITH THE MEMBERSHIP IS \$1000 A YEAR. NAACP OFFERS TEARS RANGING FROM SILVER AS 750 -- DIAMOND AT 2500. LATINO SERVICE PROVIDERS DONATION BASE PROGRAM. THOSE OF THE DOLLARS THAT I HAVE AVAILABLE. THAT IS THE BEST INFORMATION I HAVE. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS -- I'M SORRY COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS.

IS SOMEONE WHO RUNS A MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATION I KNOW THAT PEOPLE BECOME MEMBERS ALL THE TIME. THEN THEY ARE NOT ACTIVE AND DON'T TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE VALUE. I JUST WANT TO KNOW IF THE COUNCIL IS NOT ATTENDING IS IT FEASIBLE FOR STAFF TO BE PARTICIPATING IN THIS? LIKE I SAID I DO THIS EVERY DAY WITH MEMBERSHIPS. I KNOW SOMETIMES QUITE A FEW PEOPLE SIGN UP AND THEY NEVER DO ANYTHING. I JUST WANT TO KNOW WHAT IS REALISTIC?

I THINK SOME ATTENDANCE IS PROBABLY REALISTIC. I WOULD COME BACK TO WHAT I SAID EARLIER ABOUT AND THIS IS THE POINT ABOUT DOING THE GOALSETTING PRIORITY SETTING. YOU HAVE RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO YOU AS A COUNSEL TO DECIDE THE PRIORITIES. THE DOLLARS THE BUDGET IS ONE OF THEM. STAFF TIME IS ANOTHER ONE. TO THE EXTENT YOU MAKE PARTICIPATION IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS OR ACTIVITIES A PRIORITY FOR US THEN WE WILL DO OUR BEST TO HONOR THAT. I WILL SAY WE ARE A THINLY STAFFED ORGANIZATION. I'VE SAID IN THE BUDGET MATERIALS AND ELSEWHERE WE ARE AT OR NEAR OR BELOW THE STAFFING LEVELS

APPROPRIATE FOR A COMMUNITY AND CITY OF THIS SIZE. WE DON'T HAVE FOLKS LOOKING FOR THINGS TO DO. I WOULD HOPE WE WOULD BE ABLE TO DO SOME ENGAGEMENT IF THE COUNCIL DEEMS IT A PRIORITY TO PURSUE THE MEMBERSHIP.

I THINK WE HAVE ABOUT SEVEN DEPARTMENTS LEFT TO GO. LET'S MOVE TO THE NEXT ONE WITH QUESTIONS.

I THINK THIS WOULD BE THE CITY MANAGER. THIS IS WE SEE 52,000 FOUR BAKER TILLY. I UNDERSTAND THAT A CERTAIN PORTION OF THIS ACTUALLY BEFORE AN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES REVIEW. MAYBE CAN DETAIL THE \$52,000 HOW THAT WOULD BREAK DOWN.

I DON'T HAVE A DEFINITIVE BREAKDOWN ON THAT. WE ALSO HAVE SOME FUNDING CONTINUING FROM ACRE TILLY. WE SPENT \$30,000 ON [INAUDIBLE] SERVICES SO FAR THIS YEAR. I WOULD LIKE TO ENSURE WE HAVE FUNDING TO CONTINUE WORKING WITH HIM ON THE FINANCIAL MODELING NEXT FISCAL YEAR AS WELL. SO I DON'T HAVE A DEFINITIVE DOLLAR AMOUNT. THE POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT REVIEW ABETMENT SHOULD OF SERVICES THAT WOULD BE A SECOND PROJECT OR EFFORT. I THINK WE CAN DO BETTER ON REPORTING HOW WE ESTIMATE EXPENSES FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS. IT IS WORTH LOOKING AT. THOSE ARE EXAMPLES OF PRACTICES TO IMPROVE OUR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT THAT I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE A LOOK AT. I DON'T HAVE A SCOPE OF WORK IDENTIFIED IN DETAIL. I HAVE A VERY GOOD START AT IT BUT I HAVE NOT SOLICITED BIDS OR PROPOSALS FROM FIRMS OR INDIVIDUALS WHO MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN CAPABLE OF DOING THIS WORK.

OF THAT 52,000 IT SOUNDS LIKE APPROXIMATELY 30,000 WOULD BE FOR IN YOUR ESTIMATE, FOR CONTINUING SERVICES ADVISORY SERVICES FROM BAKER TILLY. APPROXIMATELY 22,000 YOU EXPECT FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

THAT IS A PRETTY GOOD BALLPARK.

WE ALSO HAVE 23,004 THE VEHICLE AND FOR THE FLEET AND VEHICLE SURVEY TO DETERMINE FUTURE NEEDS. 10,000 FOR FACILITATOR FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. 6000 FOR PAYMENT OF PRIOR OBLIGATIONS IN ORDER TO RELAUNCH FOR AN AMOUNT WE OWE THEM AND DID NOT PAY LAST YEAR. 10,000 FOR SHIPPED OF CONTRACT COSTS FOR PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL TO CITY MANAGER. ANY QUESTIONS ON THESE ITEMS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS?

ONE NOTE I WANT TO REDUCE THE 23,000 TO 20,000. WE DON'T NEED TO SPEND THE FULL 23.

THAT WOULD BE FOR THE FLEET ASSESSMENT. ARE YOU LOOKING TO SHIP THAT 3000 ELSEWHERE?

WE CAN DO THE REST OF THE WORK WITH WHAT WE HAVE.

IS THIS PROCESS WORKING FOR COUNCILMEMBERS TO RUN THROUGH THEM? NEXT SLIDE IS I THINK OUR CITY ATTORNEY. THERE WERE NO CHANGES. WE HAD THE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER. 10,000 AND REDUCE BALLOT MEASURE EXPENSES. GREAT ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER NEEDS \$10,000 LESS. ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT ONE? MOVING ONTO THE NEXT.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. THIS WE HAVE THE 114,600 FOUR -- THIS IS REDUCTIONS. WE WOULD REDUCE THE BUDGET BECAUSE THESE WERE ONE-TIME FUNDS THAT ARE NO LONGER NEEDED.

COST ALLOCATION BALLOT MEASURES IT DEPENDS ON HOW OFTEN YOU DO THEM. WE WON'T BE REPEATING THEM IN THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR.

WE HAVE A REDUCTION HERE FOR THESE ONE-TIME ITEMS THAT WE NO LONGER NEED. \$10,000 INCREASE FOR SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE. \$25,000 SHIPPED OF EXPENSES FOR PROPERTY TAX SERVICES FROM NON-DEPARTMENTAL INTO ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. \$3000 INCREASE FOR ONE PERSON IN THE CITY TO ATTEND THE MORAN SONOMA LEADERSHIP ACADEMY. ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THESE ITEMS?

THE MORAN SONOMA LEADERSHIP ACADEMY. WHO IS THAT AND WHY WOULD THEY BE ATTENDING?

THIS IS A PROGRAM THAT BEGAN THIS YEAR IN SONOMA COUNTY. IT HAS BEEN RUNNING FOR THE BETTER PART OF A DECADE. IN OTHER PARTS OF THE BAY AREA. IT IS DONE ON A COUNTYWIDE BASIS. IT IS ASPIRING AND UP-AND-COMING CITY STAFF ATTEND APPROXIMATELY EIGHT FULL-DAY SESSIONS. IT IS ORGANIZED OR FOUNDED BY A GENTLEMAN WHO IS A BIG GURU ABOUT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT NATIONALLY. FORMER CITY MANAGER FROM PALO ALTO. IT IS HIGHLY REGARDED. A PROGRAM THAT IS WHY IT HAS EXPANDED TO SO MANY COUNTIES. MARIN AND SONOMA COUNTIES ALMOST ARE PARTICIPATED LAST YEAR. INAUGURAL YEAR OF THE PROGRAM. EIGHT FULL DAYS OF PROGRAMMING PLUS MENTORING AND WORK PROJECTS. IT IS A ROBUST PROGRAM FOR PEOPLE ASPIRING TO MOVE UP IN ORGANIZATIONS. FUTURE DEPARTMENT HEADS FOR EXAMPLE. WOULD BE THE AUDIENCE FOR THIS.

I HAVE ONE MORE QUESTION. OF THE NEW SERVER 114 600. HOW MUCH OF THAT WOULD BE ALLOCATED TO SERVICE FROM MARIN IT THEIR CONTRACT? DO I ASSUME CORRECTLY THE 10,000 IS AN ALLOCATION ALSO TO MARIN IT? 114,000 IS A REDUCTION.

SORRY

TO ANSWER THE \$10,000 ITEM.

THE \$10,000 IS FOR THE FINANCIAL SOFTWARE ANNUAL MAINTENANCE. IT WAS UNDER BUDGETED FOR 23 AND 24.

THAT IS AN ANNUAL WE HAVE TO PAY. THANK YOU SO MUCH.

I HAD A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION REGARDING THE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY. YOU SAID IT WAS THE INAUGURAL YEAR. WHO ATTENDED THE INAUGURAL YEAR WHAT LEVEL OF LEADERSHIP WITHIN THE CITY HAS ATTENDED?

NOBODY FROM SEBASTOPOL ATTENDED. FROM OTHER CITIES IT INCLUDED POLICE UNIT LIEUTENANTS. HOUSING PROGRAM MANAGER. ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER. SENIOR ANALYST.

THANK YOU. IT GIVES ME A SENSE OF IT.

WAS SEBASTOPOL THE ONLY CITY THAT WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE ?

IN SONOMA COUNTY I BELIEVE SO. I DON'T KNOW 100%.

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON THIS SLIDE FOR ADMINISTERED OF SERVICES? THIS MOVE ONTO THE NEXT ONE WHICH I THINK IS PLANNING.

THIS TIES INTO THE ITEM WE TALKED ABOUT A FEW MOMENTS AGO ABOUT STAFF TIME AND GOING TO REVENUE-GENERATING WORK. OR GRANT RELATED WORK. AND ALSO INCLUDES I WILL WAIT TO ANSWER QUESTIONS IF YOU PREFER.

SO WE'VE GOT 91,800 FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF STAFF TIME. 50,000 FOR MONITORING OF OWNERSHIP HOUSING UNITS. THAT IS A NEW ITEM. 22,000 FOR MONITORING OF RENTAL HOUSING UNITS. AGAIN A NEW ITEM. GOING

BACK TO THE ITEM THAT OUR CITY MANAGER WAS SUMMARIZING HERE.
ANY QUESTIONS ON THAT ITEM?

GO AHEAD

WHICH ONE DID YOU SAY?

ANY OF THESE ITEMS.

EXPLAIN THE HOUSING -- I READ ABOUT IT.

IF YOU COULD EXPLAIN A LITTLE MORE BETWEEN THAT AND THE
INCLUSIONARY HOUSING. THE 50 IN THE 22.

I'M NOT TERRIBLY FAMILIAR WITH THESE FUNDS. I CAN EXPLAIN THE
RATIONALE FOR THE SPENDING. I DON'T KNOW IF DAVID KNOWS ABOUT THE
FUNDS. THE RATIONALE FOR THE SPENDING.

THE RATIONALE

THIS KEEPS MAKING THAT NOISE. SPELLING I WILL TAKE MY BEST SHOT AT
EXPLAINING IT. IT HELPS US COMPLY WITH THE HOUSING ELEMENT OF OUR
GENERAL PLAN TO PRESERVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING. MONITORING THE
AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO ENSURE IT STAYS AFFORDABLE. WHEN THERE IS A
CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS STAY
WITH THE NEW OWNERSHIP IS WHAT THIS IS ABOUT. I BELIEVE ESSENTIALLY
THE SAME IS TRUE FOR THE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS TO MAKE SURE THEY
STAY AVAILABLE TO FOLKS WHO QUALIFY FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
UNITS. THIS IS A WAY OF TRACKING THAT.

DID YOU SAY IT WAS NEW?

THIS IS A NEW ITEM.

IT IS NEW SPENDING. WHAT DID WE DO PREVIOUSLY?

I DON'T BELIEVE WE DID THE MONITORING. NOT THAT I KNOW OF ANYWAY.

DAVID --

I DID GET A RESPONSE FROM OUR REGARDING THIS QUESTION. FROM DAVID.
THERE YOU GO.

I WOULD BE HAPPY TO. COULD YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION?

THE QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH THE \$50,000 OWNERSHIP HOUSING UNITS.
AMOUNT IN THE 22,000 RENTAL HOUSING UNIT AMOUNT.

RESPONSE YOU GAVE TO ME TODAY BY EMAIL ABOUT THE QUESTIONS
ABOUT THESE EXPENSES AND WHY MAYBE WE SHOULD DO THEM.

I WOULD BE HAPPY TO. SURE. THE PRIOR PLANNING DIRECTOR ACTUALLY
HAD REACHED OUT TO THE --

CAN YOU PUT THE MICROPHONE CLOSER?

REACHED OUT TO THE HOUSING LAND TRUST HERE IN SONOMA COUNTY.
AND ALSO TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION. REQUESTED
PROPOSALS FOR THIS KIND OF WORK. AS I INDICATED IN THE INFORMATION I
FORWARDED TO YOU, EARLIER TODAY, THE HOUSING ELEMENT FOR THE
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL REALLY CALLS FOR MONITORING OF YOUR HOUSING
INVENTORY. YOUR AFFORDABLE HOUSING INVENTORY. IT SPECIFICALLY
STATED IN ONE OF YOUR PROGRAMS IN YOUR HOUSING ELEMENT. AND SO
THE IDEA REALLY IS THE FORMER DIRECTOR RECEIVED PROPOSALS. THE
PROPOSALS WERE NOT ACTED UPON. SO AT THIS TIME THERE IS REALLY NO
FORMAL ACTIVE MONITORING OF YOUR AFFORDABLE HOUSING INVENTORY.
THAT IS NOT RECOMMENDED. FIRST OFF IT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH YOUR
ADOPTED HOUSING ELEMENT. AND IN TERMS OF MAKING SURE THAT THOSE
UNITS THEY AFFORDABLE IN TERMS OF WHO THEY ARE RENTED TO, WHO
THEY ARE SOLD TO, HOW THEY ARE TRANSFERRED OVER TIME IT IS GOING

TO BE IMPORTANT TO HAVE THAT OVERSEEN. CURRENTLY YOU DON'T HAVE THE IN-HOUSE STAFF TO ACTUALLY TAKE ON THAT WORK. SO OUR RECOMMENDATION IS A THIRD-PARTY MONITOR TO DO THAT. I DESCRIBED THAT IN THE INFORMATION I PROVIDED TO YOU.

AS A FOLLOW-UP TO THAT, HOW MANY AFFORDABLE OWNERSHIP HOUSING UNITS DO WE HAVE AND HOW MANY AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS DO WE HAVE?

IN THIS TOWN THERE ARE AT LEAST 137 OWNERSHIP UNITS. IN APPROXIMATELY I'M SORRY. ACTUALLY 391 RENTAL UNITS. COLLECTIVELY, WELL OVER 500 UNITS THAT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO MONITORING. AS I INDICATED IN THE MEMO I GAVE TO YOU, AS PART OF YOUR HOUSING ELEMENT MONITORING ANNUAL MONITORING IT WILL BE IMPORTANT TO DEMONSTRATE TO THE STATE HCD THAT YOU ARE ACTIVELY MONITORING THESE UNITS TO ENSURE THAT THEY STAY AFFORDABLE.

THE QUESTION I HAVE IS WE ARE MONITORING BUT DO WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO ENFORCE? IF WE ARE JUST MONITORING BUT WE DON'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT THEN I'M JUST QUESTIONING THE SPEND.

I THINK YOU DO. WHAT IS REALLY IMPORTANT IS TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS GOING ON OUT THERE IN TERMS OF AS YOU HAVE A MONITOR THEY WILL KEEP TRACK OF THE RESTRICTIONS THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL PUTS ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. AND TO ENSURE THEN BY CHECKING ON THOSE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS THAT THOSE UNITS ARE BEING RENTED AND SOLD TO ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS NUMBER ONE. IF THEY ARE NOT, DOING THAT THEN THEY WILL PROVIDE NOTIFICATION TO THE CITY. THE CITY CAN USE THAT INFORMATION IN TERMS OF WORKING WITH THOSE PROPERTY OWNERS. OTHERWISE YOU COULD AS A CITY LOOSE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS AS THEY MAY BE RENTED OR SOLD TO HOUSEHOLDS THAT ARE NOT ELIGIBLE. HCD HAS PUT IN PLACE AN ENFORCEMENT GROUP. THEY WILL BE LOOKING MUCH MORE CAREFULLY AT THIS OVER TIME. AS PART OF YOUR ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS.

I'M JUST WONDERING ARE WE PENALIZED? I'M JUST WONDERING --

I THINK SHE IS LOOKING FOR THE ACTUAL CONSEQUENCES. IF WE DON'T DO IT THIS IS A CHUNK OF MONEY. LET'S RECOGNIZE THAT. \$72,000. WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES IF WE DON'T DO THIS?

THE CONSEQUENCES ARE WORST-CASE CONSEQUENCES ARE THAT YOU LOOSE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS. AS HCD HOUSING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WOULD BECOME AWARE OF THAT, WORST-CASE COULD JEOPARDIZE CERTIFICATION OF YOUR HOUSING ELEMENT. WHICH COULD AFFECT YOUR ABILITY TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR GRANTS. A STANDARD REQUIREMENT FOR GRANT MONEY IS THAT YOU HAVE A CERTIFIED HOUSING ELEMENT. AND YOU ARE IN GOOD STANDING WITH HCD. FURTHER THERE ARE FINES AND PENALTIES.

THOSE ARE SOME OF THE CONSEQUENCES.

DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION? I'M GOING TO GO BACK TO THE 91,800. I AM CURIOUS ABOUT THE WORDING OF THIS. 91,800 AND REIMBURSEMENT OF STAFF TIME FOR REVENUE-GENERATING WORK ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. WHY ARE WE CALLING THIS ISN'T IS \$91,800 TO BE SPENT ON STAFF TIME FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND GRANTS? WHAT IS THE REIMBURSEMENT PIECE?

IF I COULD I WOULD BE HAPPY TO TRY TO EXPLAIN. THE IDEA IS THE CITY CAN FREE UP STAFF TIME TO THEN WORK ON REIMBURSABLE PROJECTS WHETHER IT IS A DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS LIKE THE HOTEL PROJECT HOTEL SEBASTOPOL . WORK DIRECTLY ON GRANTS. WHERE STAFF TIME IS ELIGIBLE FOR FREE REIMBURSEMENT THAT IS THE \$91,800. AS THE STAFF DOES NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY TO WORK ON THOSE PROJECTS, THEN CITY WOULD BE IN A POSITION IT WOULD NEED TO CONTRACT OUT FOR CONTRACT STAFF TO DO THAT WORK. AND THOSE FUNDS THAT COULD BE HELD WITHIN THE CITY I THEN PASSED THROUGH TO AN OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR. DOES THAT HELP?

THAT ANSWERS THE QUESTION BUT IT ALSO RAISES ANOTHER QUESTION. IF THE EXPECTATION IS THIS \$91,800 WORTH OF STAFF TIME WILL RESULT IN REVENUE REIMBURSEMENT TO THE CITY, ARE WE ALSO SAYING THIS PROPOSED BUDGET ON THE RECEIPT SIDE THE EXPECTATION OF \$91,800 COMING IN AS A RESULT OF THE REIMBURSABLE EFFORTS BY OUR STAFF?

THE OVERALL ASSUMPTION AGAIN AS PART OF THE PART OF THE BUDGET IS THAT THERE WOULD BE ADDITIONAL STAFF CAPACITY MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH REORGANIZATION OF YOUR BOARDS COMMITTEES AND COMMISSION. SO AS THAT COULD OCCUR, THAT IS PART OF YOUR WIDER DISCUSSION.

I UNDERSTAND. THE JUSTIFICATION HERE I THINK I UNDERSTAND CLEARLY. WE WANT TO USE THAT STAFF TIME IN ORDER TO DO WORK THAT CAN THEN BE REIMBURSED. SO MY QUESTION AGAIN WOULD BE IF WE ARE PUTTING THIS ON THE EXPENSE SIDE ARE WE ALSO ON THE REVENUE SIDE HAVING A LINE ITEM THAT SAYS WE EXPECT 91,800 TO COME IN? WE ARE NOT. IS THE ANSWER FROM OUR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR.

THE WAY IT WORKS WITH THE STAFF REIMBURSEMENT IS IT IS THERE IS A LINE ITEM ON PAGE 65 SPECIFICALLY FOR THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT. STAFF WILL GET PAID THE WAY THEY GET PAID. THAT IS HOW WE BUDGET. AS THEY WORK THROUGH THESE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS GRANT PROJECTS THEY WOULD SUBMIT TO HAVE A NET [INAUDIBLE] DECREASED TO THE COST OF THE SALARY OF YOUR SALARY. YOU WILL SEE ON THAT PAGE 65 ON THE DETAILS THERE IS A LINE ITEM CALLED STAFF REIMBURSEMENT. THAT WOULD BE A NET EXPENSE.

IT SOUNDS LIKE THE NET RESULT OF ALL OF THAT IS THAT YES THERE IS FACTORED IN --

THERE IS A DIFFERENT METHODOLOGY FOR REIMBURSEMENT.

SOMEWHERE THERE IS AN EXPECTATION THAT THAT \$91,800 -- THE GENERAL FUND.

THAT IS WHAT I WANTED TO KNOW. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

I WANT TO COMMENT. YOU WERE SAYING YOU SENT US THIS INFORMATION. NOT THAT I DID NOT READ IT. WE RECEIVED IT 20 MINUTES BEFORE WE STARTED THE MEETING. JUST PUTTING IT OUT THERE.

THANK YOU. ANY OTHER --

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ON THIS PLANNING LIST?

OKAY SO ANYTHING?

LET'S GO ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

WHICH IS BUILDING.

WE TALKED BRIEFLY BEFORE ABOUT THE SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN THE ONE-TIME REVENUE LARGELY FROM THE CANOPY PROJECT AND ALSO TO A LESSER EXTENT FROM THE FEE INCREASES YOU APPROVED NOT TOO LONG

AGO. THERE IS 50,000 INCREASED INSPECTIONS AND RELATED WORK DUE TO THE INCREASED IN DEVELOPMENT.

I DID HAVE A COUPLE QUESTIONS. BUT ANY QUESTIONS FROM OTHER COUNCILMEMBERS? MY QUESTION ON BUILDING IS YOU MENTIONED THE \$1 MILLION EXPECTED TO COME IN THROUGH THE CANOPY PROJECT. WHAT PORTION OF THAT \$1 MILLION WOULD GO INTO OUR GENERAL FUND?

ALL OF IT.

AND IS THAT REFLECTED IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET \$1 MILLION IN REVENUE FOR OUR GENERAL FUND?

IT IS 800,000 ADDITIONAL FROM THE CANOPY PROJECT. MAKING A TOTAL OF NUMBER ONE POINT TO. WE WOULD GET 400,000 WITH OUR EVERYDAY SMALL PERMITS. BUT 100% OF THAT 1 POINT TO IS GOING INTO THE GENERAL FUND AT THIS YEAR.

THIS FISCAL YEAR.

THIS FISCAL YEAR. A LIKE AMOUNT OR SOMEWHERE NEAR THAT AMOUNT WOULD GO IN NEXT YEAR. BEFORE THERE IS NO MORE LAND TO BUILD.

THANK YOU COUNCILMEMBER.

I HEARD SOMETHING ABOUT MONEY FROM [INAUDIBLE] IN THIS YEAR'S BUDGET. IS THAT ALLOCATED SOMEWHERE?

IT IS IN THERE. \$100,000 I BELIEVE WE ADDED IT CORRECT. FOR THAT PROJECT. THERE IS 22 UNITS UP THERE TYPICALLY VOTING PERMITS FOR \$20,000. SINCE THAT IS AN APARTMENT BUILDING YOU DON'T GET THOSE FULL FEES. IT IS BASICALLY ABOUT 100 TO 110 WILL BE THE BUILDING PERMIT PORTION. THEY WOULD BE IMPACT FEES THAT WILL BE COLLECTED IN NEXT YEAR'S BUDGET AT THE VERY EARLIEST. THEY DON'T PAY THOSE UNTIL THE PROJECT IS DONE.

TWO QUESTIONS. YOU JUST SAID A TYPICAL FEE FOR A NEW HOME CONSTRUCTION IS 20,000.

CORRECT

SECOND QUESTION WAS SO -- WORKED INTO THE 400,000 ESTIMATED.

IT IS OVER AND ABOVE.

[INAUDIBLE] COMMONS IS ABOUT THAT AND IT IS 100,000. I THINK OUR TOTAL NOW IS 1.3. AND I SAID ONE POINT TOO EARLY. 800,000 FROM CANOPY REFIGURED 40,000 -- -- 400 WOULD BE A NORMAL YEAR. THAT IS OUR ROUTINE REMODELS AND A/D USE IN THOSE KIND OF THINGS. THEN WE STUCK ANOTHER 100,000 FOR COMMENTS.

I WOULD LIKE TO DOUBLE CHECK WITH OUR CITY MANAGER. IS IN FACT THE 100,000 ANTICIPATED FROM COMMENTS IN THIS PROPOSED BUDGET?

YES

AND THEN A QUESTION THAT I HAD FOLLOW-UP ON THIS TOPIC WHICH IS I'VE HEARD YOU MENTION THE IMPACT FEES. SO THE IMPACT FEES MY UNDERSTANDING DO NOT GO INTO THE GENERAL FUND. BUT THEY WOULD BE WHICH FUND WITH THEY GO INTO?

THERE ARE ENTERPRISE FUND FIRST SEWER WATER TRAFFIC MITIGATION. BUILDING AND FACILITIES.

THERE IS ONE FOR FIRE FACILITIES. I THINK BUILDING FACILITIES IS \$1000 PER NEW HOUSE AND FIRE FACILITIES IS SOMETHING THAT AREA. NONE OF THOSE ARE GENERAL FUND ACCOUNTS. THEY ARE ENTERPRISE FUNDS THAT CAN ONLY BE USED FOR THE MAINTENANCE REPAIR OF THOSE SPECIFIC FACILITIES. IN CALIFORNIA NOW WE CANNOT COLLECT IMPACT FEES

UPFRONT. THEY HAVE TO BE COLLECTED AT COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT. SO MOST OF THOSE WOULD NOT BE REALIZED UNTIL THE 25 AND 26 FISCAL YEAR.

THOSE IMPACT FEES CAN ALSO BE USED FOR ROADS AND STREETS AND OTHER PURPOSES.

ABSOLUTELY. LIKE I SAID THERE ARE FIVE DIFFERENT OR SIX DIFFERENT IMPACT FEES THAT ARE IN THERE THAT CAN BE USED FOR DIFFERENT THINGS. INCLUDING THERE WILL BE MONEY TO REFURBISH WELLS AND THOSE KINDS OF THINGS. AND THOSE ENTERPRISE FUNDS.

MY QUESTION IS TO STAFF OR WHOEVER COULD ANSWER THIS QUESTION. IN OUR PROPOSED BUDGET DO WE SHOW THOSE IMPACT FEES THOSE PROJECTED IMPACT FEES IS BEING RECEIVED AND WHERE DO THEY SHOW UP AND ARE THEY TARGETED TO BENEFIT PARTICULAR PROJECTS?

THEY ARE TARGETED FOR EACH ONE OF THOSE FUNCTIONS. WE DO SHOW A DRASTIC INCREASE IN IMPACT FEES THIS FISCAL YEAR. A LOT OF THAT WILL COME FROM THE WOODMARK PROJECT. THEY HAVE NOT PAID THEIR IMPACT FEES AS OF YET. YOU ARE LOOKING AT ME LIKE I'M SAYING SOMETHING WRONG.

WHERE DO THOSE SHOW UP IN OUR BUDGET? THOSE IMPACT FEES. I ASKED THE QUESTION BECAUSE THE FULL FOCUS ON ROADS AND STREETS. THEY ARE ALL OVER THE PLACE. THAT IS WHERE ALL THE SPECIAL [INAUDIBLE] START. SINCE I'M SHARING MY SCREEN I CAN SEE THE BACKGROUND. PAGE 169 WITH THE GENERAL GOVERNMENTAL FACILITY FEE FUNDS. THERE IS 150,000 DOLLARS AND THEREFORE SOMETHING. 169.

THE POINT IS WITHOUT DERAILING US TOO MUCH HERE. THOSE AMOUNTS ARE SHOWING UP AS RECEIVED REVENUE. IT LOOKS LIKE 150,000 ON PAGE 169. THAT AMOUNT COULD BE USED FOR ROADS AND STREETS OR OTHER -- THE EACH HAVE TO BE USED FOR THEIR SPECIFIC PURPOSE. SEWER CANNOT BE USED FOR WATER. WATER CANNOT BE USED FOR SEWER. THERE ARE SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNTS THAT ARE GOING AND THOSE NON-GENERAL FUND ACCOUNTS THAT CAN BE USED FOR EXACTLY WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT IS THE ONLY QUESTIONS I HAD. ANY COUNCILMEMBER QUESTIONS ON BUILDING OR CAN WE MOVE ON? LET'S MOVE ON IF WE COULD PICK CITY MANAGER I THINK IT IS ENGINEERING.

ENGINEERING THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE I GUESS THERE ARE A COUPLE HERE.

I JUST WANTED TO KNOW FOR PURPOSES OF THE PUBLIC THAT IN THE TRANSMITTAL LETTER THAT THERE ARE EXPENSES. ASSOCIATED WITH THE CANOPY PROJECT. IT LOOKS TO BE 50,000 TO COVER THE COST OF THE INSPECTIONS NEEDED FOR THE PROJECT. AND 50,000 TO ADDRESS A ADDITIONAL BUILDING RELATED EXPENSES. IS THAT CORRECT?

I BELIEVE SO.

BASICALLY BY CONTRACT COVERS 20 HOURS A WEEK RIGHT NOW. TO HANDLE THE CANOPY PROJECT WE BUMPED THAT UP TO BASICALLY 27 HOURS A WEEK. TO HANDLE THAT. YES THERE WILL BE A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF WORK FOR CITY STAFF ON THAT PROJECT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

COUNCILMEMBER TRAN05

WE ARE COMBINING PROPOSE TO COMBINE ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS. WE TALK ABOUT EFFICIENCIES. WE WILL GET SOME HERE WE MAKE THAT MERGER. SO THAT IS THE PRIMARY SAVINGS RELATED TO THAT. SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR PARTICULAR WILL BE I THINK WE WILL SEE THE BENEFITS. THE FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN GHD CONTRACT FOR [INAUDIBLE] SERVICES. THEN WE HAVE MORE MODEST REDUCTION FOR SHIFTING THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONTRACT TO POLICE. REDUCING THAT CONTRACT AND THEN WE ADDED \$5000 SO WE COULD HAVE OUR ENGINEERING CONSULTANT HELP US WITH THE SOLID WASTE PROCUREMENT. WHICH I THINK WE WILL NEED TO DO THAT.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ON THIS SLIDE?

THIS IS THE FIRST TIME WE'VE SEEN THIS PLAN OR SUGGESTION. OBVIOUSLY AT LEAST IN MY MIND A CITY ENGINEER CAUSED A WHOLE LOT MORE THAN PUBLIC WORKS TYPE INDIVIDUAL. SO, I'M CURIOUS WITH THE STRUCTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT BE -- WOULD THERE BE AN ASSISTANT TO HELP WITH THE NON-I GUESS -- I THINK THERE ARE TWO DIFFERENT LEVELS OF INDIVIDUAL. IT WOULD SEEM LIKE WE WOULD HAVE THE CITY ENGINEERING DOING ALL THE WORK AND THEY PROBABLY WOULD [INAUDIBLE]. CAN ONE PERSON FILL THE ROLE OF TWO IS MY QUESTION WITHOUT ASSISTANT OR SOME KIND OF STRUCTURE? ALSO TO SAY WE'VE GOTTEN A LOT OF FRANCE FROM OUR ASSOCIATION WITH OUR CONSULTANT -- TONY [INAUDIBLE]. WE DID NOT GET THAT LEVEL OF GRANT PRIOR TO THE STRUCTURE WE HAVE NOW. ARE WE CONFIDENT THAT WE WOULD CONTINUE TO GET THE LEVEL OF ROAD GRANTS WE'VE BEEN GETTING THROUGH HAVING A SPECIALIZED CONSULTANT?

I WILL SPEAK BRIEFLY TO THIS. I DON'T KNOW IF TONY IS ONLINE. COMBINING HAVING PUBLIC WORKS IN THE CITY ENGINEER TOGETHER IS A COMMON MODEL. WHEN YOU CAN GET SOMETHING THAT QUALIFIES FOR BOTH ROLLS WHICH IS NOT ALWAYS THE CASE. ON THAT IS NOT THE CASE WE HAVE TO FIND A CONTRACTOR SOME OTHER WAY TO ADDRESS THE ENGINEERING THE OFFICIAL ENGINEERING ROLLS OF THE CITY. AND THEN IF MARY OR TONY WANTS TO SPEAK TO THE GRANT WORK IN PARTICULAR. I'M NOT AS FAMILIAR WITH THAT.

I CAN'T SPEAK TO THE GRANT. I KNOW TONY HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN GETTING THOSE GRANTS. FOR THE STREETS ESPECIALLY THROUGH THE AS ETA. AND ALL OF THAT. IT WOULD BE ANTICIPATED THAT A CITY ENGINEER WOULD BE ABLE TO DO THAT AS WELL. THIS IS HER RECOMMENDATION AS WELL. WE DISCUSSED IT AT LENGTH ABOUT THAT. HER CALL IS TO GO AHEAD AND RECRUIT FOR PUBLIC WORKS SO IT ENGINEER WHICH IS LOT OF THE CITIES DO NOW. SMALLER CITIES SUCH AS OURS. THE REDUCTIONS WOULD REALLY BE BASED UPON THE FACT WE WOULD HAVE THAT WE WOULD NOT HAVE THAT CONTRACT ANYMORE WITH GHD FOR OUTSIDE. ONCE WE DO A RECRUITMENT WE ARE RUNNING INTO ISSUES NOW WITH PLANNING DIRECTOR RECRUITMENTS. DEPENDING UPON WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE IF WE HAVE QUALIFIED CANDIDATES -- IT COULD BE THAT IT WOULD BE A PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR THAT COULD HAVE SOME TYPE OF ENGINEERING BACKGROUND BUT NOT HAVE AN ENGINEER STAMP. WE CAN LOOK AT IT WOULD BE A REDUCED COST AT THAT POINT. THEN WE WOULD

ADD ADDITIONAL FUNDING BACK AND FOR A SMALL AMOUNT OF FUNDING FOR JUST THE USE OF A STAMP FOR CIVIL ENGINEERS. I THINK IT WILL WORK PERSONALLY. IT IS OUR HOPE TO BRING THIS ITEM ON THE AUGUST 6 MEETING. FOR DISCUSSION. TONY IS IN FULL SUPPORT OF THIS AS WELL. RIGHT NOW IT IS JUST A PLACEHOLDER IS WHAT YOU'RE RECOMMENDING IN THE BUDGET.

BECAUSE THAT IS MY QUESTION. IT REALLY IS A PLACEHOLDER ITEM. A FULL DISCUSSION WILL BE HAT DOWN THE ROAD.

THIS IS A PLACEHOLDER. WE WILL BRING IT BACK AT THE AUGUST 6 MEETING TO DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL JOB DESCRIPTIONS AND SALARY COSTS. THIS IS A PLACEHOLDER BASED UPON THOSE FURTHER ACTIONS.

WOULD BE HELPFUL IF YOU GUYS KNOW IF IT IS A PLACEHOLDER COMING BACK FOR FURTHER ACTION. IT IS A LITTLE CONFUSING FROM THIS BUDGET WHAT WE ARE DECIDING TONIGHT AND WHAT WE ARE PUTTING IN AS A PLACEHOLDER THAT WOULD COME BACK FOR A POLICY DISCUSSION. TO ME ANYWAY. IF YOU COULD CLARIFY THAT THERE ARE OTHER ITEMS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT THAT ARE JUST PLACEHOLDERS.

THAT WOULD BE VERY USEFUL WHEN WE COME BACK AFTER PUBLIC COMMENT. AS WE ARE GOING TO EACH OF THE ITEMS TO HAVE STAFF BE ABLE TO POINT THAT OUT. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON ENGINEERING FROM COUNCILMEMBERS?

MY QUESTION IS REALLY THIS IS A BIG SAVINGS. MY QUESTION IS WHAT REDUCTION IN SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC IF ANY WILL WE SEE IN THIS -- AND THESE CHANGES? IS IT SIMPLY SAVINGS FROM CONSOLIDATING 2 POSITIONS OR ARE WE LOSING SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC?

WE ARE LOSING SERVICES. I'M GOING TO ASK TONY TO ELABORATE.

THERE WILL BE A REDUCTION IN SERVICES. WHAT WAS BEING USED TO. AND SO WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IS THAT WHEN THE PUBLIC CALLS ENGINEERING TYPICALLY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT RESPONSE. WHETHER OR NOT IT IS RELATED TO A PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY OR EVEN RESPONDING IF THAT IS PRIVATE PROPERTY. IN SOME CASES. AND SO AND THAT IS NOT TYPICAL BY THE WAY. HISTORICALLY THAT IS WHAT SEBASTOPOL IS USED TO. HOWEVER IN MOST OF THE CITIES I'VE DEALT WITH IF IT IS A PRIVATE MATTER IT IS A PRIVATE MATTER. IT IS NOT REALLY SOMETHING THAT INVOLVES THE PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE. SO THAT IS PROBABLY THE BIGGEST DIFFERENCE. SOMETIMES IT TAKES ACTUALLY HAVING TO GO TO THE PROPERTY TO JUST LET THEM KNOW WHAT IS NEEDED. WE WON'T DO A DESIGN FOR THEM. AT LEAST WE WILL GIVE THEM SOME GUIDANCE. WE WON'T BE ABLE TO DO THAT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I DON'T THINK I SEE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON ENGINEERING. WE CAN MOVE ON TO THE NEXT AREA WHICH IS FIRE.

SPEAKING OF PLACEHOLDERS, ON THE FIRE BUDGET, SO WE HAVE NOT FILLING THE FIRE CHIEF POSITION SAVE US MONEY. WE ARE SAVING ON [INAUDIBLE] IT IS A TRADE-OFF. WE DO HAVE SOME \$95,000 AVAILABLE TO FUND COSTS FOR FIRE CONSOLIDATION WITH GOLD RICH. TO SOME EXTENT A PLACEHOLDER. WE DON'T KNOW TO WHAT EXTENT WE ARE GOING TO NEED ALL OF THOSE. THERE'S A \$40,000 INCREASE TO EXPAND COVERAGE AND SHIFTING \$40,000 FROM THE RETENTION EXPENSE ON THE STIPENDS TO ALSO EXPAND COVERAGE. I LOOK AT THOSE AS PLACEHOLDERS AS WELL. WITH THE GOAL OF EXPANDING COVERAGE. IT GIVES US SOME FUNDING

AVAILABLE TO DO THAT. THERE IS ALSO THE \$100,000 FOR USES TO BE DETERMINED. THAT IS ALSO A PLACEHOLDER ITEM. THIS IS A BUDGET THAT THE BOTTOM POINT I THINK IS REALLY IMPORTANT. WE NEED TO BE FLEXIBLE WITH CONSOLIDATION COMING. AS WE MAKE A TRANSITION WE ARE NOT WAITING UNTIL CONSOLIDATION HAPPENS TO START THE PROCESS. AND ALSO WE HAVE EXPECTS ITS HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IN REVENUE FOR MEASURE H FOR THIS YEAR. FISCAL YEAR. WE BUDGET 300,000 OF THAT -- INCLUDED IN THE BUDGET. ABOUT 300,000 MORE WE HAVE NOT ALLOCATED AT THIS POINT. IF THERE IS A BUDGET IN HERE THAT NEEDS IN MY OPINION -- WE NEED TO BE FLEXIBLE WITH. I THINK THE CHIEF OF GOLD RICH CONCURS WITH THIS. TO THE EXTENT WE HAVE TALKED TO THE FIRE AD HOC. WE NEED TO BE FLEXIBLE.

WITH THESE FUNDS.

LOOKING FOR QUESTIONS FROM ANY COUNCILMEMBERS ON THESE ITEMS. I THINK WE ARE HEARING A NUMBER OF THESE DOLLAR AMOUNTS ARE REALLY PLACEHOLDERS. TO BE DETERMINED LATER. WOULD IT BE FAIR WOULD IT BE ACCURATE TO SAY THAT THE CONCEPT HERE WOULD BE TO SPECIFICALLY ASK THE STIPEND AMOUNTS THAT ARE MENTIONED THAT THE IDEA THE REQUEST IS TO SET ASIDE THOSE AMOUNTS BUT NOT ALLOCATE THEM SPECIFICALLY UNTIL THEY WERE BROUGHT BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOLLOWING MORE EXAMINATION BY THE AD HOC?

I THINK THAT WOULD HELP CLARIFY. WE HAVE OUR FIRE CHIEF NODDING HIS HEAD SAYING YES. ANY INPUT ON THAT FROM OUR FIRE AD HOC COMMITTEE MEMBERS?

YES, I MEAN WE CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS LATER. MAYBE SPEAK TO IT WHEN WE ARE SPEAKING TO IT. RIGHT NOW WE HAD AN ACTIVE MEETING BEFORE THIS MEETING STARTED. WE HAVE ANOTHER MEETING SCHEDULED AND REPORT OUTS. WE HAVE AS I MENTIONED IN PREVIOUS HAD AN UNAUTHORIZED PILOT PROGRAM THAT WE TESTED SOME EXTENDED STIPENDS FOR NIGHT COVERAGE. THE PROGRAM HAS STOPPED. WE NEED TO GET BACK TO WHERE THE AD HOC ALONG WITH OUR PARTNERS CAN COME UP WITH OUR NEXT REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FULL CITY COUNCIL. SO THAT WE CAN MAKE A SOLID RECOMMENDATION. WE ARE JUST NOT THERE YET.

THESE ARE REALLY PLACEHOLDERS.

AND THEN AGAIN IN THE SPIRIT OF PLACEHOLDERS WE WILL COME BACK TO THE FULL CITY COUNCIL TO MAKE FULL RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT WHAT WE ARE RECOMMENDING.

THAT IS IN REGARD TO THE STIPENDS -- TRAN02

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE WILL COME BACK FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. APPRECIATE OUR FIRE CHIEF AND OTHER STAFF MEMBERS. WE HAVE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON FIRE?

I'M LOOKING AT OUR REMAINING TOPICS TO RUN THROUGH. I SEE POLICE. PUBLIC WORKS. A SUBCATEGORY THAT INCLUDES SENIOR CENTER COMMUNITY CENTER. THAT IS REALLY PART OF PUBLIC WORKS. AND THEN NON-DEPARTMENTAL. MY QUESTION TO THE CITY COUNCIL IS IS EVERYONE HERE COMFORTABLE MOVING THROUGH THE REMAINING POLICE AND PUBLIC WORKS ITEMS OR IS THERE ANYONE WHO NEEDS TO TAKE A QUICK -- SO I'M SEEING COUNCILMEMBERS SAYING THEY NEED A QUICK BREAK. MAY BE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK. OKAY. LET'S DO A QUICK FIVE MINUTE BREAK. WE

WILL COME BACK AND WE ARE GOING TO MUSCLE THROUGH THESE REMAINING ITEMS FOR THE BUDGET. THANK YOU.

[CAPTIONERS TRANSITIONING]

THANK YOU, EVERYONE, THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE, BACK TO THE BUDGET DISCUSSION, THE PLAN SO EVERYBODY IS AWARE OF IT IS THAT WE ARE GOING TO GO THROUGH THE REMAINING DEPARTMENTAL DISCUSSIONS, POLICE WHICH IS UP ON THE SLIDE, PUBLIC WORKS WHICH INCLUDE THE SENIOR CENTER, THE POOL AND NON-DEPARTMENTAL AND WE WILL TOUCH BRIEFLY ON THE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS BUT LIKELY HOLD BACK ANY QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE ON THE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS UNTIL WE COME BACK FOR FULL DISCUSSION BY THE CITY COUNCIL. THE REASON FOR THAT IS WE WANT TO GET, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, TO PUBLIC COMMENT, SO WE CAN HEAR FROM THE PUBLIC BOTH VIA ZOOM AND IN PERSON. AFTER PUBLIC COMMENT WE WILL TAKE A MEAL BREAK AND THEN WE WILL COME BACK AFTER HALF HOUR MEAL BREAK FOR OUR DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET ITEMS AND HOPEFULLY DIRECTION TO STAFF. ANY QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS? NO? STAFF? NO. WE HAVE THE ITEMS APPEAR FROM POLICE, CITY MANAGER, DO YOU WANT TO GIVE US A QUICK READ THROUGH?

BASICALLY REDUCING IMPROVEMENTS, POLICE DEPARTMENT FUNDED BY THAT ENDOWMENT, I WANT TO CALL UP THE 20,000 FOR A MOMENT. IT WAS ACTUALLY SHOWN ON THE SURVEY AS EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND SERVICE MANAGEMENT AS ONE OF THE HIGHEST PRIORITIES AND I THINK THERE IS ROOM FOR US TO LOOK AT WHAT WE HAVE IN PLACE AND HOW TO IMPROVE. IT IS A PLACEHOLDER IN THE SENSE OF THAT THERE IS NOTHING SPECIFIC THAT WE WOULD INCLUDE WITH THIS AT THIS POINT BUT WE WOULD LIKE THE FUNDING AVAILABLE TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO DO BETTER. I MENTIONED THE WARMING CENTER EARLIER AND THE INCREASE IN FUNDS WITH THE SHIFT IS ALREADY LARGELY USED. I TALKED ABOUT THE REDUCED CONTRACT FOR TRAFFIC ENGINEERING IN THE MOVED TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THEN SOME DOLLARS TO INCREASE CAPACITY FOR TELLING. THIS BUDGET PROBABLY HAD THE MOST CONVERSATION AT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE ABOUT FUNDING POSITIONS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT.

OKAY, THANK YOU , QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ON THESE ITEMS? NOT SEEING ANY QUESTIONS FROM MY FELLOW COUNCILMEMBERS, MY QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH THE FIRST ITEM, THE HUNDRED AND \$22,000 OF REDUCTION IN EXPENSES FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, OH, THAT IS BECAUSE OF THE ENDOWMENT FUND FROM THE POLICE, MY POINT WAS A THANK YOU TO WHOEVER THE ANONYMOUS DONOR WAS WHO DONATED THAT MONEY BECAUSE THAT MONEY WOULD BE AN AMOUNT THAT WOULD COME OUT OF THE CITIES, I WANTED TO CONFIRM THAT CAME IN LAST YEAR, IS THAT CORRECT?

CORRECT.

WHAT IS THE REMAINING BALANCE OF THE ENDOWMENT AFTER THE EXPOSED EXPENDITURE?

OFF MY HEAD I WANT TO SAY 175,000 OR 180,000 OR MAYBE A LITTLE HIGHER.

WAS AT APPROXIMATELY 450,000?

I WOULD SAY THAT.

EXCELLENT. OTHER THAN THAT I DON'T HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ON THIS ITEM, ON ANY OF THESE ITEMS. I HEARD A COMMENT THAT THERE WAS SOME DISAGREEMENT AND I WOULD LIKE TO LOOK TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE AND ASK THEM, WHERE THERE PARTICULAR ITEMS THAT EITHER OF YOU WERE PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN, PURGE PROVIDING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON?

CAN I REQUEST THAT I THINK WE SHOULD HOLD COMMENTS UNTIL WE CAN COMMENT FROM THE ENTIRE COUNCIL? THIS IS JUST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT MIGHT HELP US MAKE A DECISION.

THANK YOU. ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, NOT ADVOCATING ?

THE DISAGREEMENT WAS ACTUALLY REGARDING THE SAFE PROGRAM AND THAT IS IN THE FOLLOW-UP ITEMS, SO, THE ISSUE IS DISCUSSED IN THE NARRATIVE FOR THE BUDGET AND IT IS ABOUT FUNDING ONE POSITION FOR THE POLICE OFFICER AND ONE DISPATCH POSITION WHICH ARE BUDGETED.

IC, AS IS THE SAFE PROGRAM DISCUSSION?

OF THE SAFE PROGRAM IS A FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM AT THE BACK OF THIS. I UNDERSTAND, GO AHEAD .

YEAH. WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO ADD NEW INFORMATION, THERE WAS A DISCREPANCY OR A DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FULL AMOUNT FOR THE REQUESTED POSITIONS, THAT IS THERE, IT IS WHETHER WE DO IT FOR THE EXACT POSITIONS OR FOR THE SAFE PROGRAM. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WAS SENT OUT BY OUR GENERAL MANAGER THAT WAS IN AN EMAIL, JULY 16th, STATING THE FACT THAT THERE SEEMS TO BE AN INCREASE LIKELY THAT THE COUNTY MAY ACTUALLY FUND SIMILAR TO THE OTHER CITIES IN THE COUNTY'S. THAT WAS THE ONLY NEW INFORMATION I HAD.

LOOKING AT THE TRANSMITTAL LETTER I JUST WANT TO CONFIRM THAT WHAT IS IN THE BUDGET CURRENTLY IS THE FOLLOWING AMOUNTS, ONE FOR AN OFFICER AT 121,000, A DISPATCHER FOR 106,000, IS THAT CORRECT? CORRECT.

PART OF THE DISCUSSION BY THE BUDGET COMMITTEE THAT WE MIGHT COME BACK TO, WAS WHETHER THE MONEY WOULD BE BETTER SPENT FOR A SAFE PROGRAM?

CORRECT.

OKAY.

TO CLARIFY THAT IS WHERE WE SPLIT . I SUPPORT KEEPING THE STAFF AND STEPHEN WOULD RATHER HAVE THE SAFE PROGRAM AND NOT SUPPORT KEEPING THE STAFF.

UNDERSTOOD, THAT WILL BE TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

A CLARIFICATION QUESTION, UNDER THE REDUCED CONTRACT FOR TRAFFIC AND ENGINEERING TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR ENGINEERING, WHAT EXACTLY DOES THAT MEAN? WHAT IS BEING SHIFTED?

I'M GOING TO ASK CHARLIE TO ELABORATE BUT WE HAVE A \$23,000 CONTRACT FOR TRAFFIC ENGINEERING, THE RESPONSIBILITY RESIDES PER CITY CODE WITH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND WE ARE PROPOSING TO REDUCE THE CONTRACT, CUT IT IN HALF AND SHIFT RESPONSIBILITY TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT IN TERMS OF DETAILS AND ACTUAL WORK.

MY OTHER QUESTION IS, DOES THAT CREATE MORE WORK FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT? OR MAYBE WE CAN UNDERSTAND THAT?

UNDER THE CITIES -- CODE THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERS ACTUALLY ASSIGNED TO THE POLICE CHIEF, WE ARE GOING BACK TO I GUESS WHAT WAS DONE IN THE PAST. SO, FOR SOME REASON IT CHANGED TO ENGINEERING, DON'T KNOW WHEN IT DID THAT, PERHAPS A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO OR MAYBE FOUR YEARS AGO, MARY WOULD PROBABLY KNOW BETTER BUT IT IS GOING TO GO BACK TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. WHAT IS HAPPENING WITH THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING IS THAT TRAFFIC ENGINEER ATTENDS MONTHLY, ATTACH THE AD HOC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND IN THE PAST THE CITY ENGINEER WAS ACTUALLY RUNNING THAT, THOSE MEETINGS. AND RESPONDED TO THE PUBLIC AND NOW IT WILL BE TRANSFERRED TO THE POLICE CHIEF. THE POLICE CHIEF ALWAYS ATTENDED THOSE MEETINGS BUT NOW IS TAKING THE LEAD IN THE ROLE. IT IS SHIFTING BACK IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE. IN TERMS OF IS THAT EXTRA WORK? YES, IT IS EXTRA WORK BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO COORDINATE THE MEETING. THEY DID REDUCE IT FROM BIMONTHLY MEETINGS TO MONTHLY, THAT IS THE OTHER LEVEL OF SERVICE THAT IS GOING DOWN. WHEN PEOPLE HAVE TRAFFIC SAFETY CONCERNS THEY HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING, WHICH IS NOW MONTHLY.

THANK YOU, DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS? OKAY, THANK YOU. AND TO CLARIFY, I APOLOGIZE IF THIS HAS ALREADY BEEN ANSWERED BUT WHAT IS IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET IS FUNDING FOR THE TWO POLICE POSITIONS, WHAT IS NOT CURRENTLY IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET IS FUNDING FOR THE SAFE GRAHAM, IS THAT CORRECT? CORRECT.

THANK YOU. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON THE POLICE BUDGET? SEEING NONE. GOING ON TO THE NEXT ON WHICH I THINK IS PUBLIC WORKS.

A VARIETY OF REDUCTIONS.

CITY MANAGER ? CAN YOU GET CLOSER TO THE MIKE?

YES THANK YOU. THIS BUDGET HAS A REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS SUPERINTENDENT AS THAT POSITION WOULD GO AWAY WITH THE CONSOLIDATION OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENGINEERING WHICH WE WILL CONSIDER NEXT MONTH. AS A PART OF THE WATER AND SEWER RATES STUDY WE SHIFTED FUNDING FOR LABOR POSITION TO BETTER MAINTAIN THOSE SYSTEMS AND THERE ARE A VARIETY OF REDUCTIONS FOR REIMBURSEMENTS, FROM GRANTS, FROM THE CITY BUILDING RESERVE FUND FOR PROJECTS, REDUCING MAINTENANCE RELATED CONTRACTS, SERVICES AND SUPPLIES. AND SHIFTING THE COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICE CONTRACT FROM PARK VILLAGE TO PUBLIC WORKS BECAUSE THAT IS KIND OF A PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CONTRACT MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE AND THAT FITS THE DEPARTMENT'S ROLE. AND THERE ARE SEVERAL ITEMS THAT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE REQUESTED WE ADD IN AND THAT IS WHAT WE HAVE FOR PUBLIC WORKS, THIS PART OF IT. IF YOU ARE OKAY I WILL MOVE ON TO THE NEXT PART.

LET'S WORK THROUGH THE ITEMS THAT ARE BEFORE US HERE. ANY QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ON THESE ITEMS? COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

A QUESTION ON THESE REFLECTIVE SIGN POLES, A REQUEST TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE, HOW MANY SIGN POLES WITH THAT GET US FOR \$15,000?

DANTE , WOULD YOU RESPOND TO THAT QUESTION?

THIS IS IN REACTION TO A SECTION WE SET UP AROUND -- SCHOOL WHICH HAD A HIGH LEVEL OF APPRECIATION THAT WE ARE INCREASING THE SAFETY ON THAT. THE \$15,000 AS A PLACEHOLDER TO BUY HARDWARE AND REFLECTIVE, I THINK ONE SET IS \$80 AND QUITE A FEW. BUT THERE HAS AN INTEREST AND CONVERSATION ABOUT UTILIZING THEM IN LOCATIONS LIKE THE TURN ARROWS ON BODEGA AVENUE TO INCREASE THE FEELING OF SLOWING DOWN TRAFFIC, AS WELL AS ENHANCING ANY PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS THAT ARE NOT SIGNALS FIRST AND THEN FOCUSING ON OTHER AREAS OF ATTENTION THAT MIGHT NEED PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENTS.

MAY ASK ANOTHER QUESTION WHILE YOU ARE UP? SO, WE HAVE 64,000 IN REDUCTION AND MAINTENANCE-RELATED CONTRACTS AND \$56,000 IN REDUCTION IN MAINTENANCE SERVICES AND SUPPLIES, CAN YOU SPECIFY WHAT WOULD BE REDUCED? AND WHERE THE LOCATIONS WOULD BE THAT WE WILL NOT HAVE MAINTENANCE?

IN GENERAL, PUBLIC WORKS IS THE NUTS AND BOLTS, LITERALLY . THERE HAVE BEEN REDUCTIONS IN EVERY AREA POSSIBLE BUT I WOULD SAY SOME SIGNIFICANT LARGE NUMBERS, I HAD PREVIOUSLY LIKE A \$26,000 CONTRACT TO DO THERMOPLASTIC, WHICH IS THE LONG-TERM STREET MARKINGS, THAT WAS REMOVED ENTIRELY. WE ARE GOING TO DO PAINT IN-HOUSE WITH THAT. THERE WAS SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN TREE WORK THAT WERE SCHEDULED. SUPPLIES AND SERVICES HAVE BEEN REDUCED, ROCK, GRAVEL, ASPHALT, CONCRETE, WOOD, EVERYTHING.

MOSTLY AFFECTING PARKS? OR WHAT AREAS ARE MOSTLY AFFECTED?

I LOOKED AT IT GLOBALLY AND TRY TO AFFECT EACH AREA KIND OF EQUALLY, IT IS GOING TO AFFECT THE MAINTENANCE IN TOWN. SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT WERE ADDITIONALLY ADDED BY THE BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE I WILL

BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS AND THEY LEND TO A BROADER SCOPE OF SOME IDENTIFIED NEEDS. THE POND AT LIBBY PARK, THE FENCING WAS TALKED ABOUT PREVIOUSLY AND SOME PLANNING REVIEW ON IT. WE ARE STILL IN THE PROCESS OF COMING UP WITH A PLAN TO REPLACE THAT AND I AM EVEN LOOKING INTO LOCAL SERVICE GROUPS TO WORK WITH US ON PROVIDING LABOR, IF WE CAN PROVIDE THE MATERIALS AND WORK CLOSELY WITH SOME OF THOSE ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN A GREAT ASSET TO THE CITY.

I HAVE A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION FOR YOU, DANTE, I LOOKED AT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE REQUEST AND I THINK ABOUT THE IMPACT OF THE REDUCED FUNDS FOR MAINTENANCE AND MAINTENANCE RELATED CONTRACTS AND SERVICES AND SUPPLIES, AND THINK ABOUT YOUR ANSWER TO COUNCILMEMBER HINTON'S QUESTION JUST NOW. IF THOSE BUDGET COMMITTEE REQUEST WERE NOT FILLED, WHAT DO YOU THINK THE BALANCE WOULD BE? SO, YOU HAVE SOME BUDGET COMMITTEE REQUEST WHICH CLEARLY COULD BENEFIT THE COMMUNITY, THE REFLECTIVE SIGNPOST, REPLACING THE LANDSCAPING AT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, THE LIBBY PARK FENCING, WHAT IS YOUR OPINION AS A SUPERINTENDENT ABOUT IF WE HAVE LIMITED FUNDS, SHOULD WE BE LOOKING AT USING THE 40 OR \$55,000 IN FUNDS FOR THOSE PROJECTS? THAT HAVE BEEN ADDED AS REQUEST OR WHAT THEY MOST BENEFIT THE COMMUNITY TO BE USED IN OTHER WAYS? TO SUPPLEMENT THE AMOUNTS THAT WE HAVE ELIMINATED.

I WILL SAY THE ITEMS THAT HAVE LISTED HAVE BEEN A FOCAL POINT AND A VOICE MARKING ENTITY FOR SOME TIME NOW. THE FENCE AT LIBBY POND WAS BROUGHT UP YEARS AGO IT WAS ACCOMMODATED IN A BUDGET TO REPLACE IT WITH A METAL FENCE WHICH WAS THEN YOU KNOW, DISCUSSED BECAUSE OF THE AESTHETIC REASONS, IT IS MORE PRACTICAL THEN ATTRACTIVE, FOR LACK OF A BETTER TERM AND I KNOW THAT IS THE FOCUS. NOT TO DIGRESS BUT YOU KNOW, I DO REALIZE THAT OUR CURRENT MAINTENANCE IS LESS THAN WHAT WE WISH WE COULD ACCOMPLISH AND IN PREVIOUS BUDGET WE HAVE CUT MANY MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS. I DO REALIZE THAT SEVERAL OF OUR PUBLIC SPACES ARE LESS THAN IDEAL, IDEALLY MAINTAINED. WE, AS A CITY MANAGER, MENTIONED WE ARE VERY THINLY STAFFED ORGANIZATION AND PUBLIC WORKS IS QUITE OFTEN REACTIONARY RATHER THAN HAVING THE ABILITY TO BE PROACTIVE. LIKE WHEN WE HAVE A STAIN ON OUR STREET AND ONE OF OUR COUNCILMEMBERS MENTIONS TO OUR STAFF THAT WE SHOULD PROBABLY ADDRESS THAT, WE RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THOSE THINGS AND THAT IS LIKE THE MONDAY MORNING QUARTERBACK, WE ARE VERY REACTIONARY ON ITEMS.

OKAY. YEAH. LIMITED FUNDS AND YOU HAVE TO DECIDE WHERE TO SPEND THEM.

I THINK THE COMMUNITY HAS VOICED INTEREST IN THOSE SPECIAL ITEMS, SO, I DON'T THINK IT WAS DRIVEN BY THE BUDGET COMMITTEE AS THEIR SPECIAL ITEMS, I THINK IT WAS VOICES FROM THE COMMUNITY THAT BROUGHT THOSE FORWARD.

OKAY, THANK YOU.

I WANTED TO SAY, HAVEN'T WE ALSO HAD REQUEST FROM THE COMMUNITY, I HAVE FOR THE LAST TWO YEARS I'VE BEEN HERE ABOUT IVES PARK IN THE FENCE THERE AS WELL. THAT IS EQUALLY AS --

I UNDERSTAND THERE IS A GREATER PLAN THAT LIVES IN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT THAT IS CRIPPLED MY ABILITY TO MAKE REPAIRS BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO SPEND GOOD MONEY AFTER BAD BUT THE PLAN HAS DRUG OUT FOR SO LONG, I PRETTY MUCH COULD'VE REPLACED THE FENCE AND IT COULD'VE HAD A USABLE LIFESPAN BEFORE THIS PLAN GETS THEM FOMENTED.

I'M JUST POINTING OUT WE HAVE A LAUNDRY LIST.

AS YOU KNOW I HAVE BEEN DOING THIS FOR A LONG TIME AND THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS I WISH WE COULD MAINTAIN BETTER . AND FOR MY STAFF TO TAKE A LOT OF PRIDE IN THEIR WORK IT IS TOUGH WHEN WE SPEND A LOT OF TIME PICKING UP GARBAGE AND VANDALISM AND OTHER ITEMS THAT ARE NOT VERY EXCITING.

OKAY, I THINK OUR QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED. ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS?

I HAVE A COMMENT, THAT WAS ME, THERE WAS AN OUTLINE OF A PERSON THAT LOOKED LIKE THEY HAD DIED THERE. I THINK YOU REALLY NEED TO CLEAN UP AND YES, YOUR STAFF WAS VERY SWEET WHEN I POINTED IT OUT. THAT WAS THE FIRST TIME WE WERE MADE AWARE OF THE RED PAINT SPILL AND THEN SOMEBODY, AMUSINGLY DREW A LITTLE SHOCK --

OKAY, FOLKS I'M GOING TO BRING US BACK ON TOPIC.

SENT YOU APPEAR AND YOU MENTIONED THAT A SPIRITED STAFF WANTING TO DO GOOD BUT THEY SPEND A LOT OF TIME I THINK YOU SAID ON

VANDALISM AND PICKING UP TRASH. SO, THAT WILL FEED, AT LEAST FOR ME AND TWO OTHER DISCUSSIONS ABOUT WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO AND THE QUESTION I HAVE IS, DO YOU NOW, IS THERE AN UPTAKE AND WHY DO YOU FEEL LIKE THERE IS AN UPTICK AND HAVING YOUR STAFF TO ADDRESSING VANDALISM PICKING UP TRASH? DO YOU SEE ANY CORRELATION? OR ARE YOU NOT WANTING TO MAKE A CORRELATION?

IS THE STRUGGLE IN EVERY CITY, IT IS NOT JUST SEBASTOPOL. SEBASTOPOL IS NOT SINGLED OUT IN ITS PROBLEM. THERE ARE ISSUES THAT GO ALONG WITH SOME HOMELESSNESS, DEBRIS, THERE ARE SOME LABOR-INTENSIVE DUTIES THAT PUBLIC WORKS TAKES ON AND IN GREAT COLLABORATION WITH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT I MIGHT ADD ON, WE WORK TOGETHER VERY MUCH ON THIS. THE ENCAMPMENTS IN THE LAGUNA, ILLEGAL DUMPING, ANYTHING FROM A BATTERY LEFT ON THE SIDE OF THE STREET TO A HOMEMADE TOILET ON THE SIDE OF THE STREET, I MEAN IT CAN BE VERY DEGRADING AND NOT VERY GLAMOROUS WORK THAT I ASKED MY STAFF TO DO.

OKAY.

I HAVE ONE OTHER QUESTION.

GO AHEAD.

IF I RECALL FROM A PREVIOUS RESOLUTION A LONG TIME AGO, HE SAID WE SPEND ABOUT 40,000 A YEAR DEALING WITH GRAFFITI, IS THAT STILL, IS THAT --

THAT WAS A DOLLAR NUMBER AND THE NUMBER WE WERE ABLE TO GATHER BASED ON INFORMATION WE WERE TRACKING VERY CLOSELY ON THE MOORE STREET ISSUES IN THE PAST AND AS WELL AS DURING THE COVID TIME PERIOD WE PROVIDED A LOT OF PORT-A-POTTIES AND OTHER ACCESS, DRINKING FOUNTAINS, HAND WASH STATIONS, ALL OF THAT WAS FIGURED IN. WE ARE WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TO TRY TO TRACK INCIDENTS OF VANDALISM, ANY DEBRIS REMOVAL AND OTHER ITEMS TO TRY TO GET OUR HEADS WRAPPED RUN EXACTLY HOW MUCH TIME WE ARE SPENDING AND MONEY WE SPEND ON THESE ISSUES.

OKAY, THINK WE WILL KEEP YOU UP THERE FOR THE NEXT DISCUSSION SENSE IT IS ONE WITHIN YOUR DEPARTMENT. BUT REGARDING THE ITEMS THAT ARE UP ON THE SLIDE, I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THE PRIOR SLIDE, WERE ALL OF THOSE ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET? ARE ALL OF THOSE ITEMS IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET?

YES.

OKAY, THANK YOU. NOW WE ARE TO THE NEXT SLIDE WHICH IS SENIOR CENTER, COMMUNITY CENTER, AND IVES POOL. NOT A LOT OF ITEMS HERE BUT SENIOR CENTER AND SEE THE REDUCTION WITH ELIMINATION OF THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE SENIOR CENTER, 38,250, COMEDIC CULTURAL CENTER HAS A \$76,600 REDUCTION IN SUPPORT FOR GENERAL OPERATION WITH THE REMAINING 58,300 INTENDED TO PROVIDE SIX MONTHS OF SUPPORT DURING THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD. AND THEN IVES POOL, NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES. AND THEN WE SEE THE NOTATION THAT THE PUBLIC WORKS LABOR IS BEING SWITCHED TO WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS, SO IT WILL NOT BE PROVIDING LANDSCAPING SUPPORT, I ASSUME, FOR SENIOR CENTER COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER OR IVES POOL, IS THAT CORRECT? MY LAST STATEMENT, DANTE?

THERE IS MORE THAN THAT LABOR POSITION ALLOCATED TO MAINTENANCE OF THOSE FACILITIES AND IN GENERAL THE STAFF TIME OF I BELIEVE, FOUR POSITIONS THAT HAVE AN ALLOCATION HAVE BEEN REDUCED. SO, SOME MAINTENANCE WORK, THE BIGGEST SCALE AS THE LABOR POSITION FOR LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE AND THAT WILL BE REDUCED.

I HAVE A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION , BUT COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS? IF YOU'RE REDUCING STAFF TIME TO THESE FACILITIES, ARE WE RELYING AND COMMUNICATING WITH EACH OF THE NONPROFITS THAT THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THESE ITEMS? FOR THIS MAINTENANCE NOW? I AM JUST WONDERING, FOLLOWING THE DISREPAIR.

YES. WHETHER IT IS APPROPRIATE OR NOT I THINK I NEED TO SAY THAT I APPLAUD ALL THOSE ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE AMOUNT THAT THEY DO AND THE TEAMWORK THEY SHOWED THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT BECAUSE HE REALLY COULD NOT DO IT WITHOUT THEM.

YOU AND I WORKS TOGETHER AT THE COMMUNITY CENTER , EVERYBODY KNOWS THAT.

AS WELL AS OTHER COUNCILMEMBERS.

YES.

I DID TAKE A HISTORICAL LOOK AT HOW MUCH TIME AND HOW MUCH ARE WE ACTUALLY SPENDING AND IT GOES IN FLUX. I WILL USE THE SENIOR CENTER FOR EXAMPLE. WE DON'T SPEND VERY MUCH TIME THERE BECAUSE THEY ARE SELF-SUFFICIENT, THEY HAVE VOLUNTEERS THAT DO THE GARDENING, THEY MAINTAIN ALL OF THE INSIDE, WE JUST DO MAJOR MECHANICAL THERE AND PROVIDE SERVICES WHEN NEEDED, VERY MINIMAL, UP UNTIL THIS YEAR, ONE OF OUR TREES FELL ON THE BUILDING. IT IS A MOVING TARGET. HISTORICALLY WE TRACK THIS. LUCKILY, WE HAD TO PAY A CERTAIN AMOUNT FOR THE TREE REPAIR BUT MUCH OF IT WAS COVERED BY OUR INSURANCE. TO THAT ANSWER QUESTION?

THE PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION WAS TO UNDERSTAND THE DECISIONS ARE MAKING AND THE IMPACT THEY WILL HAVE AND FOR US TO UNDERSTAND THAT IN THE COMMUNITY.

MY FOLLOW-UP QUESTION ON THE SAME TOPIC IS, YOU MENTIONED THERE IS A VARIETY OF STAFF TIME AMOUNTS THAT ARE BEING SHIFTED AWAY FROM THE MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES, LANDSCAPING AND OTHERWISE THAT MIGHT BE BENEFITING THE CITY OWNED FACILITIES, THE SENIOR SENEY, COMMUNITY CENTER, AND IVES PARK, WHAT IS THE TOTAL VALUE YOU THINK? WHAT IS THE DOLLAR VALUE OF THOSE SERVICES AND STAFF TIME THAT IS BEING SHIFTED AWAY, THAT CURRENTLY WOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THOSE CITY OWNED ABILITIES? BECAUSE I WAS UNDERSTANDING IS ONE LABORER BUT YOU ARE SAYING IT IS MORE.

IS PRIMARILY BASED ON LANDSCAPING THAT WE HAVE OTHER TIME ALLOCATED LIKE MAINTENANCE TO CHECK ON HVAC SYSTEMS BEFORE CALLING A PROFESSIONAL HVAC SERVICE AND THOSE TYPES OF THINGS. TO PUT A DOLLAR VALUE ON THAT I WOULD HAVE TO PUT THAT TOGETHER.

OKAY. BUT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS THAT FOR INSTANCE, THERE WILL NOT BE A CITY EMPLOYEE THAT WILL BE CHECKING ON HVAC SYSTEMS? LESS.

OKAY. HAS THERE BEEN COMMUNICATION WITH THOSE THREE NONPROFITS ABOUT THOSE CHANGES?

WE ARE STILL MAINTAINING, I AM STILL MAINTAINING MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS FOR THE HVAC BECAUSE THAT IS A PART OF OUR CITY LEASE AGREEMENT BUT WHEN WE GET, A CALL THAT THE THERMOSTAT IS WORKING, BEFORE WE CALL CONTRACT RESEND SOMEBODY OUT, IT MIGHT BE THE NEXT DAY, IT MAY BE THE NEXT WEEK, IT MAY NOT BE AT ALL UNTIL WE CAN GET THE CONTRACTOR OUT THERE. IT IS JUGGLING.

ARE WE GOING TO ZERO ON TERMS AND MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES FOR THOSE FACILITIES?

NO, THAT WOULD BE IRRESPONSIBLE.

OKAY, NOT TRYING TO JUDGE IT, JUST TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHAT THE IMPACT IS ON THE FACILITIES.

IT WILL BE A VISIBLE IMPACT AND THERE WILL BE A DELAY IN SERVICES. IT WILL BE SIMILAR TO THE HURT THAT IS FELT IN OUR STREETS AND PARKS IN OUR PARKING LOT MAINTENANCE. I TRIED TO EQUITABLY SPREAD THE REDUCTIONS.

GOT IT. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ON THESE ITEMS? THANK YOU, DANTE, FOR PROVIDING US WITH THOSE ANSWERS AND I THINK WE HAVE ONE MORE SLIDE WHICH IS NON-DEPARTMENTAL, I THINK JUST ABOUT SHIFTING AMOUNTS, CORRECT? NO. OKAY, \$154,000 SHIFT OF COST FOR CONTRACTS TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS, AND WE ALSO SEE THE HUNDRED 16,525 DOLLAR INCREASE FOR TECHNOLOGY REPLACEMENT. I HAD A QUESTION BUT ANY FOLLOW-UP COMMENTS?

THE SHIFT WE HAVE REFERRED TO THOSE THROUGHOUT DEPARTMENT BY DEPARTMENT TO PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY AND OWNERSHIP, IF YOU WILL, OF THE CONTRACTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THAT IS REALLY WHAT THAT IS ABOUT. THE 116,000, WE ARE WOEFULLY BEHIND ON OUR TECHNOLOGY AND PLACES. I THINK NINE YEARS OLD IS OUR LONGEST LASTING COMPUTER THAT WE HAVE AND WE REALLY NEED TO REPLACE THEM. WE PROBABLY NEED TO DO EVEN MORE THAN WE ARE PROPOSING IN THE BUDGET, TO BE HONEST BUT AT LEAST TWO PATCH OF THE BIGGEST HOLES WE NEED TO MAKE THESE INVESTMENTS IN OUR EQUIPMENT AND CYBERSECURITY.

GOT IT, ANY QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ON EITHER ITEMS? OKAY. OUR REMAINING ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED BY OUR CITY MANAGER WOULD COME UNDER THE CATEGORY OF ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS, ADDITIONAL TOPICS. MY SUGGESTION, IF IT IS ACCEPTABLE TO THE CITY COUNCIL HERE, WE NOW GO OUT TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE BUDGET, OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING A LOT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND THEN ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS WE MIGHT HAVE ON THE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS WE HOLD BACK UNTIL AFTER OUR MEAL PERIOD, ANY OBJECTION TO THAT? OKAY. THE ONLY OTHER COMMENT I WOULD HAVE IS THAT WE DO HAVE STAFF MEMBERS, A QUESTION TO THE CITY MANAGER, IS THERE A NEED TO SOLICIT COMMENT OR INPUT AT THIS POINT FROM OUR STAFF MEMBERS?

NOT THAT I KNOW OF BUT IF SOMEBODY FEELS A COMPELLING NEED AND I AM SEEING A LOT OF HEADSHAKING, NO.

SEEING NO OBJECTION, WE GOT TO PUBLIC COMMENT, WE OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AND GO OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED BUDGET.

THANK YOU , MAYOR.

THIS IS PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED BUDGET. BEFORE I OPEN IT TO THE PUBLIC I WANT TO SAY THAT WE DID RECEIVE 34 EMAILS SINCE THE MEETING AND IT IS ALL RELATED TO THE COMMUNITY CENTER. FOR THOSE THAT HAVE SENT THEM IF YOU HAVE NOT RECEIVED AN EMAIL FROM YET I HAVE RECEIVED THEM AND THEY HAVE BEEN FORWARDED. AGAIN, THIS IS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE PUBLIC HEARING AND I WILL GO TO IN CHAMBERS FIRST. IF THERE'S ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS, COME ON UP.

I THINK IT IS CLEAR FROM THE SURVEY, OVERWHELMINGLY, NUMBER ONE WAS PROVIDING EFFECTIVE PUBLIC SAFETY INCLUDING 911 EMERGENCY, MEDICAL, POLICE, FIRE RESPONSE, ACCORDING TO THESE NUMBERS IT IS MANAGING CITY FINANCES THE SECOND BUT THERE THE CITY'S RESPONSES TO FLOODS, WILDFIRES AND OTHER NATURAL DISASTERS. IT IS CLEAR WE NEED TO ADEQUATELY FUND THE FIRE AND POLICE DEPARTMENTS AS THE NUMBER ONE PRIORITY IN HIS BUDGETING. THE ONLY OTHER SERIOUS COMMENT I WOULD MAKE IS THE EARLY DISCUSSION ABOUT THE CLIMATE ACTION COMMITTEE AND THESE OTHER SORT OF QUASI-CITY ORGANIZATIONS WHICH I PERSONALLY AND I SAID THIS BEFORE, IT IS GREAT THEY ARE DOING IS BUT I DON'T THINK THEY SHOULD HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE CITY. THEY ARE SORT OF A PERSONAL QUEST TO DO SOMETHING AND THAT IS GREAT BUT GIVEN THE FINANCIAL SITUATION WE ARE IN AND THIS SURVEY, THEY ARE NOWHERE ON THIS, THE PARKS, THE YOUTH AND RECREATION PROGRAMS ARE ALL BC VERY IMPORTANT AS WELL AS WE WERE DISCUSSING. I WAS A BIT DISAPPOINTED TO SEE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND JOB CORRECTION IS BELOW SUPPORTING THE LOCAL LIBRARY WHICH IS ACTUALLY THE COUNTY LIBRARY. BUT JUST TO ECHO WHAT I SAID AT THE BEGINNING, FIRE, POLICE, THEY HAVE TO BE THE ABSOLUTE A1 PRIORITY. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, OLIVER. NEXT I WILL GO OUT TO ZOOM. ROBERT, MAY YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES, CAN YOU HEAR ME?

I CAN HEAR YOU. I WILL JUMP IN WHEN YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS LEFT. OKAY. THIS IS A HARD ONE TO HAVE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON BUT I APPLAUD THE MOVEMENT OF CONTRACTS TO DEPARTMENTS THAT SHOULD LOGICALLY BE ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE WORK. I THINK THAT IS BRILLIANT. THE CITY ATTORNEY DIDN'T GET MUCH DISCUSSION BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT MANY NUMBERS THERE BUT IT IS A BIG NUMBER AND I KNOW YOU ARE IN THE MIDST OF PICKING A NEW CITY ATTORNEY AND A LOT OF THAT IS PROBABLY UP IN THE AIR BUT I DID NOT WANT TO LET IT PASS WITHOUT SAYING THAT WE ARE SO HAPPY TO SPEND \$600-\$700,000 FOR A CITY ATTORNEY WHICH IS HIGHER THAN ANY CITY IN SONOMA COUNTY, I BELIEVE. THAT HAS TO BE FIXED SOMEHOW IT NEEDS MORE DISCUSSION THEN GOES INTO THE BUDGET. THERE WAS NOT ANY DISCUSSION, WHEN YOU ADD UP ALL OF THESE CAL-PURSE CHARGES THAT SHOW UP AS A SINGLE LINE, NEW LINE ITEM WITHOUT A HISTORICAL CHARGE AGAINST IT, IT IS \$1.2 MILLION, IS THAT NEW MONEY WE ARE PUTTING INTO CAL-PURSE? BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T BEFORE OR IS IT BEING SHIFTED FROM SOMEWHERE? POLICE, THE SAFE PROGRAM, ON THE SURFACE IT SOUNDS INTERESTING AND I THINK IT WOULD BE REALLY GOOD TO DIG DEEPER INTO IT. IF YOU DID 24 SEVEN, \$1.2 MILLION, THAT IS \$14,000 PER HOMELESS PERSON, IN ESSENCE

THE CITY IS GOING TO TAKE ON THE RESPONSIBILITY NOW FOR PROVIDING \$14,000 MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES TO EACH OF THE HOMELESS PEOPLE IN OUR CITY? THAT DOES NOT FEEL RIGHT TO ME. BUT IF YOU CAN GET MEASURE O MONEY AND THERE WAS AN ARTICLE --

ROBERT, YOU HAVE 30 SECONDS.

LET'S GRAB SOME A MEASURE O MONEY TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE HOMELESS PROBLEM THE CITY, CLEARLY FROM A SURVEY SHE DID IT IS THE TOP ONE OR TWO ISSUES WITH PEOPLE THAT LIVE HERE. I THINK I CAN PROBABLY -- THE ONLY OTHER COMMENT IS ABOUT PUBLIC WORKS, IT REALLY FEELS LIKE THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN ALLOCATED AND NOW YOUR DOUBLE COUNTING IN PUBLIC WORKS, THE RATEPAYERS ARE NOW DOUBLE PAYING FOR THAT AND IT IS NOW SHIFTING GENERAL FUND MONEY TO RATEPAYERS AND THE BENEFITS --

ROBERT, THAT IS TWO MINUTES. THANK YOU, ROBERT FOR YOU PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL GO TO CHAMBERS, IF THERE'S ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC MOM, -- MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT.

THANK YOU, I'M KENNY WEBSTER A BOARD MEMBER OF THE SEBASTOPOL COMMITTEE CULTURAL CENTER. I'M HERE TO SUPPORT YOUR STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION FOR THE \$58,300 FOR THE NEXT SIX MONTHS TO HAVE US WORK ON A TRANSITION TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY AND I WOULD POINT OUT THAT WE ARE TAKING A MAJOR HIT, COMPARED TO LAST YEAR'S FUNDING FROM THE CITY AND WE ARE MAKING PAINFUL CUTS, AS WELL AS SEEKING NEW REVENUE OPPORTUNITIES. SO, PLEASE, SUPPORT YOUR STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND WE CERTAINLY APPRECIATE ALL THE WORK YOU ARE DOING AND YOUR SUPPORT. THANKS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I'LL GO OUT TO THEM. LINDA, CAN YOU LIMIT YOURSELF, PLEASE? THANK YOU, GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, LINDA.

I AM REALLY SURPRISED, KENNY THAT YOU HAVE THE NERVE TO SHOW YOUR FACE HERE, AFTER WHAT YOU HAVE DONE WITH THE CITY AND NOW I UNDERSTAND YOU ARE IN PRIVATE BUSINESS AND STILL BEING PRO-BUSINESS AND SCREWING THIS TOWN --

LINDA, CAN YOU FOCUS YOUR COMMENTS ON THE BUDGETARY ISSUES, I WOULD APPRECIATE THAT.

I AM. I AM TALKING ABOUT WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE POSITION WHEREIN AND YOU ARE LARGELY IT, MAYOR RICH, AFTER THE \$5.6 MILLION FIASCO THAT YOU AND DANTE GOT US INTO OVER THE WIRELESS WATER METERS WHICH ARE CITY MANAGER AND CITY ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER MARY DID NOT SUPPORT AND NOW WE ARE IN THIS POSITION OF DEFICIT AND STILL PAYING OFF THAT \$5.6 MILLION, FOR THE NEXT 13 YEARS, THAT NOBODY WANTED AND IT IS AGAINST OUR BEST INTEREST AND, YOU KNOW, YOUR RAIN, MAYOR RICH IS MARKED BY FAILURE --

LINDA, PLEASE , WE ARE TRYING TO DETERMINE THE APPROPRIATE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THIS BUDGET, IF YOU COULD LET US KNOW WHAT YOUR OPINION WOULD BE ON THE APPROPRIATE ALLOCATION ON FUNDS FOR THIS BUDGET IT WOULD BE REALLY HELPFUL.

MY OPINION AND IT IS REALLY HELPFUL, TO FIGURE OUT HOW WE GOT IN THE PLACE WHERE WE ARE, FINANCIALLY AND OTHERWISE AND IT IS LARGELY BECAUSE OF YOU AND THE SWAYING OF POLICYMAKING THAT --

YOU HAVE 30 SECONDS, LINDA.

IRRESPONSIBLE, MARKED BY ABJECT FAILURE EVERY STEP OF THE WAY AND REFUSAL TO LISTEN TO A LOT OF VERY, TALENTED, EXPERT PUBLIC, YOU JUST DO NOT LISTEN TO PEOPLE WHO KEEP TRYING TO TALK TO YOU AND YOU TRY TO SILENCE US EVERY STEP OF THE WAY, WHEN PEOPLE HAVE EXPERTISE AND THEIR OFFERING TO YOU FOR FREE AND THEN SO I --

LINDA, THAT IS TWO MINUTES. THANK YOU, LINDA FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS, IF THERE IS ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS?

HELLO. I SUPPORT RAISING TAXES BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO LOOSE SERVICES. I UNDERSTAND POLICE HAVE REPORTED THAT APPROXIMATELY HALF OF THEIR TIME IN CALLS ARE RELATED TO HOMELESS PEOPLE AND I KNOW THERE BEEN THOUSANDS OF CRIMES COMMITTED BY HOMELESS PEOPLE IN SEBASTOPOL. WAS A GIGANTIC WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY, POLICE SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED IN HOMELESS SERVICES BECAUSE YOU CANNOT ARREST PEOPLE OUT OF HOMELESSNESS AND THE ONLY PLACE HOMELESS PEOPLE CAN GO FROM BEING ARRESTED IS JAIL WHICH COSTS HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS PER NIGHT. PLEASE BE DILIGENT ABOUT MONITORING THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING BECAUSE APPARENTLY WE HAVE NOT BEEN DOING THAT. PLEASE INVEST IN THE SAFE PROGRAM. I AM ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT THE REDUCTION PUBLIC WORKS BUDGET BECAUSE IT REALLY SEEMS LIKE WE NEED TO INVEST IN THAT, WE DON'T DO TREE MAINTENANCE IT DOES CAUSE EXPENSIVE PROBLEMS. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM . KYLE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

YES, I CAN.

THANK YOU. GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

SO, WATCHING THE CITY OVER THE YEARS I HAVE SEEN THIS BEFORE, THIS IS BASICALLY ANOTHER CARRYOVER BUDGET. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN THE BUDGET OF THIS YEAR AND THE PREVIOUS YEAR, JUST LOOKING AT TOTAL EXPENDITURE FROM YEAR-TO-YEAR. MEANWHILE MASSIVE, MASSIVE MOVEMENT IN TERMS OF REVENUE GENERATION, MOSTLY FOR BACKFILLING PREVIOUS YEARS OF MISSED MANAGE BUDGETS. IN ORDER FOR US TO MOVE FORWARD, SUSTAINABLY, IT IS GOING TO BE REALLY IMPORTANT THAT OUR CITY ACTUALLY FOCUS ON WAYS IN REDUCING ITS BUDGET, YEAR-TO-YEAR. THIS IS GOING TO NEED A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF AUDITING IN OUR FINANCIAL PROCESSES THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. WE HAVE SEEN MULTIPLE TIMES WHERE AS A RESULT OF FAILURE TO MAINTAIN WE ENDED UP WITH REPLACE, THAT WILL CONTINUE UNLESS THE CITY DOES ITS DUE DILIGENCE TO GET ITSELF IN A SUSTAINABLE MANNER, WITH THE REVENUE SOURCES THAT IT HAS AND MAKE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN ITS EXPENDITURES YEAR-OVER-YEAR.

THANK YOU, KYLE, FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. IF THERE IS ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT. AARON?

YES. I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT SCI YOU TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATION TO HAVE A CLASS IN COMP STUDY BECAUSE IT KIND OF MAKES SENSE TO SEE HOW WE COMPARE TO SIMILAR AGENCIES AND THE ONLY ADDITION TO THAT IS THAT IT IS ALSO A MANDATORY SUBJECT AND

WOULD LIKE TO WORK WITH THE CITY ON BOOKING CONTRACTS LOOKING AT COMPATIBLE AGENCIES AND SO FORTH. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, AARON, FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I'LL GO BACK TO ZOOM, SKIP, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE?

GOOD AFTERNOON, CAN YOU HEAR ME?

I CAN HEAR YOU, SKIP. I WILL JUMP IN WHEN YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS LEFT.

THANK YOU. AS A PART OF THE MEET YOUR NEIGHBORS PROGRAM IN SEBASTOPOL , WHERE WE WORK WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOODS, ONE OF THE QUESTIONS, ONE OF THE THREE PRIMARY QUESTIONS THAT WE ASK IS, WHO KNOWS WHAT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD? SO, WE CAN FIGURE OUT WHO IS IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD MIGHT BE ABLE TO ANSWER A QUESTION, TAKE CARE OF A PROBLEM, BE ABLE TO ASSIST IN A WAY WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOOD THAT TURNS OUT TO BE VERY HELPFUL. IN LISTENING TO THE MEETING SO FAR, I HAVE NOTED FIVE OR SIX PLACES WHERE IT SEEMS LIKE IT MIGHT BE WORTHWHILE TO ASK THE COMMUNITY ITSELF IF THERE MIGHT NOT BE PEOPLE THAT ARE WILLING TO HELP, THAT HAVE PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUNDS, MAYBE HAVE RETIRED FROM THEIR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OR MAY ACTUALLY HAVE ACTIVE SESSIONAL SKILLS AND RESOURCES FOR THEMSELVES THAT WOULD BE ABLE TO ASSIST IN SOME OF THE CATEGORIES, SOME OF THE AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN MENTIONED THAT REDUCTIONS NEED TO TAKE LACE. I JUST WANTED THROUGHOUT THE IDEA THAT IN OUR COMMUNITY, WHEN ASKED, WHO KNOWS WHAT? THERE ARE ALMOST ALWAYS PEOPLE WHO STEP FORWARD TO BE ABLE TO LOOK AT SOLVING PROBLEMS AND NOT EVERYBODY IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND IT DOES NOT WORK IN ALL NEIGHBORHOODS BUT IN MANY TIMES, PEOPLE DO STAND UP AND SAY, I ACTUALLY KNOW HOW TO DEAL WITH THAT -- SKIP, 30 SECONDS.

THANK YOU. AND HOW CAN I HELP? I THROUGHOUT THE IDEA THAT OUR COMMUNITY HAS A STANDARD OF DOING THAT, AT LEAST AT THE NEIGHBORHOOD LEVEL. AND THANK YOU, SO MUCH, FOR EVERYTHING YOU ARE DOING.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I'LL COME BACK TO CHAMBERS. IF THERE IS ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT, SEEING ON, I'LL GO BACK TO ZOOM. JUNE, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF PLEASE?

THIS IS JUNE, CAN YOU HEAR ME?

I CAN HEAR YOU. I WILL JUMP IN WHEN YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS LEFT.

GREAT, THANK YOU. I WANTED TO MENTION THE SURVEY RESULTS AND CAUTION FOLKS ABOUT HOW TO INTERPRET THEM. I KNOW THAT A LOT OF CATEGORIES WERE SORT OF CLUMPED TOGETHER AND ALSO I THINK IT IS GREAT THAT WE GOT INPUT, IN GENERAL, FROM ONLINE AND THE FORUMS OUT AT THE TOWN HALL AND THINGS BUT IT IS NOT REALLY KNOWN WHO FILLED OUT WHAT AND HOW MANY TIMES AND I FEEL LIKE THE PHONE PULLING, AS WELL AS WE DON'T REALLY KNOW HOW TO REALLY TRUST:, IT DOES GIVE THE INDICATION OF MORE OF A QUANTIFIABLE, REACHING OF PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN SEBASTOPOL. AND EVEN THERE THERE IS A LOT OF CLUMPING OF THINGS, LIKE POLICE, FIRE, SAFETY, TOGETHER, YES, THAT IS A HIGH PRIORITY. SAFETY HAS ALWAYS BEEN A HIGH PRIORITY FOR SEBASTOPOL BUT WHAT SAFETY MEANS HAS AND VERY DIFFERENT. THE

PREVIOUS POLL WE HAD SAFETY NUMBER ONE AND WE ALSO HAD INTEREST IN CUTTING THE BUDGET WITH THE POLICE BECAUSE PEOPLE INTERPRET SAFETY IS ALL SORTS OF RINGS AS FAR AS SAFETY, HAVING A SENIOR CENTER THERE, HAVING EMERGENCY SERVICES, VERY IMPORTANT. SOME PEOPLE ARE WANTING TO FEEL LIKE THEY CAN COME TOGETHER WITH OTHERS TO ADDRESS THE CLIMATE CRISIS AND THEY ARE FEELING VERY UNSAFE ABOUT CLIMATE IMPACTS, HAVING TO EVACUATE DURING FIRES. I WANT FOLKS TO KNOW THAT TIME AND TIME FOLKS IN SEBASTOPOL HAVE VOTED FOR SAFETY IN THE BROADER SENSE AND I WOULD ASK THAT WE KEEP THE BUDGET THAT WE HAVE FOR THE POLICE BUT WE DO NOT ALLOCATED OUT YET FOR STAFF BECAUSE IT MIGHT MAKE MORE SENSE IF HALF THE CALLS GO TO DO OUTREACH IN SITUATIONS WHICH DO NOT REQUIRE POLICE THAT WE ACTUALLY HAVE SOMETHING LIKE THE SAFE PROGRAM AND I WOULD ACTUALLY SAVE US A LOT OF MONEY IN A LOT OF AREAS AND EVERYBODY WINS. THE POLICE CAN FOCUS ON THE WORK THEY ARE SET FOR AND WE ARE NOT IN A BUDGET CRISIS. WE CANNOT REALLY OVERSTEP OUR POLICE AS WELL. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK TO CHAMBERS , IF THERE'S ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT.

HELLO, MY NAME IS TONYA SIERRA AND I'M THE ACTING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SEBASTOPOL COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER AND I WANTED TO ECHO WHAT KENNY SAID, IN TERMS OF HOW HARD WE ARE WORKING TO GET TO A PLACE WHERE WE CAN BE SELF-SUSTAINING. WE HAD MADE CUTS THAT HURT AND WE ARE WORKING SUPER HARD, EVERY PERSON ON THE STAFF IS WEARING MULTIPLE HATS TO MAKE THAT HAPPEN AND I KNOW MANY NONPROFIT DO THE SAME. FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE, NORMALLY OVER THE PAST COUPLE OF YEARS WE HAVE HAD 12 SELF PRODUCED CONCERTS WE PUT ON AND WE WANT TO DOUBLE THAT IN 2025 AND WE ARE ACTIVELY WORKING ON MAKING THAT HAPPEN. WE HAVE OVER 20 INSTRUCTORS WHO REGULARLY USE THE SPACE FOR THEIR CLASSES, WHICH OFFERS MIND AND BODY ENRICHING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE COMMUNITY AND WE ARE ALSO A SPACE WHERE PEOPLE HOST THEIR SPECIAL EVENTS IN THE COMMUNITY. SO, I DO ASK THAT YOU PLEASE APPROVE THE PROPOSED FUNDING FOR US, SO WE HAVE A CHANCE TO GET ON OUR FEET AND BE SELF-SUSTAINING, THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I'LL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, MARY , CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF, PLEASE? P2 YES, HI.

GO AHEAD I WILL JUMP IN WHEN YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS LEFT.

IT WON'T TAKE THAT LONG. I JUST WANT TO THANK COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN AND MAURER FOR THEIR WORK ON THIS BUDGET , BEING RELATIVELY NEW MEMBERS THEY TOOK ON A REALLY HARD JOB AND I JUST WANTED TO THANK THEM, THAT IS IT, THANK YOU.

THANK YOU , FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, NEXT I'LL COME BACK TO CHAMBERS, IF THERE'S ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT, SEEING THEN I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZUNE, PHIL, CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF?

CAN YOU HEAR ME?

I CAN HEAR YOU. I WILL JUMP IN WHEN YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS LEFT, GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT PLEASE.

GREAT. I AM A UNION REP WITH SCIU AND I'M HERE TO SUPPORT THE CITY WORKERS WHO HELP THE CITY RUN EVERY DAY. WE PROBABLY REPRESENT PUBLIC WORKS AND ADMIN STAFF AND SEIU TENT ONE SUPPORTS AND ENCOURAGES THE COUNCIL TO SUPPORT AND ALLOW THE PUBLIC TO VOTE ON HALF SENT SALES TAX AND WITHOUT THIS ACTION SERVICES WILL BE HARMED SENT SALES TAX REVENUES ARE SUBTLY DECREASING THE COST INCREASE. IT IS ALSO NOTED IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET, IT RELIES ON FUNDS WHICH WILL NOT BE THERE IN THE LONG RUN, SUCH AS BUILDING FEES. RELYING ON REVENUES THAT WILL NOT CONTINUE DRAWING ON DIMINISHING FUND BALANCE IS NOT SUSTAINABLE. SEIU WANTS TO PARTNER WITH THE CITY AND COMMUNITY PARTNERS TO HELP KEEP SEBASTOPOL A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE, THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION ON ALLOWING PUBLIC INPUT , THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I'LL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. IF THERE IS ANYBODY IN CHAMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE BUDGET HEARING. SEEING NOW NEVER GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. IF THERE'S ANYBODY ON ZOOM THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE BUDGET HEARING YOU PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY. SEEING YOU NONE, THE PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED ON THE BUDGET.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MARY GURLEY . WE HAVE DONE PUBLIC COMMENT. THE NEXT STAGE IN THE PROCESS IS TO COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR DISCUSSION AND COMMENT IN ORDER TO THEN PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF ON THIS ITEM. AT THIS POINT I WILL TURN TO COUNCILMEMBERS AND THE STAFF FOR ANY FINAL COMMENTS, AND BARRING THEN WE WILL TAKE A MEAL BREAK FOR HALF AN HOUR. ANY COMMENTS FROM CITY COUNCILMEMBERS? BEFORE WE TAKE THAT BREAK? NO. OKAY. SO, STAFF, ANY COMMENTS OR INPUT? WE WILL RE-CONVENE AT 7:25 TO FINALIZE OUR BUDGET COMMITTEE, THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, VERY MUCH, WE ARE RECONVENING TONIGHT CITY COUNCIL MEETING AT APPROXIMATELY 7:34, IN ORDER TO CONTINUE THE BUDGET ITEM. WE HAD AN INITIAL PRESENTATION, INITIAL QUESTIONS OF THE COUNCIL AND COMMENTS AND INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC AND NOW WE ARE BACK AT THE COUNCIL TABLE TO DISCUSS THIS ITEM, MAKE COMMENTS AND HOPEFULLY MOVE FORWARD WITH SOME DIRECTION TO STAFF. MARY GURLEY, COULD YOU DO US A FAVOR AND REMIND US, IF YOU COULD, WHAT THE SPECIFIC ACTION IS THAT WE ARE BEING ASKED TO TAKE, THERE WERE A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT ITEMS AND I THINK IT WOULD HELP TO BE REMINDED OF THOSE, IF YOU HAVE THEM IN FRONT OF YOU.

THE ACTION TONIGHT IS TO GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE BUDGET, TO MAKE ANY CHANGES, RECOMMENDATIONS, ALSO TO DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL FOR THE CREATION OF THE COMMITTEE, THE CITY COUNCIL AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR THE SEBASTOPOL COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER BASED ON THE CIP MEETING FROM LAST WEEK OR TWO WEEKS AGO, FOR THE BUILDING ASSESSMENT AND THEN THE REQUEST IS TO CREATE ANOTHER AD HOC COMMITTEE TO EXPLORE SPECIALIZED ASSISTANCE FOR THE SAFE PROGRAM . AND SETTING A DATE FOR THE MINI-GOALS WITH THE BIGGER GOALS TO BE HELD IN JANUARY/FEBRUARY OF NEXT YEAR. THERE WAS A QUEST FOR MINI-GOALS BETWEEN NOW AND DECEMBER, HOPEFULLY DECEMBER,

OCTOBER TIMEFRAME AND THEN TO COME BACK IN OUR MAJOR GOALS FOR PROBABLY A FEBRUARY TIMELINE.

ACTION ON THE BUDGET ITEM , QUESTION OF CREATION OF AN AD HOC FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER , I HAVE A QUESTION HERE FROM VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN.

HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE MINI-GOALSETTING THING, THAT WE WERE NOT DOING UNTIL AFTER THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR, THAT I GET THAT WRONG?

MY UNDERSTANDING IS YOU WOULD HAVE SMALL GOALS BETWEEN NOW AND THE MAJOR BUDGET AND THEN IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING WE WOULD HAVE, AFTER THE COUNCIL , AFTER A NEW COUNCIL SELECTED WE HAVE A MAJOR GOAL SETTING SESSION IN THE JANUARY/FEBRUARY TIMEFRAME.

CAN YOU JUST REFRESH YOUR MEMORY, OKAY.

AND TO CLARIFY, THE \$10,000 ITEM IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET IS NOT FOR THE MINI-GOALSETTING, IT IS FOR THE MAJOR GOAL SETTING AFTER THE ELECTION?

CORRECT. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THERE WOULD NOT BE ANY COST, LIKE A STUDY SESSION FOR THE MINI-GOALS, BETWEEN NOW AND DECEMBER AND THE 10,000 WAS THE ESTIMATE, COULD BELOW, DEPENDING ON WHAT THE FACILITATOR COMES BACK WITH THE 10,000 WOULD BE SET ASIDE FOR THE JANUARY/FEBRUARY GOAL SESSION.

THANK YOU FOR CLARIFICATION. WE HAVE DIRECTION ON THE BUDGET, POTENTIAL OF AN OUT OF A AD HOC FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER , AN AD HOC ON THE SAFE PROGRAM AND SETTING A DATE FOR THE MINI-GOAL SESSION, DOES THAT CAPTURE AT ALL?

CORRECT.

GREAT. SO, WHEN WE TOOK OUR BREAK WE HAD NOT YET GONE THROUGH THE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS, ITEMS, I THINK IT WOULD BE WORTHWHILE UNLESS ANYBODY OBJECTS TO PULL THAT. I SEE COUNCILMEMBER MAUER HAS COMMENT, YES?

I HOPE WE CAN JUST GO STRAIGHT THROUGH THE DEPARTMENTS AND FINISH UP WITH THOSE, IS THAT MAKE SENSE?

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

I WOULD RECOMMEND OR LIKE TO SEE'S ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS ADDED AS WE GO THROUGH THE DEPARTMENTS. FOR EXAMPLE, NUMBER ONE, \$30,000 CLASSIFICATION COMPARISON STUDY, WHAT DEPARTMENT IS THAT IN? WE CAN LOOK AT A DEPARTMENT BY DEPARTMENT. I DON'T FEEL GOOD LIKE RECOMMENDING THE BUDGET FOR DEPARTMENT AND THEN WE ADD AN ADD-ON LATER, THAT SEEMS SILLY.

I AGREE.

GREAT, THANK YOU , VERY MUCH. THE 30,000 FOR CLASSIFICATION COMPENSATION STUDY, WHICH DEPARTMENT DOES THAT COME WITH? ADMINISTRATIVE? OKAY. LET'S ADD THAT TO ADMINISTRATION SERVICES FOR OUR DISCUSSION THERE. STAFFING STUDY? SAME, OKAY ADMIN SERVICES. AND THEN THE COUNCILMEMBER ATTENDANCE AT LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES? CITY COUNCIL? OKAY. AND THEN THE WARMING CENTER GOES IN POLICE DEPARTMENT? WARMING AND COOLING CENTERS, OKAY. THE FINAL, TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION, WHAT DEPARTMENT WOULD THAT BE IN?

IT WOULD BE IN ADMIN SERVICES BUT THAT DOES NOT MEAN IT WOULD BE AN ADMIN SERVICES EMPLOYEE, IT DEPENDS, THERE HAS TO BE INTEREST FROM AN EMPLOYEE TO DO THIS BUT IT MAKES SENSE THERE BECAUSE IT IS RISK MANAGEMENT AND THE HANDLE RISK MANAGEMENT.

ALL RIGHT, ONE ITEM FROM THIS LIST ADDED ONTO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT WOULD BE THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES, WE HAVE ONE ITEM ADDED TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT WARMING AND COOLING CENTERS AND THE REMAINING THREE ITEMS WOULD BE IN ADMIN SERVICES. SO, IF PEOPLE CAN HELP ME KEEP TRACK OF THAT, MARY GURLEY, MAYBE YOU COULD? ON THE REMAINING SLIDES THERE WAS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL TOPICS ON PLANNING STAFF TIME BUT I THINK THOSE ARE INCORPORATED WITHIN THE SLIDES THEMSELVES. SO, WE CAN PROBABLY JUST DISCUSS THOSE ONLY GET THERE. THAT IS THE MERGER OF THE COMMITTEES, AMONG OTHER ITEMS. OKAY, I THINK WE ARE READY TO JUST START GOING THROUGH A DISCUSSION OF THE DEPARTMENT ITEMS, IS THAT ACCEPTABLE TO EVERYONE? OKAY. BEFORE WE START THAT, COULD YOU PLEASE, CAN SOMEBODY PLEASE PUT UP THE LIST OF CITY COUNCIL? THE ITEMS, THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL I THINK FOR RUNNING THROUGH OUR DISCUSSION. MY THOUGHT, I WILL INVITE CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS TO JUST MAKE ANY INITIAL COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE BEFORE WE DO THE DEEP DIVE INTO IT BUT MY THOUGHT IS TO PULL UP CITY COUNCIL AND JUST GO THROUGH SEQUENTIALLY, WE CAN HAVE SOME COMMENTS OR WE CAN JUST GO THUMBS UP, THUMBS DOWN AND THEN COME UP BACK TO THOSE ITEMS THAT WE FEEL WE NEED MORE DISCUSSION ON, ANYBODY HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS ON A BETTER OR DIFFERENT APPROACH? NO, LET'S TRY THAT. THEN WE WILL MODIFIED AS WE MOVE ON. HERE'S OUR CITY COUNCIL LIST. BEFORE GOING INTO THIS, ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS IN GENERAL? FROM CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS REGARDING THE BUDGET OR ANY BIGGER ISSUES? NO. STAFF, ANY COMMENTS FROM STAFF?

I WANT TO CALL THAT THERE IS A DISAGREEMENT ON THE BUDGET COMMITTEE , IN CASE YOU WANT TO TALK ABOUT IT.

THANK YOU, THINK WE CAN TRUST THAT AND I THINK THEY WILL BE GOOD ADVOCATES. IS THERE ANYTHING ON THIS LIST THAT WOULD BE, WHAT WAS IT, BASICALLY A HOLDING AMOUNT THAT WILL BE DISCUSSED LATER ON? A PLACEHOLDER, A PLACEHOLDER AMOUNT THAT WE ARE BEING REQUESTED TO SET ASIDE THAT WILL COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL IN ORDER FOR THE CITY COUNCIL TO MAKE A FINAL DECISION. YOU MAY HEAR DIRECTION FROM THE CITY COUNCIL TO IDENTIFY SOME OF THOSE IN THAT WAY BUT ANYTHING FROM THE STAFF?

I WANT TO CALL OUT ONE THING SO YOU ARE AWARE OF THE CONTRACT SUPPORT , THE TERM IS BASIC GOALSETTING OR FROM WHAT I ENVISION WE WOULD DO FOR THE FIRST MONTH OR TWO OF NEXT YEAR, THAT WILL BE EXTREMELY BASIC IN TERMS OF CONTRACT SUPPORT, THE TYPICAL RATE FOR SOMETHING LIKE THAT IS CLOSER TO 25,000 AND INCLUDES CONSIDERABLE PREP WORK. CONSIDERABLE FOLLOW-UP DELIVERABLES LIKE A PLAN TO IMPLEMENT AND ALL OF THAT. THIS WILL BE ALMOST A STRAIGHT FACILITATION WITH PREP AND FOLLOW-UP FOR \$10,000.

SO, YOU ARE SAYING THAT A FULL GOALSETTING SESSION WOULD PROBABLY MORE REASONABLY COST 20,000?

EASILY AND I'VE SEEN IT UP TO 30, 20 IS EASY.

IS MAYBE AN ITEM THAT IS MINIMALLY FUNDED THAT THE COUNCIL MIGHT ADDRESS LATER? AS A REMINDER, WHEN DO WE EXPECT TO HAVE A MID-YOUR BUDGET REVIEW?

WE DON'T HAVE A DEFINITIVE DATE, WE MAY MAKE PROJECTIONS AND TRY TO HAVE IT BEFORE THE END OF THE YEAR. ANOTHER OPTION IS TO WAIT FOR THE MID-YOUR NUMBERS AND THEN DO THAT IN THE FIRST MEETING IN FEBRUARY, SECOND IN JANUARY, ONCE YOU HAVE A CHANCE TO GET THE NUMBERS COMPILED.

OKAY, THANK YOU . LOOKING AT THESE ITEMS I'M GOING TO JUST TRY THIS OUT, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER?

JUST A SUGGESTION, MAYBE SOME OF THESE THINGS ARE NOT GOING TO BE ARGUABLE AND THEY WILL BE ACCEPTABLE, I'M JUST WONDERING IF WE CAN DISCUSS ONLY THE PARTS THAT ARE ARGUABLE?

LET'S GO THROUGH THIS, LOOKING AT THIS LIST, LET'S MAKE A LIST OF THOSE ITEMS THAT ANYONE ON THE COUNCIL WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS FURTHER. OKAY, LET'S JUST START WITH THE FIRST ITEM. IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE PROPOSING, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

KNOW I'M PROPOSING WHAT MAURER SAYS, WROTE ON THE LINE AND IF YOU DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH IT WE WILL BRING DOWN THE THINGS YOU WANT TO DISCUSS.

OKAY. AND IS YOUR SUGGESTION THAT I START WITH COUNCILMEMBER MAURER AS AN EXAMPLE AND JUST ASK HER IF THERE IS ANYTHING?

YES.

IS THAT ACCEPTABLE TO YOU? OKAY. I'M GOING TO GO WITH COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, DO YOU HAVE AN ITEM HERE IN THE CITY COUNCIL LIST THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS FURTHER. OKAY. VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN?

YES, THE 38,000 HOMELESS SHIFT FROM HOMELESS OUTREACH TO POLICE, NO WE APPROVE SOMETHING GIVING HER GENERAL MANAGER THE AUTHORITY TO STAFF ONCE AND I WANT TO STATE THE FACT THAT THIS GRANT WAS UNDER A CIVIL DEPARTMENT HAD, IT WAS OUR PAST PLANNING DIRECTOR AND TO HAVE IT UNDER LAW ENFORCEMENT IS A CONCERN. I UNDERSTAND THEY INTERFACE A LOT BUT TO HAVE IT GO FROM HAVING IT CIVILLY MOUNTED TO CRIMINALLY MONITORED MONITORED IS A CONCERN FOR ME AND THAT IS THE REASON WHY WE DIFFERED IN OUR ROLES THERE. LET'S SEE. AND THE 4000 INCREASED AND I KNOW THERE ARE QUESTIONS RAISED EARLIER AND IT IS MY HOPE THAT THE RECOMMENDATION COULD HAVE BEEN MUCH HIGHER BUT I THINK THAT WE ENDED UP NEGOTIATING IT AND WE THOUGHT THAT 4000 WAS A GOOD START TO AT LEAST BE A MEMBER AND IT IS MY ANTICIPATION THAT BASED UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF WHAT STAFF MIGHT WANT TO GO VOLUNTARILY THAT THEY GO, MAYBE NOT ON THE CITY DIME, I DON'T KNOW THAT IS UP TO HIM BUT I CERTAINLY WOULD WANT TO BECAUSE I DID NOT COME UP WITH THIS IDEA. THERE WAS A REPRESENTATIVE FROM AN ORGANIZATION THAT REPRESENTS A PART OF OUR COMMUNITY AND I WILL STATE WHAT SHE SAID. IF WE KEEP GIVING OUT PROP DONATIONS THEY ARE NOT GOING TO GET ONE, THEY NEED NOTHING OTHER THAN A RECOGNITION ONCE PER MONTH. THE NEED TO SEE THE CITY ACTUALLY DO SOMETHING CONCRETELY TOWARDS ADDRESSING GOALS OF HONORING AND LIFTING UP MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES. THE IDEA CAME FROM THAT AND I JUST SORT

OF EXPANDED, IT DOES NOT HAVE TO BE LIMITED TO THOSE, IF ANYBODY ELSE WANTS TO IDENTIFY ONE, I WILL, YOU ARE MORE THAN WELCOME TO HAVE IT BE PART OF THE DISCUSSION.

THANK YOU , I'M GOING TO CHECK IN WITH STAFF, EXPECT THERE MAY BE CHANGES THAT ARE MADE AS WE GO ALONG HERE AND LOOK AT THESE PARTICULAR ITEMS THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE DISCUSSING THAT UP ON THE SLIDE AND THERE MIGHT BE ADDITIONAL ITEMS THAT COME INTO DISCUSSION. WHO ON STAFF CAN KEEP TRACK OF THOSE CHANGES? OKAY. YOU CAN MAKE SURE YOU DO THAT FOR US, THAT WOULD BE GREAT. OTHER COMMENTS ON THE CITY COUNCIL AMOUNTS? COUNCILMEMBER HINTON ? SURE, I WILL GO NEXT. I AM FINE WITH THE SHIFT OF THE HOMELESS OUTREACH CONTACT. FRANKLY, WHEN WE ORIGINALLY SUPPORTED THIS, AND I DID SUPPORT THIS AND I BROUGHT IT FORTH TO THE COUNCIL, IT WAS SUPPOSED TO ALWAYS REPORT TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BECAUSE THIS WAS BASICALLY OUR CAHOOTS SUBSTITUTE MODEL. BECAUSE WE COULD NOT AFFORD THAT AT THE TIME. THIS WAS FUNDED BY THE FIFTH DISTRICT SUPERVISOR MONEY WE RECEIVED WHEN THE HOTEL IN RAILROAD SQUARE BECAME A PROJECT FOR US AND MYSELF AND UNIT GLASS BROUGHT THIS FORWARD, I WAS SURPRISED TO HEAR HAD BEEN REPORTING TO ANOTHER DEPARTMENT HEAD. SECONDLY, I THINK THE \$4000 TO FUND MEMBERSHIPS IS ASPIRATIONAL BUT I DON'T FEEL LIKE WE ARE IN A POSITION WHERE WE CAN FUND ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. I DID GO DOWN THE LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WE CURRENTLY PAY FOR AND I AM NOT SURE BUT IT LOOKS LIKE, IF WE CONTINUE TOWARD OUR GOAL OF CONSOLIDATION THAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO ACTUALLY REDUCE SOME OF US ORGANIZATIONAL FEES BECAUSE I ASSUME UNDER AN UMBRELLA WITH GOLD RIDGE THAT SOME OF THOSE FIRE CHIEF ORGANIZATIONS THAT WE PAY FOR NOW MIGHT NOT NEED TO BE FUNDED BY THE CITY. THERE ARE A COUPLE OF THEM THAT I THINK AMOUNT TO ABOUT \$8000. SO, NOT ONLY DO I NOT WANT TO SUPPORT AN INCREASE BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT MAYBE NEXT YEAR, WE WILL NOT HAVE TO FUND ALL OF THOSE ORGANIZATIONS THAT WE CAN RE-LOOK AT THIS. LASTLY, I'M NOT IN FAVOR OF THE ADD-ON OF THE \$3000 TO ATTEND THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF CITIES CONFERENCE IN LONG BEACH. I ATTENDED THAT ONCE MYSELF AND THE FOCUS OF IT WAS VERY MUCH ON SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, BIG-CITY PROJECTS. I JUST DON'T FEEL LIKE WE HAVE THE MONEY, I DON'T WANT TO PULL FROM SOMETHING THAT WE REALLY NEED IN OUR CITY TO SEND SOMEBODY TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TO REPRESENT US AT THAT ONE CONFERENCE. I ALSO QUESTION HOW WE DETERMINE WHO SHOULD GO IF THERE ARE MULTIPLE PEOPLE. THOSE ARE MY WAY INS AND EVERYTHING ELSE IS FINE.

ALL RIGHT, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS.

I SUPPORT THE SHIP FOR THE HOMELESS OUTREACH COORDINATOR AND IT MAKES COMPLETE SENSE TO ME. I'VE COMMUNICATED WITH POLICE OFFICERS NUMEROUS TIMES AND I AM FULLY AWARE OF HOW MUCH THEY INTERFACE AND IT MAKES SENSE TO ME, TO HAVE THEM ALL WORKING TOGETHER UNDER THE SAME UMBRELLA. AS FAR AS THE 4000 I AGREE WE ARE NOT IN THE POSITION TO PUT OUT MONEY FOR SOMETHING LIKE THIS WHEN WE ARE ACTUALLY LOOKING AT CUTTING SO MANY DIFFERENT AREAS. AND AGAIN, OPEN TO LOOKING AT NEXT YEAR BECAUSE I AM AWARE OF MEMBERSHIPS THAT WE MAY BE ABLE TO STOP PUTTING FUNDS TOWARD

ONCE WE DO HAVE THAT MERGER AND I ACTUALLY DO SUPPORT SENDING COUNCILMEMBERS TO INCREASING THE MONEY, TO SEND THEM TO THE CONFERENCE. I UNDERSTAND SOMETIMES, I KNOW YOUR EXPERIENCE BUT I WENT AND I FOUND IT VERY INFORMATIVE FOR ME, WE HAVE HAD DIFFERENT EXPERIENCES, I AM IN SUPPORT OF IT AND I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT FOR ALL OF US TO HAVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT. I MEAN WE ARE PRETTY MUCH VOLUNTEERS BUT IT IS ALMOST A FULL-TIME JOB AND HAVING THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR US AS WELL IS BENEFICIAL FOR THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE FOR US TO BETTER UNDERSTAND WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE STATE. THAT IS PRETTY MUCH WHERE I'M AT. EVERYTHING ELSE I AM FINE WITH.

OKAY, WEIGHING IN HERE , I AM FINE WITH THE SHIFT IN THE HOMELESS OUTREACH CONTRACTS TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, I HAVE TO ADMIT, THE REASON IS BECAUSE OF THIS PARTICULAR POLICE DEPARTMENT WITH THIS PARTICULAR POLICE CHIEF. SO, I HAVE SOME HESITATION BECAUSE I DON'T THINK OUR POLICY SHOULD NECESSARILY BE DRIVEN BY WHO HAPPENS TO BE HOLDING THE POSITION IN THE MOMENT BUT I DO KNOW THAT IS WHERE THE DIRECTION AND THE EFFORT AND THE ENERGY IS PLACED. IF IT IS NOT SHIFTED TO OUR POLICE CHIEF, THAT IS THE PERSON WHO CURRENTLY IS GOING TO BE HANDLING ALL OF THE ISSUES THAT COME UP. FROM A PRAGMATIC, PRACTICAL PERSPECTIVE I WOULD SUPPORT THAT BUT I CAUTION THE COUNCIL TO KEEP AN EYE ON IT, DEPENDING ON WHAT HAPPENS IN TERMS OF CHANGES WITHIN OUR CITY, IN TERMS OF LEADERSHIP AND FOCUS. AS TO THE OTHER ITEMS, THE \$4000 INCREASE, THE NEW ITEM TO FUND MEMBERSHIP IN EQUITY ORGANIZATIONS, I SEE THIS AS A SYMBOLIC INVESTMENT AND I THINK THERE IS SOME BENEFIT TO THE SYMBOLIC INVESTMENT. I WOULD RATHER HAVE US BE KNOWN FOR OUR PRACTICAL, APPLIED EFFORTS AND WHAT WE DO, NOT JUST OUR SYMBOLIC EFFORTS BUT I UNDERSTAND THE MESSAGING BEHIND THIS. I WOULD URGE US TO CONSIDER TWO ORGANIZATIONS, THE GOVERNMENT, I AM SORRY, THE GOVERNMENT ALLIANCE FOR RACIAL EQUITY, WHICH I THINK HAD A \$1000 MEMBERSHIP AMOUNT AND THEN THE NAACP WHAT YOU THINK STARTED AT A \$750 AMOUNT . TO ME THAT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE. I WOULD NOT GO BEYOND THAT. SO, I PROPOSE 1750 OR \$2000 ABOUT, FOR THAT ITEM BUT NOT THE 4000. AS TO THE COLLEAGUE OF CITIES, I AM REALLY TAKEN AND COMPELLED BY THE OBSERVATION OF OUR NEW CITY COUNCILMEMBER, WHO REALLY FELT, I WOULD'VE VOTED NO. I JUST THINK THIS IS A FISCAL CRISIS BUT WE HAVE AN ELECTION OF CITY COUNCILMEMBERS COMING UP AND I WOULD LIKE TO ENCOURAGE AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE AND WE ARE HAVING A CITY COUNCILMEMBER SAYED WAS REALLY USEFUL TO ME, I HAVE TO LISTEN TO THAT AND SUPPORT THE \$3000 AMOUNT, THAT IS WHERE I WOULD LAND ON THIS. OTHERWISE I WOULD SUPPORT ALL OTHER ITEMS. I THINK OUR CITY COUNCILMEMBERS, OUR BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS DID NOT HAVE A CHANCE TO WEIGH IN ON THE \$3000 AMOUNT FOR THE COLLEAGUE OF CITIES, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER?

I'M NOT SUPPORTING IT THIS YEAR.

HELP US UNDERSTAND YOUR REASONING.

WE HAVE A COW CITIES REPRESENTATIVE AND I WOULD ASSUME THAT THEY KEEP UP ON THE ISSUES AND I DON'T SEE A NEED FOR GOING TO A BIG TRIP WITH A BIG EXPENSE IN THAT.

OKAY, VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN?

I AGREE, WE ARE AFFORDED THE OPPORTUNITIES TO CONTINUE TO A LEARN HOW TO DO OUR JOBS BETTER, MAYBE IT IS JUST ME CONSTANTLY FEELING I AM NOT DOING ENOUGH AND THAT I COULD BE DOING BETTER, I AM IN FULLY IN SUPPORT OF THAT REQUEST.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

I WANT TO ADD THAT IF ARE GOING TO SUPPORT THIS, IF I RECALL , COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS ATTENDED A BECAUSE SHE DID NOT ATTEND IN SACRAMENTO , IS THAT CORRECT ABOUT THAT? I AM JUST WONDERING IF WE CAN ONLY SEND THREE TO SACRAMENTO IN JANUARY, ARE WE GOING TO SUPPORT THIS THEN I WOULD REQUEST THAT WE LET OTHER PEOPLE HAVE TURNED TO ATTEND THE VARIOUS CONFERENCES AND THE PERSON THAT MAY BE INTERESTED IN ATTENDING THIS WOULD NOT TAKE ONE OF THE SLOTS TO GO TO SACRAMENTO IN JANUARY.

MARY GURLEY, DID YOU HAVE SOMETHING TO CONTRIBUTE ON THIS TOPIC?

I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY THAT THE CONFERENCE THAT IS COMING UP IN LONG BEACH, THIS IS THE ANNUAL LEAGUE CONFERENCE THAT DEALS WITH RESOLUTIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE, NOT THE SAME ONE, OKAY, I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE BECAUSE THEY ARE TWO SEPARATE CONFERENCES.

THE CONFERENCE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE WOULD BE FOR THE CONFERENCE WHERE RESOLUTIONS WOULD BE ADDRESSED?

THIS IS A RESOLUTION STATEWIDE, CITIES BRING FORWARD RESOLUTIONS THAT CONTAIN POLICIES AND AS IS THE BOATING CONFERENCE THAT THE COUNCIL WOULD SEND A VOTING DELEGATE TO REPRESENT THE CITY.

OKAY, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, McLEWIS I MEAN DO NOTHING US TO CONTRIBUTE?

NO, I DID ATTEND A DIFFERENT ONE BUT IT DOES NOT CHANGE MY THOUGHT ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, IT IS IMPORTANT NO MATTER WHAT ROLE YOU ARE IN AND WE ALL SIT HERE AS ELECTED OFFICIALS AND I AM A HUGE SUPPORT OF PROFESSIONALS OF ELEMENT AND I THINK WE CUT IT OUT OF THE BUDGET LAST YEAR AND I JUST THINK THAT WE OWE IT TO OUR CONSTITUENTS TO KEEP UP ON STUFF AND I UNDERSTAND WHAT THE CONFERENCE IS COMING UP AND I DO SIT ON A LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE AND I DO ATTEND THE MEETING MONTHLY WITH THE COW CITIES WRAP BUT I DON'T SEE THAT AS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, WE ALL SIT THERE AND TALK ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS WITHIN THE CITY AND WE ARE EDUCATED ON WHAT IS PENDING IN SACRAMENTO BUT THE CONFERENCE, I MEAN I THINK IT IS STILL IMPORTANT FOR SOME COUNCILMEMBERS AND I'M NOT ADVOCATING IT JUST BECAUSE I WANT TO GO. I WOULD HOPE WE WOULD HAVE A FAIR PROCESS WITH THAT, THAT IS MY THOUGHT ON IT. OF COURSE I LOVE HIGHER EDUCATION, THAT IS WHY I HAVE A FOUR DEGREES, BUT, YOU KNOW.

THANK YOU, VERY MUCH. WE HAVE NO WAY TO ON ALL OF THESE ITEMS. I THINK IS A PROCESS MY SUGGESTION IS THAT WE GO THROUGH EACH OF THEM, THUMBS UP, THUMBS DOWN AND THEN REMEMBER THAT AFTER WE ARE DONE WE CAN ALWAYS COME BACK. IF WE NEED TO. IF THERE ANY ITEMS THAT PEOPLE CHANGE THEIR MINDS ON ONCE WE HAVE ADDRESSED OTHERS AND ONCE WE KNOW THE TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH BECAUSE WE NEED TO RECOGNIZE THAT ALREADY WE ARE CONSIDERING ADDING A \$3000 ITEM TO A BUDGET THAT IS ALREADY IN A

DEFICIT. LET'S GO THROUGH, 2500 REDUCTION IN CONTRACT WITH PCA, THUMBS UP OR THUMBS DOWN. OKAY. \$4000 REDUCTION FOR LEGAL HEARING NOTICES? 3500 REDUCTION IN COST FOR SHUTTLE FAIR PROGRAM. THE \$36,800 SHIFT OF THE OUTREACH HOMELESS OUTREACH CONTRACT TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. OKAY. \$10,000 SHIFT OF COST FOR PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS TO CITY MANAGER. OKAY. 7186 INCREASING BENEFITS WHICH MAY OCCUR WITH YOU COUNCILMEMBERS. \$10,000 INCREASE FOR CONTRACT SUPPORT FOR BASIC GOAL SETTING SESSION. \$4000 INCREASE TO FUND MEMBERSHIP IN THE GOVERNMENT ALLIANCE, WE WILL COME BACK FOR A POSSIBLE MODIFIED BUT A \$4000 INCREASE TO FUND MEMBERSHIP IN THE VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS. OKAY WERE YOU --

I WANT TO DISCUSS THAT FURTHER IF POSSIBLE.

SURE. LET'S COME BACK. \$3000 FOR COUNCILMEMBERS TO ATTEND CAL LEAGUE OF CITIES CONFERENCE, OKAY. MARY, THERE ARE THREE. OKAY. THE ITEM THAT COUNCILMEMBER MAURER WANTS TO RETURN TO IS THE MEMBERSHIP ITEM. GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER.

I HAD ORIGINALLY AGREED TO THIS AND I AM RE-THINKING IT BASED ON HEARING OTHER COMMENTS. I FUNDAMENTALLY SUPPORT THIS BUT IF IT IS JUST SYMBOLIC I HAVE TO THINK ABOUT OUR OWN CHAMBER AND OUR OWN LOCAL GROUPS, ARE WE GIVING MONEY TO THIS GROUP AND NOT TO OUR OWN CHAMBER? COULD YOU TELL ME HOW MUCH IS IN THE BUDGET FOR THE CHAMBER? DO WE HAVE ANY MONEY SET ASIDE FOR THE CHAMBER? I BELIEVE I SAW WE HAD A BASIC MEMBERSHIP BUT SOMEBODY SHOULD CLARIFY.

I WILL ALSO TURN TO VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN WHO MAY HAVE INPUT ON THIS TOPIC .

WHILE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT MEMBERSHIP, I DID NOT SEE MEMBERSHIPS, SOMEBODY MENTIONED EIGHT , WE BELONG TO ATE SOME THINGS THAT MIGHT GET REDUCED BASED UPON CONSOLIDATION, I DON'T KNOW WHERE THAT IS.

THE QUESTION IS BEING RAISED, OUR CURRENT MEMBERSHIPS WHICH WERE REFERENCED BY COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

ON PAGE 192 OF THE BUDGET. I DID ALSO REACH OUT TO THE CITY OF CATATAS TO ASK ABOUT THEIR ORGANIZATION AND REVIEWED THEIR MEMBERSHIP AND THEY DON'T BELONG TO THESE TYPES OF MEMBERSHIPS THAT ARE BEING PROPOSED, THEY BELONG TO THE SAME BASIC MEMBERSHIPS THAT MOST CITIES DO. I WANTED THAT AS AN EXAMPLE FROM ANOTHER NEIGHBOR CITY.

THANK YOU, VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN, DID YOU COMPLETE YOUR COMMENTS?

YES.

OKAY. WE CAN CONFIRM WE DO HAVE A VARIOUS MEMBERSHIPS , FURTHER DISCUSSION, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER?

LOOKS LIKE THE CHAMBER RECEIVES \$250 .

[INAUDIBLE]

242, RIGHT?

I HAVE 250 ON PAGE 241.

THE NEW MEMBERSHIP IS 250. FOR '23-'24.

I SEE, \$250 IN THE FISCAL YEAR WE ARE CONSIDERING, OKAY, THAT IS THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION. SO, ANY OTHER WEIGHING IN ON THIS ITEM,

OH, A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION ON THIS ITEM. I HAVE NOT HEARD ANYTHING THAT INDICATES THAT WE ARE RECEIVING ANYTHING OF SUBSTANCE FROM THIS MEMBERSHIP, THAT WE ARE SIMPLY SUPPORTING THE ORGANIZATIONS AND CONVEYING A MESSAGE BUT I WANT TO DOUBLE CHECK AND MAKE SURE, IS THAT ACCURATE?

NO, I THINK WE ALSO GET LIKE OPPORTUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE AND TO VOTE ON THEIR LEADERSHIP AND I THINK ACTUALLY TRAINING AND ALSO JOB OPPORTUNITIES, IF WE HAD JOBS. I KNOW WE HAD A DISCUSSION ABOUT JOBS WE NEED TO FILL BECAUSE DURING THE BUDGET DISCUSSION THERE WAS A THOUGHT ABOUT JOINING -- BECAUSE THEY CAN HOST JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS AND GOODNESS, WE DO HAVE SOME THAT ARE GOING TO NEED TO BE FILLED AND LIKE RIGHT NOW.

OKAY, WE HAVE THE SUGGESTION THAT IS IN THIS BUDGET, THE 4000 . I CAME UP WITH 1750 FOR THE NAACP AND THE GOVERNMENT ALLIANCE OR RACIAL EQUITY. WE ALSO HAVE A NUMBER OF COUNCILMEMBERS THAT ARE SUPPORTING NOTHING, ZERO CONTRIBUTION ON THIS SO FAR. COUNCIL MEMBER LOUIS? [CAPTIONERS TRANSITIONING]

IF WE WERE ACTUALLY MOVING THE NEEDLE OR SOMETHING, RIGHT NOW ESPECIALLY, GIVEN THAT WE ARE COVETING -- CUTTING FROM MOST OF OUR OWN ORGANIZATIONS AND THAT, YOU KNOW?

WE HAVE CONTRIBUTED OUR COMMENTS, I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH THE 4150 AND ZERO. ONE THUMBS-UP. IN SUPPORT OF \$1750 FOR THIS SITE? ALL RIGHT, WE HAVE TWO THUMBS UP, ANY OTHER SUGGESTIONS ON THIS ITEM? SO THAT'S WE HAVE, ANA, HAVE YOU TRACKED OUR DECISIONS HERE? WONDERFUL. WE ARE GOING TO GO TO THE CITY MANAGER PAGE, CHECKING IN WITH THE CITY MANAGER AND STAFF, ARE WE OKAY IN OUR PROCESS? DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS OR REQUESTS OF US? ON THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ITEM? WE DIDN'T GET TO THAT. OR DID WE? \$3000 FOR THE -- I THINK WE VOTED, NUMBER THREE. YES, THANK YOU. AND IT IS ONLY 8:00! SO NOW WE ARE ON THE CITY MANAGER PAGE, I WAS THINKING ABOUT SWITCHING HOURLY ROTATION, BUT I THINK THERE IS SOME BENEFIT TO STARTING WITH BUDGET COMMITTEE, I'M GOING TO GO AHEAD AND START AGAIN WITH COUNCILMEMBER MAURER AND VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN. GO AHEAD.

JUST A REMINDER THAT THE CITY MANAGER REDUCED THE EQUIPMENT TECHNOLOGY AND VEHICLE RESERVE FUND FROM \$23,000 DOWN TO \$20,000. THAT IS A SAVINGS OF \$3000 RIGHT THERE, AND I SUPPORT THE PAYMENT FOR THE RELAUNCH PROGRAM. SO I SUPPORT ALL OF THIS.

THANK YOU, GO AHEAD, VICE MAYOR.

I SUPPORT ALL OF THIS.

ALL RIGHT, COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS? SURE, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON? I AM QUESTIONING AND WITH CONSIDERING A PLACEHOLDER FOR THE BOB LEYLAND, WE JUST FINISHED A CONTRACT WITH HIM AND I HESITATE TO MOVE INTO ANOTHER CONTRACT WITHOUT HAVING THIS FULLY VETTED AND BROUGHT BACK TO FULL COUNCIL TO MAKE EIGHT DECISION ON IT. I ALSO HAVE TO SAY, I AM QUESTIONING THE COMP STUDY FOR \$30,000. I KNOW THAT WE DO COMP STUDIES WHEN WE MAKE -- CASA ZIK08 -- THAT IS AN ADD-ON? BESTIE I AM HEARING SOME QUESTIONS FROM THE END OF THE TABLE.

WE AGREE TO ADD THOSE TO THIS?

NOT TO CITY MANAGER.

THOSE RC ARE ADMINISTRATION, JUST THE BOB LEYLAND AND THAT WILL BE ALL.

I WILL BE POINTING OUT, I'M SORRY, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, WITHIN THE \$50,000 FOR BOB LEYLAND, NOT FOR HIM PERSONALLY, BUT THERE IS AN AMOUNT INTENDED TO BE USED TO ASSESS OUR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT. THAT IS CORRECT, RIGHT, CITY MANAGER? I BELIEVE THAT AMOUNT WAS APPROXIMATELY 25,000. SO WITHIN THAT, THAT MAY BE WHERE YOU ARE GETTING \$20,000. I'M SORRY, COUNCIL MEMBER.

OKAY, NOW I AM A LITTLE CONFUSED.

WITHIN THE \$52,000, THERE IS A \$25,000 ESTIMATE IN ORDER TO ASSESS ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TO DETERMINE IF THERE ARE WAYS TO DO QUARTERLY REPORTS, IMPROVE OUR SERVICES THERE, AND THEN THE BALANCE OF THAT \$52,000 WOULD BE FOR GENERAL SERVICES FROM BAKER TELLING.

SO I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF JUST PUTTING GENERAL SERVICES OUT THERE THAT WE DON'T HAVE A NEED FOR AT THIS POINT. I THINK, BUT I SUPPOSE, I DON'T KNOW, I AM ON THE FENCE ABOUT THE OTHER.

AND YOU ARE PROPOSING ON THE \$52,000, JUST TO BE CLEAR HERE, THAT HE MIGHT SUPPORT A PLACEHOLDER?

PLACEHOLDER, YEAH.

ANY COMMENTS ON THE OTHER ONE? FOR THE INSTANCE, THE VEHICLE?

OKAY, NO COMMENTS ON THAT. CITY MANAGER?

JUST ONE NOTE, ANY CONTRACT THAT WE WOULD DO FURTHER WORK WITH BAKER TILLY WOULD COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL BECAUSE A LOT OF THE CONTRACT IS ALREADY AT MY SIGNING AUTHORITY. WE WOULD DO THAT FOR THE VEHICLE PROJECT ALONE AND ANY FURTHER WORK WITH BOB LEYLAND TO CONTINUE THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR. I DO THINK IT IS APPROPRIATE TO PUT SOME MONEY THAT YOU ARE COMFORTABLE WITH ASIDE, BUT IT WILL COME BACK TO COUNCIL FOR ANY TYPE OF CONTRACT.

CAN YOU REMIND US WHAT YOUR AUTHORITY MAX IS QUICK \$50,000.

IF WE PUT IT IN AS A PLACEHOLDER, WE WOULDN'T HAVE TO COME BACK TO COUNCIL BECAUSE IT IS WITHIN YOUR AUTHORITY?

IT WOULD, I CAN'T PIECEMEAL A CONTRACT, LIKE, I CAN'T TAKE TWO \$30,000 CONTRACTS WITH BAKER TILLY. ONCE I HIT \$50,000, I HAVE TO HEAD BACK TO THE COUNCIL TO GET APPROVAL TO GO OVER THAT. IF THAT MAKES SENSE? COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS? ANY COMMENTS ON THESE ITEMS? I WILL WEIGH IN HERE, I AM ON THE \$52,000 FOR BAKER TILLY AND SIMILARLY, ON THE \$20,000 AMOUNT FOR A VEHICLE PROJECTIONS. THESE ARE JUST FULL ENOUGH VETTED FOR ME. I CERTAINLY WOULD BE WILLING TO SET ASIDE AS A PLACEHOLDER AMOUNT OF MONEY FOR THE \$52,000 AND FOR THE \$20,000 DOWN FROM \$23,000, BUT I AM NOT PREPARED TO PUT A RUBBER STAMP ON APPROVAL FOR THOSE APPLICATIONS AND ALLOCATIONS UNTIL THEY COME BACK WITH A FULL STAFF REPORT FOR THE CITY COUNCIL. THE REST OF THE ITEMS I AM FULLY IN SUPPORT OF. SAD ABOUT THE RELAUNCH PROGRAM, BUT WE OWE THEM THE MONEY, SO WE NEED TO DO THAT. ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BEFORE WE DO OUR -- GO AHEAD CALC, COUNCIL MEMBER.

WE ARE PUTTING THIS AS A PLACE HOLDER, RIGHT?

THE BAKER TILLY MANAGEMENT REVIEW I LOOK AT IS PUTTING IN PLACE HOLDERS. I WANT TO TALK TO FIRMS OR INDIVIDUALS WHO DO THAT WORK, SEE WHAT THEIR COST COME BACK AND THEN BRING ESPECIALLY BAKER TILLY, THEY NEED TO COME BACK FOR NO OTHER REASON THAT IF THEY DO THE VEHICLE PROJECT THAT ONCE THEY ARE OVER TWO 50,000, THAT IS COMING BACK FOR SURE. I'M NOT SURE THERE WILL BE OTHER PIECES OR NOT. TO THE MAYOR'S POINT, I THINK WHAT YOU'RE ASKING FOR IS, WE ARE COMING BACK TO BAKER TILLY, A FORESHORE COMES BACK TO THE FULL COUNCIL. IF YOU WOULD LIKE THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW, WE WOULD BRING THAT BACK AS WELL, IT IS WITHIN MY SIGNING ACCORD.

MY SUGGESTION WOULD BE THAT WE APPROVE THE AMOUNTS AS A PLACEHOLDER, SUBJECT TO FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY THE FULL CITY COUNCIL. AT A LATER TIME, THAT WOULD BE MY THOUGHT. AND MY PROPOSAL GOT COUNCILMEMBER?

WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY PLACEHOLDER?

MEANING, SET ASIDE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY, BUT I PERSONALLY AM NOT PREPARED TO ALLOCATE \$52,000 FOR SERVICES THAT I HAVE NOT SEEN THE SCOPE OF, I DON'T KNOW THAT, IN FACT, THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY IS WHAT IS NEEDED. I DON'T HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION IN ORDER TO SAY, YES, I WANT TO SPEND THIS TAXPAYER MONEY.

CAN I CLARIFY, CAN YOU DID YOU JUST SAY YOU TARGETED BAKER TILLY TO DO THE RESERVE FUND

THAT IS THE ONLY FIRM I HAVE BEEN ABLE TO FIND THAT DOES THAT WORK.

WE WILL HAVE 20 PLUS 52 FOR BAKER TILLY?

WE WOULD ADD 20 FOR THE FLEET PROJECT AND THE 52 WOULD BE AVAILABLE, I CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND, I AM NOT WILLING TO WRITE A CHECK FOR \$52,000, BUT I WOULD WANT TO SCOPE OUT THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND I DO WANT TO BE ABLE TO ENSURE THAT WE CAN CONTINUE TO WORK WITH BOB LEE FLYNN ON THE FINANCIAL EXAM. HE MIGHT BE A AN APPROPRIATE PERSON TO HELP WITH THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. HE IS AN EXPERIENCED FINANCE DIRECTOR. I THINK IT IS -- THINKING OF IT AS A PLACEHOLDER, PENDING FINAL COUNCIL DECISION, IS AN APPROPRIATE WAY TO THINK ABOUT IT.

NOW I HAVE TO ADD ON, HE SAID ADD MONEY FROM LAST YEAR TO THE \$20,000, SO HOW MUCH ARE WE CARRYING OVER FROM LAST YEAR?

WE ARE CARRYING \$20,000 OVER FOR THE BAKER TILLY CONTRACT FROM LAST YEAR.

SO THIS EQUIPMENT TECHNOLOGY VEHICLE RESERVE PROJECT IS A \$40,000 PROJECT?

NO, IT IS A \$20,000 OFFER THAT WOULD BE PAID OUT OF A SEPARATE FUND. THE TOTAL IS THE \$72,000 TO CARRY OVER FOR THIS YEAR AND THEN, CONTINUING TO WORK WITH THEM NEXT YEAR AND THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF ADMINISTERING OF SERVICES. I KNOW THAT WE ARE GOING TO NEED THAT MUCH, WE SPENT ABOUT 30 ON BOB LEE FLYNN -- LELAND FOR SIX MONTHS. I WOULD HAVE TO DO A DEEPER DIE TO SEE WHAT WE WOULD SPEND. IF YOU WANTED TO REDUCE THAT, I WOULD BE OKAY WITH THAT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT WE ARE ACTUALLY GOING TO NEED AND WE COULD REVISIT IT AT MIDYEAR IF WE NEEDED TO.

BREAKING THIS DOWN, IT SOUNDS LIKE \$27,000 IS YOUR ESTIMATE FOR A BAKER TILLY CONTRACT, \$25,000 IS YOUR ESTIMATE FOR THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES REVIEW AND THEN, AS A SEPARATE ITEM, YOU HAVE \$20,000 FOR THE ASSESSING OF THE CITY FLEET AND VEHICLES NEEDS, IS THAT CORRECT?

AND THERE IS A \$20,000 CARRYOVER FROM THIS YEAR.

AND THAT CARRYOVER IS NOT REFLECTED IN THESE NUMBERS?

THAT IS CORRECT, THAT IS A CARRYOVER.

THAT'S INTERESTING, SO IT IS A CARRYOVER, BUT ARE THERE OTHER AREAS WHERE WE ARE -- DOES THAT \$20,000 SHOW UP IN THE BUDGET FOR CITY MANAGER? AS A BAKER TILLY AMOUNT? I AM SEEING OUR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES NOT HER HEAD. OKAY, SO THEN A QUESTION FOR ANA KWONG , THE AMOUNT WE HAVE IN OUR PROPOSED BUDGET, IS IT \$20,000 PLUS THE \$52,000? OKAY, AND THEN, AS A SEPARATE AMOUNT, \$20,000 FOR THE VEHICLE AND PROPOSED BUDGET?

BUT THAT'S IMPORTANT CLARIFICATION. SO THE \$20,000 AMOUNT FOR THE VEHICLE ASSESSMENT STUDY IS NOT IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET? BUT WE DO HAVE IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET IS \$20,000 CARRYOVER? WHICH, FOR PURPOSES OF DISCUSSION, ME COMING OUT OF THE CURRENT BUDGET. I WOULD SEE THAT AS FOR FUTURE AND COPPER TRANSPARENCY, THIS NUMBER \$52,000 SHOULD BE \$70,000 FROM MY PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE. WHAT WE ARE LOOKING AT IS 72,000 TO BAKER TILLY? IS THAT CORRECT? \$72,000 FOR BAKER TILLY AND THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW, WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT BE BAKER TILLY.

OKAY, BAKER TILLY WOULD BE \$47,000? MORE OR LESS?

MORE OR LESS.

PLUS \$25,000 FOR THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW?

YES.

IN TERMS OF YOUR -- IN TERMS OF SIGNING AUTHORITY, I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO CLARIFY THAT THIS IS -- I MEAN, THIS IS A \$47,000 PLUS \$25,000 AMOUNT, CORRECT?

POTENTIALLY.

OKAY, AS WE GO THROUGH THIS DISCUSSION, I THINK IT WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR ALL OF US, IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER CARRYOVER AMOUNTS, ANY AMOUNTS YOU WOULD CONSIDER TO BE CARRYOVER AMOUNTS, WE SHOULD BE MADE AWARE OF. NOT RIGHT IN THIS INSTANCE, BUT AS WE GO THROUGH.

SORRY, FOLKS, LENGTHY DISCUSSION. DEFINITELY, IN LIGHT OF ALL OF THAT, WOULD BE IN SUPPORT OF SETTING THE REQUESTED AMOUNTS ASIDE, SUBJECT TO OUR THOROUGH EXAMINATION AT A LATER CITY COUNCIL MEETING. ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON THESE ITEMS? GIVEN WHAT WE JUST HEARD? COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS, WAS THERE SOMETHING YOU WANTED TO SAY?

NO. JUST, YEAH, I'M SHAKING MY HEAD.

SO WE HAVE THESE ITEMS FOR CITY MANAGER. IN TERMS OF A PLACEHOLDER CONCEPT THAT HAS JUST BEEN DESCRIBED, I JUST WANT TO GET A SENSE, IS THE CITY COUNCIL -- I AM IN SUPPORT OF THAT IDEA, I HEAR FROM COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, ALSO FOR COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS, LOOKING AT OUR BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS, DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCERNS ABOUT THAT?

MY CONCERN IS, I DON'T WANT TO SAY HI THE CITY MANAGER'S HANDS. IF HE HAD A NEED FOR ANALYTIC SUPPORT, I WANT HIM TO BE ABLE TO REACH OUT AND RECEIVE THAT AND NOT FEEL LIKE HE HAD TO WAIT FOR TWO OR THREE WEEKS TO COME TO COUNCIL TO MAKE THOSE DECISIONS. IS IT POSSIBLE WE COULD GIVE HIM A CERTAIN, LIKE, HALF OF WHAT HE'S ASKING FOR? COME BACK AND REVIEW MIDYEAR OR HAVE A PLACEHOLDER OR SOMETHING TO THAT EFFECT?

ANY COMMENTS, COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS?

I CAN GET ON BOARD WITH THAT, IF WE SPLIT IT OUT.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

I CAN GET ON BOARD WITH SPLITTING WHAT HE'S ALREADY GOT IN THE WORKS, BUT I REALLY NEED TO SAY, PUBLICLY CLEAR EVEN THOUGH HE HAS THE \$15 AND DOLLAR -- \$15,000 SIGNING ABILITY, I'M NOT COMFORTABLE WITH THIS GOING FORWARD, I'M NOT TRYING TO TIE HIS HANDS, BUT WE HAVE TO MAKE DECISIONS. I DON'T FEEL LIKE I CAN MAKE A DECISION AND JUST AUTHORIZE THIS AMOUNT AND I THINK COUNCIL SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THESE DECISIONS, ESPECIALLY WHEN WE ARE HIRING OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS. SO THAT'S HOW I FEEL.

WHAT ABOUT THE IDEA OF THINKING OF THE SUGGESTION HERE FROM COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, HAVING THE COUNCIL APPROVED A \$20,000 AMOUNT WITH THE AMOUNT OF THE BALANCE COMING BACK WITH THE FULL CONTRACT, BUT AUTHORIZING OUR CITY MANAGER TO SPEND \$20,000 ON BAKER TILLY WITH THE REMAINING ASK COMING BACK TO US, SET ASIDE AS A PLACEHOLDER, BUT COMING BACK TO US FOR A FINAL DECISION?

THAT IS ACTUALLY ALREADY IN PLACE RIGHT NOW BECAUSE I HAVE THE SIGNING AUTHORITY AND I HAVE \$20,000 LEFT IN THAT SIGNING AUTHORITY. I APPRECIATE THE DESIRE FOR FLEXIBILITY, I AM ALSO FINE WITH PROCEEDING AS YOU WERE INITIALLY SUGGESTING, I DO THINK I HAVE SOME FLEXIBILITY. THE ONE THING I WOULD JUST WANT TO NAIL DOWN AND MAKE SURE WE ARE CLEAR ON, ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, THE VEHICLE RESERVE OR THE VEHICLE PROJECT, IF YOU WILL.

OKAY, SO LET'S CLOSE UP THE DISCUSSION, I THINK VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN MIGHT HAVE HAD SOMETHING, DID YOU HAVE A COMMENT?

NO, I AGREE WITH COUNCILMEMBER MAURER AND IF IT WORKS WITH THE GENERAL MANAGER, IT SOUNDS LIKE THE \$20,000 AND ANYTHING BEYOND THAT, YOU HAVE TO COME BACK WITH A STAFF REPORT.

GREAT, IS EVERYONE THUMBS UP ON THAT IDEA? OKAY, GOOD. THANK YOU. AND THEN, THE AMOUNT FOR THE \$20,000 FOR THE VEHICLE RESERVE STUDY, CITY MANAGER, DID YOU HAVE A COMMENT HE WANTED TO MAKE?

THIS MIGHT HAVE BEEN AN OVERSIGHT IN FINISHING UP THE BUDGET, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST WE TAKE THAT \$20,000 OUT OF THE EQUIPMENT, TECHNOLOGY AND VEHICLE RESERVE FUND. IT SEEMS APPROPRIATE USE OF THAT FUND TO FIGURE OUT WHAT WE REALLY NEED FOR FLEET AND HOW WE CAN IMPROVE OUR OPERATIONS.

OKAY, MY ONLY COMMENT IS, WHY \$20,000? IS THIS JUST A NUMBER UP THERE?

IT'S WHAT IS COMPED, I TALKED TO SEVERAL FIRMS WHO WOULD DO LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONSULTING, IT TURNS OUT THAT BAKER TILLY IS THE ONLY ONE WHO HAS A SPECIALIST THAT DOES THIS WORK AND THEY GIVE US A PROPOSAL THAT IS \$20,000 OR VERY VERY CLOSE TO THAT. WE DID SCOPE --

BRING IT DOWN IN SCOPE A LITTLE BIT, WE WANT TO LEAVE THE FIRE APPARATUS OUT OF IT, WE THINK WE CAN MANAGE THAT SEPARATELY.

THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS?

I JUST HAD A QUESTION, I REALIZE IT SAYS EQUIPMENT TECHNOLOGY AND VEHICLE, IT SEEMS TO ME, WOULDN'T DEPARTMENT HEADS KNOW WHAT THEY NEED? WE RELY ON THE FIRE CHIEF TO TELL US WHAT FIRETRUCKS WE NEED, JUST WONDERING WHY WE HAVE TO PAY \$20,000. I'M JUST TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THE LOGIC BECAUSE I THINK DANTE HAS A GOOD IDEA OF WHAT WE NEED FOR PUBLIC WORKS, SO I AM JUST --

TO ME, THE PROPER MAY WAY TO MANAGE YOUR FLEET, YOU BUY A NEW VEHICLE AND EXPECTED TO LAST 10 YEARS, THE YEAR YOU BUY OR THE YEAR AFTER YOU BUY, YOU PUT 10% OF THE COST ASIDE. WE DON'T NEED A NEW \$100,000 PIECE OF EQUIPMENT WITH NO MONEY SET ASIDE. FIGURING OUT WHAT THOSE NUMBERS OUGHT TO BE BASED ON THE CURRENT FLEET, HOW MUCH LONGER WE EXPECT VEHICLES TO LAST, WHAT SHOULD WE HAVE PUT ASIDE FOR REPLACEMENT? WHAT DO WE NEED TO BE PUTTING ASIDE FOR THIS YEAR? IS THERE THINGS WE CAN DO IN TERMS OF MAINTENANCE THAT GIVE US A LITTLE MORE CONFIDENCE THAT WE ARE MAINTAINING THEM PROPERLY, ALL THAT IS PART OF PROPER FLEET MANAGEMENT.

I'M SORRY, I'M GOING TO TRY TO MOVE US ALONG.

THIS IS JUST A ONE TIME THING YOU NEED TO DO? FROM THERE WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO, HOPEFULLY, HAVE THE FORMULAS OF WHATEVER?

YES.

OKAY, I THINK WE ARE PROBABLY READY TO MAKE A DECISION HERE. WE ALREADY COVERED THE \$52,000, THE \$20,000 AMOUNT, THUMBS UP TO PULL THAT OUT OF THE VEHICLE RESERVE? YES, NO, MAYBE? OKAY. THE \$10,000 FOR THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION? COUNCILMEMBER HINTON IS HESITATING, THAT YOU -- OKAY. \$6000 FOR PAYMENT FOR PRIOR WORK FOR THE RELAUNCH PROGRAM? AND THEN, \$10,000 SHIFT OF CONTRACT COSTS FOR PUBLIC COMMUNICATION'S FROM CITY COUNCIL TO CITY MANAGER? THUMBS UP, EVERYONE? OKAY. I THINK THAT COVERS OUR CITY MANAGER ITEMS AND, NOW, MOVING ON TO CITY ATTORNEY, NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES. THE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER ITEMS, \$10,000 IN REDUCED BALLOT MEASURE EXPENSES, THUMBS UP, EVERYONE?

I'M SORRY, EXCUSE ME.

PLEASE. YES?

I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE I AM CLEAR, ON THE BUDGET, IS IT \$72,000 FOR THE CONTINUING OR \$52,000?

I'M GLAD YOU ASKED THAT FOLLOW-UP QUESTION, THIS IS A QUESTION I HAVE ABOUT HOW CARRYOVER AMOUNTS ARE DEALT WITH.

I DON'T THINK IT IS LISTED BECAUSE TYPICALLY, CARRYOVERS ARE. IF YOU LOOK IN THE CITY MANAGER'S BUDGET, WE DO HAVE CARRYOVERS LIKE R-3. WE HAVE THE CONTRACT FROM LAST YEAR, WE EXPENDED WHATEVER AMOUNT WE EXPENDED AND CARRIED OVER THE REMAINDER OF IT. IS THE CARRYOVER IN HERE? I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE IT IS CLEAR, IT 72 IF IT'S NOT IN HERE OR 52 IF IT IS IN HERE?

ANA QUAN, WHAT AMOUNT HAS BEEN ALLOCATED THIS YEAR, IS IT \$52,000 OR \$72,000?

52,000 IS NEW, 20 IS CARRYOVER.

'S OF THE BUDGET DOES CURRENTLY HAVE \$72,000?

TOGETHER KIA SPECTRA

AND IT DOES SHOW UP FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR?

YES.

DO WE, AS A COUNCIL, NEED TO APPROVE THE \$20,000 ALLOCATION? THAT IS MY QUESTION.

YOU JUST GAVE A THUMBS UP AS A WHOLE IS MY UNDERSTANDING. 50 CAN I JUST ASK A CLARIFYING QUESTION, THE NEXT BULLET POINT IS THE \$20,000. DIFFERENT AMOUNT.

REALLY, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT 72,000+ 20? THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT 90? IS NOT CORRECT, WE ARE. THIS IS A QUESTION THAT IS -- WHAT IS OUR PRACTICE -- POLICY AND PRACTICE IN TERMS OF AMOUNTS THAT WERE ALLOCATED IN A PRIOR YEAR FOR AN EFFORT AND HAVEN'T BEEN SPENT? I ALWAYS THOUGHT THAT THOSE THEN CAME IN -- THEY WERE REASSESSED IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR BUDGET? THERE WASN'T AN ASSUMPTION THAT THEY WOULD BE --

IF YOU HAVE A CONTRACT, THOSE CARRYOVER. WITH OUR THREE, WE APPROVED THE CONTRACT IN A CERTAIN AMOUNT, WE EXPENDED SO MUCH BY JUNE 30th, THAT REMAINDER, YOU ARE COMMITTED TO THAT AMOUNT. WE ALREADY ALLOCATED THE \$200,000, WHATEVER HAS NOT BEEN SPENT IS NOW JUST CARRIED OVER INTO THE NEW FISCAL YEAR. AS LONG AS YOU HAVE A CONTRACT THAT ALLOCATES THE INITIAL FUNDS.

HOW DOES THAT APPLY TO THE CURRENT SITUATION WITH BAKER TILLY? ARE WE ALREADY OBLIGATED?

WE ARE OBLIGATED TO THAT \$20,000. THAT \$20,000 IS CARRYOVER, IN ADDITION TO THAT \$20,000, THE CITY MANAGER IS ASKING FOR AN ADDITIONAL \$50,000 FOR VARIOUS STUFF.

WITH THOSE FACTS IN FRONT OF US, DO YOU NEED ACTION FROM THE CITY COUNCIL TO APPROVE THE \$20,000 THAT WE ARE ALREADY OBLIGATED TO? NO, THE CONTRACT IS \$50,000, WE ARE OBLIGATED TO PAY THE CONTRACT FOR \$50,000.

GOT IT, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

THIS IS MY FOLLOW-UP QUESTION, WE ARE OBLIGATED TO \$50,000, HAS HE FINISHED THE WORK AND HE DID FASTER? SO WE STILL OWE HIM \$20,000 FOR ADDITIONAL SOMETHING? WE OWE HIM \$20,000, BUT IS THE WORK COMPLETED?

HE HAS DONE AND WE HAVE PAID FOR \$30,000 AND CHANGE WORTH OF WORK. THE CONTRACT INCLUDES \$20,000 MORE IN AUTHORITY OF WORK HE HAS NOT DONE AND WE HAVE NOT PLAYED FOR.

WE HAVE NOT ASSIGNED HIM BECAUSE -- SOMETIMES, WE AUTHORIZE A CONTRACT BECAUSE WE THINK IT IS GOING TO COST THIS MUCH. IT SOUNDS LIKE TO ME WE AUTHORIZE THIS CONTRACT FOR 50 BUT HE DID THE WORK IN 30. THE DIFFERENCE OF 20, WHICH WE STILL OWE HIM FOR OTHER NEW WORK, IS THAT HOW I AM UNDERSTANDING THIS?

I THINK THAT IS MOSTLY CORRECT, IT WOULD BE OTHER WORK THAT WOULD ANTICIPATE THE CONTINUATION OF WHAT HE IS DOING IN TERMS OF UPDATING FINANCIAL MODELS.

I'M GOING TO BACK US OFF TO A REALIZATION TO TIME CHECK, I THINK THE UNDERLYING QUESTION IS, WHETHER THIS COUNCIL IS COMFORTABLE WITH THE REMAINING \$20,000 OF A \$50,000 CONTRACT BEING SPENT BY OUR CITY

MANAGER IN THIS FISCAL YEAR, DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY CONCERNS ABOUT THAT?

I MEAN, IT IS, ONCE IN A WHILE, NICE TO SAVE SOME MONEY. WE OWE THEM \$20,000, WE ARE GOING TO ALLOCATE AND GIVE HIM MORE WORK, BUT THAT \$20,000, IN MY MIND, SHOULD BE APPLIED TO THIS \$52,000 OR THE 20 THAT WE JUST OFFERED FOR VEHICLE. NOT JUST ON TOP OF IT, WE JUST SAVED OURSELVES 20,000, YEA, WE HAVE MORE WORK TO DO. I WANT TO ALLOCATE \$52,000 AND THE 20 CARRYOVER GETS APPLIED TO THE VEHICLE, THAT WOULD BE MY ARGUMENT.

IT SOUNDS LIKE YOUR PROPOSAL, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, WOULD BE, WE ARE IN THIS FISCAL YEAR, THERE IS A NEED, APPARENTLY, FOR 52,000, WE ALREADY HAVE \$20,000 THAT HAS CARRIED OVER, CAN WE INSTEAD JUST ADDING AN ADDITIONAL \$32,000?

\$72,000 TOTAL IF WE ARE GOING TO USE THEM ON VEHICLE AND A \$20,000 CARRYOVER.

DO YOU REALLY NEED TO CITY MANAGER? \$52,000 FOR THE -- DO YOU REALLY NEED \$92,000.

I DON'T REALLY KNOW, I DO KNOW THE \$20,000 FOR THE VEHICLE, THAT IS A VERY SOLID NUMBER. THE REST OF THEM ARE, TO USE THE TERM WE HAVE USED BEFORE, PLACEHOLDERS TO SOME DEGREE. I'M OKAY IF YOU WANT TO TAKE IT BY 20.

FOR PURPOSES OF THIS DISCUSSION, IT WOULD BE MY PROPOSAL THAT WE GET CONSENSUS HERE BY REDUCING THIS AMOUNT. YOU CAN DO IT ANYWAY YOU WANT TO, BUT AS IT IS LISTED HERE, REDUCED TO \$32,000 PLUS THE \$20,000 IN CARRYOVER. WITH \$20,000 APPROVED FOR YOUR EXPENDITURE BEFORE YOU COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

I THINK I AM HEARING THREE ITEMS. 52 GOES TO 32, 20 IN CARRYOVER, -- WHICH YOU CAN SPEND NOW.

RIGHT. AND 20 FOR THE VEHICLE?

YES. YES. SO THE AMOUNT THAT WOULD NEED TO COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL WOULD BE 32,000 FOR YOUR FIRST BULLET POINT, PLUS THE 20,000 FOR THE VEHICLE, I THINK? IS THAT CORRECT?

THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING, YES.

ALTHOUGH, NO, I AM CONFUSING AT. THE FIRST BULLET ITEM SAYS \$52,000, WE ARE ASKING THAT YOU COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR \$32,000 APPROVAL. AND THAT IS THE PLACEHOLDER, \$32,000, CORRECT? EVERYONE IN AGREEMENT? OKAY, AND THE \$20,000 THAT YOU ALREADY HAVE THAT YOU CARRIED OVER, YOU ARE FREE TO SPEND ON BAKER TILLY. IN TERMS OF VEHICLE AMOUNT, I THINK, I'M NOT SURE WE GOT TO THAT, BUT I THINK EVERYONE WAS THUMBS UP ON JUST DOING IT, OKAY? I'M SORRY, 23, IS THAT CLEAR AS MUD?

SORRY, I DIDN'T MEAN TO DERAIL THE CONVERSATION.

I APPRECIATE THAT YOU RESOLVED THAT, THE PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS OUR CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS BETTER AS A RESULT. NOW WE ARE ON CITY ATTORNEY AND THE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER ITEM, I THINK WE DID THUMBS UP ON THE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER PROBLEM, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER?

I JUST HAD A COMMENT ON THE CITY ATTORNEY WHAT BUDGET AND I JUST WANTED TO BE SURE THAT EVERYBODY SAW THAT THE BUDGET IS \$647,000. I KNOW FOR ME AND MY COMMENTS DURING THE BUDGET PROCESS, THIS IS

JUST SO DISAPPOINTING, TO BE SPENDING SO MUCH MONEY ON ATTORNEY FEES AND I WOULD LIKE TO FIND WAYS TO REDUCE THAT, IF AT ALL POSSIBLE. I JUST DIDN'T WANT TO SKIP OVER THAT BECAUSE IT IS A LOT OF MONEY.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON THAT ITEM?

CAN I JUST MAKE A BRIEF ONE, I 100% AGREE AND WE ARE -- WE ARE ALL TRYING TO DO OUR BEST, BUT YEAH, THAT IS RIDICULOUS AND OUTRAGEOUS, I FULLY AGREE.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

I THINK, AS WE MOVE FORWARD, AS WE MAKE CHOICES, YOU KNOW, WE RELY ON THEM TO HELP US TO ASSESS RISK AHEAD OF TIME AND BE MORE PROACTIVE. YOU KNOW, WE CAN'T CHANGE WHAT IS IN RIGHT NOW, DOING A BETTER RISK ASSESSMENT AND IN THE FUTURE, I WOULD AGREE, IS PARAMOUNT. WE ARE STARTING ANEW, SO.

THAT'S TRUE.

ALL RIGHT, GOOD INTENTIONS, WE JUST HAVE TO DELIVER. ADMINISTERED OF SERVICES IS OUR NEXT CATEGORY, I THINK WE WILL START -- OH, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF ITEMS.

YOU HAVE THE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER CITY CLERK BUDGET?

WE DID, WE DID THUMBS UP. YES. ON ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, THERE WERE, I THINK, THREE ITEMS THAT WERE ADDED. I THINK THOSE WERE THE COMP STUDY, CORRECT?

YES. FOR \$30,000. AND THEN WE HAD A STAFFING REPORT? IS THAT CORRECT?

THAT IS TO UPDATE THE STAFFING ASSESSMENT THAT WAS DONE A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO.

STAFFING ASSESSMENT, THAT WAS A \$10,000 ASK? THEN, WE ALSO HAD THE CIRA TRAINING, FOR \$2400? 2 CORRECT.

WE WILL GO THROUGH ALL OF THOSE, STARTING WITH THE BUDGET COMMITTEE, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, ANY INPUT?

SORRY, I DID NOT SUPPORT THE \$3000 INCREASE FOR ONE PERSON TO ATTEND A LEADERSHIP TRAINING. IT JUST DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO ME THAT ONE PERSON WOULD BE PULLED OUT FOR TRAINING, EVERYBODY NEEDS TRAINING. I DON'T KNOW, IT JUST DIDN'T SIT RIGHT WITH ME THAT ONE PERSON WOULD GET TO GO. I MEAN, HOW MANY EMPLOYEES DOES THE CITY HAVE AND HOW LONG WOULD IT TAKE FOR EVERYBODY TO HAVE TRAINING? I LIKE THE IDEA OF HAVING EQUALITY, SO I WASN'T COMFORTABLE WITH THAT. I AM WONDERING ABOUT THE COMP STUDY AND THE STAFFING STUDY BECAUSE WE DID A STAFFING STUDY AND WE DID NOTHING WITH IT. I JUST FEEL LIKE WE HAVE SO MUCH IN FRONT OF US, I DON'T WANT TO DO A COMP STUDY OR A STAFFING STUDY UNTIL WE ACTUALLY HAVE TIME TO ACTUALLY DEAL WITH IT. ADDRESS IT AND MAKE THE CHANGES THAT WE NEED, FOR EXAMPLE, IF WE PASS -- IS A SALES TAX PASSES ON THE BALLOT AND WE HAVE THE FUNDS TO ACTUALLY FIX THE STAFFING PROBLEMS, THEN IT WOULD MAKE SENSE TO DO THE STAFFING STUDY. AT THIS TIME, I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT WE BRING BACK THE COMP STUDY AND THE STAFFING STUDY FOR A MIDYEAR BUDGET REVIEW. TO SEE, DO WE HAVE THE TIME TO DEAL WITH THIS?

OKAY, THANK YOU. VICE MAYOR? 3 YES, I AM FINE WITH EVERYTHING LISTED ON HERE AND A \$3000 INCREASE FOR ONE PERSON TO ATTEND, I

CAN'T STRESS ENOUGH AS FAR AS RISK MANAGEMENT GOES, WE NEED SUCCESSION PLANNING. WE CAN JUST HAVE DEPARTMENT HEADS LEAVE AND NOT HAVE ANYONE TO STEP UP. THIS IS A WAY FOR THEM TO LEARN TO STEP UP AND TAKE A HIGHER POSITION. THE COMP STUDY IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY BECAUSE I HAVE HEARD THOUSANDS OF TIMES, IT IS LIKE YOU CAN'T COMPARE APPLES AND ORANGES AND YOU CAN'T COMPARE US TO CANTATA, YOU KNOW, BUT IT HAPPENS. I AM NOT GOING TO THROW OUT A SPECIFIC NAME OF AN ENTITY, BUT IT DOES HAPPEN. IT'S LIKE, WELL, WHATEVER YOU GET PAID IN MARIN, YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO GET PAID THE SAME HERE, RIGHT? I JUST NEED DEFINITIVE ANSWERS AND DEFINITIVE INFORMATION TO MAKE WELL CALCULATED DECISIONS ABOUT HOW EVERYONE IS GETTING PAID. AS FAR AS THE UPDATE ON THE STAFFING ASSESSMENT, YES, I WISH WE COULD HAVE ACTED ON IT. WE MADE EFFORTS TO TRY TO PUSH THIS FORWARD LAST YEAR AND DIDN'T GET VERY FAR, BUT I THINK WE OWE IT TO OUR CURRENT STAFF, ESPECIALLY SOME STAFF DOING THE JOBS OF THREE PEOPLE, TO ACTUALLY GET AN UPDATED STAFFING ASSESSMENT AND THIS TIME, ACTUALLY MOVE IT FORWARD. AND FOR THIS YEAR, DEFINITELY APPROVE THAT AMOUNT.

OKAY, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR COUNCILMEMBER LEWIS? GO AHEAD, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

I HAVE TO AGREE WITH COUNCILMEMBER MAURER ABOUT THE MIDYEAR REVIEW FOR BOTH THE COMP STUDY AND THE \$10,000 TO BE -- I MEAN, THAT IS RELATED TO RE-LOOKING AT THE MATRIX REPORT, WHICH WE SPENT A LOT OF MONEY ON AND THEN COULD NOT IMPLEMENT. NOW IT IS OLD AND WE ARE SUPPOSED TO SPEND ANOTHER \$10,000 TO LOOK AT IT AGAIN, BUT WE REALLY DON'T HAVE THE MONEY, THAT'S WHY WE HAVEN'T ACTED ON IT. IT IS PUTTING THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE A BIT HERE AND SINCE WE ARE GOING TO DO A MIDYEAR BUDGET REVIEW, MAYBE WE ARE GOING TO HAVE A BETTER SENSE OF WHAT WE'VE GOT TO SPEND MONEY ON, I WOULD LIKE TO PUSH THOSE TWO ITEMS. I ALSO HAVE ALREADY SAID THAT I WASN'T IN FAVOR OF SENDING ONE OF US TO A CONFERENCE AND WE HAVE BASICALLY WORKED FOR A STIPEND. THERE IS A LOT OF TRAINING THAT WE ALREADY DO FOR STAFF THAT IS REQUIRED AND THAT THEY DO TO EARN CERTIFICATES TO GET HIGHER LEVELS OF PAY, AND HAVING ATTENDED LEADERSHIP ACADEMIES, BOTH IN COUNTY DAILY ACTS. A VARIETY OF THINGS THAT I HAVE FUNDED IN MY OWN LIFE, I JUST HAVE A HARD TIME WITH WHAT WE ARE DOING THIS YEAR TO AGREE TO APPROVE THAT FOR, I AGREE, ALSO, ONE MEMBER, HOW DO YOU SELECT THAT MEMBER? IT JUST SEEMS LIKE AN EXTRA AND I JUST DON'T FEEL THIS BUDGET HAS ROOM FOR EXTRAS UNTIL WE FIGURE OUT EITHER IF WE ARE GOING TO HAVE SALES TAX MEASURE OR WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO. I WOULD NOT BE IN FAVOR OF THE TRAINING AT ALL THIS YEAR AND THE OTHER TWO, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE COME BACK IN MIDYEAR REVIEW.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH AND CLARIFICATION, STAFF, PLEASE HELP REMIND US, WHAT WAS THE CONSULTANT THAT DID THE STAFFING STUDY? IT WASN'T MATRIX, I DON'T THINK.

NO, IT WAS REGIONAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. IT WAS RTS, REGIONAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. COUNCILMEMBER Mc LEWIS?

JUST GOING DOWN THE LINE HERE, THE COMP STUDY, I AM WITH MICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN, WE HEAR SO MUCH ABOUT COMPENSATION HERE, IT'S

TOO HIGH, IT'S TOO LOW, IT SHOULD BE THIS, IT SHOULD BE THAT. I SUPPORT THAT SIMPLY BECAUSE OF I THINK WE DO NEED DEFINITIVE ANSWERS AT THAT. AS FAR AS THE STAFFING STUDY UPDATE, I HAVE THE SAME CONCERNS. SO WE GET THE INFORMATION, BUT IF WE DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY TO ACT ON THE DATA, I JUST DON'T KNOW WHAT WE -- I MEAN, AT THIS POINT, WE ARE NICKEL AND DIMING EVERYTHING HERE, SO I WORRY ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT WE ACTUALLY CAN DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT. GREAT TO HAVE THE INFORMATION, BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, AT THIS POINT, NO. I DON'T SUPPORT THAT, AND THEN, OF COURSE, I SUPPORT THE \$3000 FOR THE COUNCILMEMBERS, HONESTLY, THE WARMING CENTERS, I PERSONALLY FEEL THAT THAT SHOULD BE THROUGH THE COUNTY, IS THAT - - NO, THAT IS NOT PART OF THIS. I'M GOING DOWN THE WRONG LIST.

THE NEXT ITEM WAS THE CIRA, 24,000 TOWARD CIRA. COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, YOU ARE NOT IN SUPPORT OF THE CIRA AMOUNT? I AM IN SUPPORT OF THE CIRA.

HERE IT IS, THE CIRA TRAINING, SORRY, GUYS, I FORGOT I HAD THE ONE IN BETWEEN THERE.

IS THAT CLEAR? DO I NEED TO GO THROUGH IT AGAIN?

I THINK WE HEARD YOU, THE \$3000 SONOMA LEADERSHIP ACCOUNT ACADEMY, YOU ARE A KNOW AT THE MOMENT, COMP STUDY, YES, STAFFING CONCEPT, YOU DELAY AND CIRA, YOU ARE IN SUPPORT OF?

I DIDN'T ADDRESS THE \$3000 FOR THE LEADERSHIP, I ACTUALLY DO SUPPORT THAT, WE DO NEED A SUCCESSION PLANNED AND I DO WORRY ABOUT THE FACT THAT WE DO HAVE SO MANY LEADERS, YOU KNOW, DEPARTMENT HEADS LEAVING. SO I DO SUPPORT THAT AT THIS POINT, IT IS NOT IDEAL TO JUST PICK ONE AND I AGREE, THAT IS A LITTLE CONCERNING TO ME AND I AM HOPING WE CAN RELY ON THE CITY MANAGER TO MAKE THE APPROPRIATE DECISIONS AND DIRECTION WITH THAT AS HE SEES FIT TO MANAGE HIS STAFF AND, HOPEFULLY, LIFT SOME PEOPLE UP SO WE DON'T GET INTO THIS SITUATION WHERE WE CAN'T FIND PEOPLE.

LOOKING TO STAFF, THERE ARE THREE ITEMS BEING DEBATED HERE, JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE YOU HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO WEIGH IN IF YOU FEEL ANY OF THESE ARE PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT. \$3000 FOR THE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY, THE \$30,000 FOR THE COMP STUDY, \$10,000 FOR STAFFING, \$2400 FOR CIRA, THOSE ARE IN QUESTION AT THE MOMENT. IF THERE IS ANY FINAL THOUGHTS YOU HAVE, PLEASE SHARE THEM WITH US.

I THINK MARY AND I AGREE, WE NEED TO PRIORITIZE THESE, THE CIRA WOULD BE OUR TOP PRIORITY.

I ASSUME EVERYONE IS IN SUPPORT OF THE \$114,000 AND 600 IN REDUCTION, SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT, UNANIMOUS. \$25,000 SHIFT OF EXPENSES FOR PROPERTY TAXES FROM NON-DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET? UNANIMOUS. \$3000 INCREASE FOR ONE PERSON IN THE CITY TO ATTEND THE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY OR OTHER TRAINING? WHAT OTHER TRAINING? OR OTHER TRAINING?

JUST, IF SOMEBODY COULDN'T MAKE THAT PARTICULAR, WE FOUND SOMETHING THAT WAS GOOD, MAYBE, ACCEPTABLE TO MORE PEOPLE. BIAS AND OPPORTUNITY A BETTER CHANCE COMES ALONG.

THUMBS-UP OR THUMBS DOWN? I AM HAVING TROUBLE READING THIS. YES OR NO.

TO SUPPORT, 32 OPPOSE.

THE COMP STUDY, OPPOSE? YOU HAVE TO DECLARE YOUR THUMBS, \$30,000 FOR THE CLASSIC COMP STUDY? OKAY, THUMBS UP. OKAY, THE STAFFING STUDY, I ACTUALLY HAVE A DIRECT QUESTION, PLEASE, OF MARY GOURLEY. DO YOU FEEL THIS IS PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT OR DO YOU FEEL DELAYING IT TO MIDYEAR WOULD BE EQUALLY HELPFUL?

I THINK DELAYING IT TO MIDYEAR WOULD BE HELPFUL BECAUSE WE ARE BRINGING BACK THE PUBLIC WORKS, ENGINEERING, AS YOU KNOW, WE ARE GOING THROUGH CONSOLIDATION. IT COULD BE DELAYED UNTIL MIDYEAR REVIEW.

I AM GOING TO PROPOSE \$10,000 STAFFING STUDY, LET'S SEE IF EVERYONE IS FULLY IN SUPPORT OF IT. OKAY, HOW ABOUT DELAYING IT? OKAY. FOR MIDYEAR, THUMBS UP ON DELAYING THE \$10,000 AMOUNT? BRING IT BACK, TO BE SET ASIDE THE MONEY AND BRING IT BACK AT MIDYEAR?

THAT'S WHAT HE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE HAPPEN?

I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THAT SET ASIDE BECAUSE OF SOMETHING HAPPENS IN THE MEANTIME, WE CAN BRING AN ITEM BACK TO THE COUNCIL SAYING WE WOULD LIKE TO DO IT BEFORE THEN, AS OF RIGHT NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE IT IN THE BUDGET AND WE REVIEW IT AGAIN AT MIDYEAR AS A PLACEHOLDER AND IF YOU ARE WITH IT, WE WILL MOVE FORWARD AT THAT TIME.

LOOKS LIKE YOU GOT 4-1, AND THEN CIRA, \$2400 FOR CIRA? COUNCILMEMBER? LOOKS LIKE YOU GOT UNANIMOUS THERE. ALL RIGHT, FOLKS, WE ARE ON TO PLANNING. CAN WE HAVE THE SLIDE UP? THERE ARE NO ADDITIONS TO PLANNING. WE HAVE THREE ITEMS HERE, THE \$91,800 AMOUNT. IN THIS PLANNING DISCUSSION, EMBEDDED A DISCUSSION REGARDING FUNDING FOR THE COMBINED PLANNING COMMISSION AND DRV. AND THE REDUCTION OF SERVICES TO CLIMATE ACTION AND THE PUBLIC ARTS COMMITTEE, I BELIEVE? JUST A MOMENT, BUT I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY, THE UNDERSTANDING AT THE MOMENT IS THAT THIS BUDGET DOES NOT INCLUDE FUNDING THAT WOULD ALLOWED THE COMMITTEES TO CONTINUE TO BE SUPPORTED IN THE WAY THEY ARE SUPPORTED NOW, IS THAT GROUP -- TRUE?

I THOUGHT WITH ALL THIS, DON, YOU ARE GOING TO BRING THIS BACK AT SOME POINT? FOR AN AGENDA ITEM WHEN EVERYTHING WAS FULLY BAKED, RIGHT? THAT WAS MY READ ON ALL OF THIS, SO HOURS WOULD BE COMBINED OR ARE WE DELAYED? WE HAVE EXTRA MONTHS OR WHATEVER, I DID NOT THINK WE WERE DISCUSSING ALL OF THAT.

THE REASON I ASKED THE QUESTION, VICE MAYOR, TO EXACTLY VERIFY THAT. TO THE EXTENT THAT THE FUNDING IS IN THIS PROPOSED BUDGET, WHICH WOULD ALLOW THE CONTINUATION OF CURRENT SUPPORT. FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, THAT WOULD ALLOW THE DISCUSSION TO HAPPEN LATER ON. IT SEEMS TO BE THE DOG -- THE TAIL WAGGING THE DOG. HOW DO WE THEN DECIDE THAT WE DON'T WANT TO REDUCE SERVICES IF WE DON'T HAVE MONEY IN THE BUDGET THAT ALLOWS US TO MAKE THAT DISCRETIONARY DISCUSSION? WHAT IS THE FUNDING IN THE BUDGET NOW, WOULD ALLOW SUFFICIENT FUNDING TO CONTINUE THESE GROUPS AS THEY EXIST NOW WITH THE SAME LEVEL OF SUPPORT? IF THE ANSWER IS YES, THEN WE DON'T HAVE TO MAKE THAT DECISION TODAY.

CAN I ASK YOU TO COME TO THE PODIUM? WOULD YOU PLEASE COME TO THE PODIUM OR THE TABLE?

WE ARE GOING TO ASK YOU THAT QUESTION. SO YOU KNOW. THIS IS MY UNDERSTANDING AND IF I AM INCORRECT, I ASKED DAVID TO CORRECT ME. FOR NOW, WE CAN CONTINUE WITH WHAT WE HAVE BEEN DOING, FOR NOW. BUT WE WOULD RECOMMEND THAT IN THE RELATIVELY NEAR FUTURE, AT LEAST TONIGHT, I WOULD LIKE TO GET A SENSE OF DIRECTION FROM THE COUNCIL OF WHERE YOU WOULD LIKE TO GO WITH THESE ITEMS AND BRING BACK SOMETHING MORE FORMAL WHEN WE ARE FURTHER DOWN THE ROAD.

CITY MANAGER, I WOULD LIKE THE ANSWER TO MY QUESTION, IS THERE FUNDING THAT WOULD ALLOW? THE PROPOSED BUDGET, DOES IT INCLUDE SUFFICIENT FUNDING TO ALLOW CONTINUATION OF THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT THAT THOSE COMMITTEES CURRENTLY INSURED?

HE KNOWS THE ISSUE BETTER THAN I DO.

AS WE PUT TOGETHER THIS PROPOSED BUDGET, WE LOOKED AT TRYING TO FREE UP STAFF TIME. REALLOCATE STAFF TIME SO THAT STAFF COULD FOCUS ON REIMBURSABLE WORK. AS YOU SEE HERE, WE HAVE IDENTIFIED THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ABOUT \$91,800 IN REIMBURSABLE WORK. BY FREEING UP STAFF TIME BY REORGANIZING THE COMMITTEE'S. BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS.

DAVE, I'M SORRY, IT'S 8:45, BUT I REALLY JUST NEED TO KNOW, I UNDERSTAND THE JUSTIFICATION, BUT REALLY NEED TO KNOW WHETHER, CURRENTLY, IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET, THERE IS SUFFICIENT MONEY TO COVER THE CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR THESE COMMITTEES OR, WHETHER, IN FACT, THERE WAS A DECISION BY STAFF TO INSTEAD JUST PUT INTO THE PROPOSED BUDGET REDUCED AMOUNTS WITH THE HOPE AND EXPECTATION THAT THE CITY COUNCIL WOULD SUPPORT REDUCED AMOUNTS? JUST NEED TO KNOW THE ANSWERS THE QUESTION.

IT WOULD MEAN DEFERRED WORK, IT WOULD MEAN THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE WOULD BE A NEED TO CONTRACT OUT, IN SOME CASES, TO PERFORM WORKS ON CERTAIN PROJECTS AND OTHER PROJECTS WOULD BE SIMPLY DEFERRED.

SO IF WE, IN FACT, APPROVE THIS PROPOSED BUDGET AS IT EFFECTIVELY SHIFTING THOSE AMOUNTS OF MONEY TO OTHER INTERESTS AS HAVE BEEN DESCRIBED HERE? I THINK THE ANSWER IS YES, I JUST WANT TO KNOW THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, TO BE PERFECTLY HONEST.

IT IS YES.

THE ANSWER IS, AS CURRENTLY OR PROPOSED, I THINK WE ALL UNDERSTAND THE RATIONALE, BUT AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED, THE BUDGET WOULD SUPPORT THE SHIFTING OF THESE RESOURCES TO DO THESE OTHER PROJECTS, THE \$91,800 IN THESE EFFORTS THAT ARE DESCRIBED THERE AND, THEREFORE, IN ORDER TO COVER THOSE EXPENSES, SHIFTING AWAY FROM THE CURRENT SUPPORT FOR THESE COMMITTEES? IS THAT ACCURATE? THAT'S THE QUESTION I WANTED ANSWERED AND I THINK THAT ANSWERS -- THAT CLARIFIES WHAT IS HAPPENING HERE AND I CAN EXPRESS MY OPINION ABOUT THAT, BUT THAT WAS MY QUESTION TO CLARIFY AND SO, ANY COMMENTS FROM THE BUDGET COMMITTEE?

YEAH, THIS IS A REALLY HUGE ISSUE TO BE DECIDED ON AND I THINK IT IS A LOT TO ADDED IN WITH THIS BUDGET DISCUSSION TONIGHT, SO I WANT TO -- I WANT TO AGREE WITH WHAT THE MAYOR IS TALKING ABOUT, WE WANT TO BE SURE THAT THE MONEY IS THERE TO CONTINUE THESE BOARDS AS THEY

ARE UNTIL THE TIME THAT WE DECIDE AND VOTE AND, YOU KNOW, HAVE TIME TO REALLY DISCUSS THIS BECAUSE I JUST DON'T THINK TONIGHT IS THE RIGHT TIME TO DO IT, IT IS TOO BIG AND WE REALLY -- WE ALSO WANT OUR PUBLIC TO WEIGH IN ON THIS, WE WANT OUR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD TO WEIGH IN ON THIS AND I AM NOT COMFORTABLE JUST MAKING THIS DECISION SO QUICKLY TONIGHT WITHOUT HAVING THE TIME AND SPACE TO REALLY DISCUSS IT, SO IT IS UNCLEAR TO ME, THIS \$91,000, SO THAT IS BUDGETED IN HERE, SO I WOULD SUGGEST THAT, MAYBE, -- BLESS YOU.

I'M NOT SURE WHAT TO DO ON THIS, ACTUALLY.

AND I HAVE A SUGGESTION, VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN, DID YOU HAVE SOMETHING AS BUDGET COMMITTEE? I'M SORRY, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

I PERSONALLY THINK IT IS THE RIGHT TIME TO TALK ABOUT IT, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT BUDGETS FOR EVERY DEPARTMENT AND WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD PUT MONEY TOWARD LEADERSHIP AND ALL OF THE DIFFERENT STAFF, THIS IS TALKING ABOUT STAFF TIME AND WE ARE TALKING ABOUT BUDGETS RIGHT NOW, SO I MEAN, I HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT DEFERRING SERVICES AND PROJECTS AND WHATNOT BECAUSE WE ARE PUTTING STAFF TIME TOWARD, YOU KNOW, COMMITTEES AND LOOKING AT ALL OF THESE OTHER ENTITIES THAT WE WORK WITH, NONPROFITS, EVERYONE ELSE, I'M NOT SURE WHY THIS IS A CARD OUT AND WE CERTAINLY HAVE TAKEN THE TIME TO DISCUSS EVERYTHING ELSE, AND IT IS PART OF THE BUDGET. IT IS PART OF STAFFING, I MEAN, I DON'T KNOW, I THINK WE NEED TO DISCUSS IT, PERSONALLY.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

WELL, I AM SOMEWHERE IN THE MIDDLE. FIRST OF ALL, WE HAVE ALREADY HAD SOME BRIEF DISCUSSIONS, I THINK, ABOUT THE PUBLIC ARTS COMMISSION. I WOULD FEEL FINE WEIGHING IN ON THAT AND I WOULD SUPPORT THEM GOING TO A QUARTERLY MEETING, I DON'T THINK IT TAKES AWAY FROM THEIR WORK. CLIMATE ACTION, I AM MORE HESITANT TO DO THAT WITHOUT THEM HERE TO TELL US WHAT THEY WANT. BECAUSE THAT IS AN OFFICIAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE, IT WASN'T CREATED NECESSARILY BY THIS COUNCIL, AS FIVE INDIVIDUALS, WE MIGHT HAVE OUR OWN OPINIONS ON THAT, BUT ALSO, IT SOUNDS LIKE IT IS UNCLEAR IF THEY WANT TO CONTINUE WITH THE CITY AFFILIATION, SO I DON'T WANT TO PULL THE RUG OUT FROM ANDY -- ANYBODY. I WOULD LIKE TO AT LEAST SEE, IN THE BUDGET, MONEY FOR THAT TO CONTINUE UNTIL WE CAN GET IT BACK ON THE DAIS SO WE CAN HAVE A FULL CONVERSATION ABOUT THAT. WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO THAT DEPENDING HOW THE OTHER ITEMS IN THIS PLANNING BUDGET GO WITH OUR DISCUSSIONS ABOUT WHAT IS ALREADY PLACED IN THERE THAT THREE OF US COUNCILMEMBERS HAVEN'T WEIGHED IN ON BECAUSE THEY ARE BRAND-NEW ITEMS. MAYBE WE CAN TALK ABOUT THE WHOLE THING AND THE MONEY IS JUST GOING TO BE THERE.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

I JUST HAVE A QUESTION FOR STAFF. KNOWING THAT, DAVID, YOU ARE ALMOST FINISHED WITH YOUR INTERNAL -- I'M JUST WONDERING, AS FAR AS PLANNING, HOW ARE WE GOING TO BE WITH STAFF? IF WE ARE ALREADY TALKING ABOUT WITH HAVING THE INTERIM HERE AND POSSIBLY DELAYING

THINGS, HOW DOES THAT ROLL DOWNHILL? EVEN IF IT IS A MONTH OR TWO, THAT IS STILL DELAYING ITEMS.

WHAT YOU ARE EXPERIENCING NOW IS IN LARGE PART A REFLECTION OF THE TURNOVER WE HAVE HAD. SHE LEFT, DAVID CAME IN, PART-TIME WHILE THERE WAS PART-TIME HOURS. WE THINK WE HAVE AN INTERIM PERSON ON A CONTRACT BASIS AND WE JUST NEED TO GET THE PAPERWORK SIGNED, ESSENTIALLY, TO START NEXT WEEK, PART-TIME UP TO 30 HOURS A WEEK, PROBABLY CLOSER TO THREE DAYS A WEEK. WE HAVE A COUPLE OF GOOD CANDIDATES FOR THE PERMANENT POSITION, WE ARE STILL IN THE RECRUITMENT PROCESS, SO I DON'T KNOW HOW THIS IS GOING TO GO. IS A VERY CHALLENGING POSITION TO FILL.

ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

NO, I JUST WANTED TO HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING OF HOW SHORT-STAFFED ARE WE? YOU KNOW, HOW MANY HOURS ARE WE PUTTING INTO THIS, BECAUSE THAT IS NOT CLEAR.

THIS PART OF THE CITY HAS A LOT ON THEIR PLATE RIGHT NOW WITH THE CANOPY PROJECT, THE PARLOR HOTEL, THE REGULAR DEVELOPMENT WORK AND THEN I'M SURE I AM MISSING A HALF A DOZEN THINGS OR MORE. SO THERE IS A LOT ON THIS GROUPS PLATE RIGHT NOW.

I'M JUST GOING TO SAY, I AM NOT COMFORTABLE WITH POSSIBLY DELAYING A HOTEL OR ANYTHING ELSE THAT COULD BRING IN SIGNIFICANT REVENUE BECAUSE WE HAVE STAFF AT CLIMATE ACTION, IT CERTAINLY COULD FUNCTION AS A CITIZEN COMMITTEE, IN MY OPINION.

OKAY, WE HAVE A NUMBER OF ITEMS HERE UNDER PLANNING, THERE IS THIS ITEM THAT WE HAD AN ADDITIONAL ITEM ABOUT, DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND GRANTS. I AM GOING TO INVITE COMMENTS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ON THOSE TWO ITEMS, MAYBE, STARTING WITH BUDGET COMMITTEE? GO AHEAD, VICE MAYOR.

SURE, I REMEMBER WHEN I FIRST GOT ON COUNCIL AND WE HAD TO DO SOMETHING WITH OUR HOUSE AND IN THAT DISCUSSION, IT WAS CLEAR TO ME THAT THE BEST WAY TO KEEP AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS TO KEEP PEOPLE IN THEIR HOUSING. THEIR CURRENT HOUSING. SO THAT WAS WHAT WAS ON MY MIND AS FAR AS TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT PEOPLE REMAIN IN THEIR HOUSE AND THEY ARE NOT BOOTED OUT OR IT IS NOT SOLD OUT FROM UNDERNEATH THEM OR OWNERSHIP HASN'T TRANSFERRED, ALSO, I WAS VERY PERSUADED BY DAVID IN THE FACT THAT WHAT HE JUST SAID TONIGHT WAS AT THE BUDGET HEARING AND THE FACT THAT WE ARE NOW BEING, APPARENTLY, NOT JUST US, BUT I GUESS STATE -WISE, BEING SCRUTINIZED BY HCD, RIGHT? AND IT IS LIKE, THESE -- IMPLEMENTING THESE 2T WOULD SIGNAL TO THEM THAT WE ARE VERY ON TOP AND WE ARE NOT GOING TO GET DINGED OR PUT ANYTHING IN JEOPARDY BECAUSE I AM GOING TO VOTE FOR WHATEVER WE HAVE TO DO TO MAKE SURE WE ARE WELL POSITIONED TO GET OUR NEXT HOUSING ELEMENT DONE WHEN IT NEEDS TO BE DONE WITH NO DINGS.

OKAY, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER? I THOUGHT I SAW YOU WANTED TO WEIGH IN?

YES, I DO SUPPORT THE \$22,000 FOR MONITORING OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS FROM THE INCLUSIONARY HOUSING FUND, I DO NOT SUPPORT THE \$50,000 FOR THE MONITORING OF OWNERSHIP HOUSING UNITS BECAUSE -- HOW MANY DO WE HAVE IN THIS TOWN? I THINK IT WAS A

LITTLE OVER 100 HOUSES THAT WERE AFFORDABLE, DEED RESTRICTED AFFORDABLE, AND THEN HOW MANY OF THOSE ARE GOING TO ACTUALLY BE FOR SALE IN A YEAR? SO MY SUGGESTION WAS TO HAVE THAT WORK DONE BY STAFF IN-HOUSE. AND THEN, IF YOU LOOK AT, THERE IS A DOCUMENT SENT TO US ON HOUSING AND LAND TRUST OF SONOMA COUNTY AND THEY ARE THE ONES WHO ARE OFFERING TO DO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOME BUYER PROGRAM AND THE SERVICES THEY ARE PROVIDING OUR WAY BEYOND THE OVERSIGHT OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING. SO IT IS EDUCATION AND THERE ARE ALL KINDS OF THINGS, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU SAW THIS, DAVID SENT IT TO ALL OF US. I'M NOT GOING TO WASTE TIME GOING THROUGH ALL OF THAT, I DID NOT SUPPORT THE \$50,000 PER THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

OUR FORMER PLANNING DIRECTOR WANTED TO DO THIS, SHE WENT OUT AND GOT A PROPOSAL. THERE IS A SONOMA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY THAT INVESTIGATED PROCEDURES AND MONITORED AND LOOKED AT ALL NINE CITIES IN SONOMA COUNTY AND HOW WE ARE MONITORING THIS, BASICALLY, ALL NINE CITIES OR MOST ARE RELYING ON SELF REPORTING. ACCORDING TO THE SONOMA COUNTY GRAND JURY. SO AS OUR SMALLEST CITY AND OUR FISCAL CRISIS, THERE IS JUST NO WAY I FEEL LIKE WE CAN AFFORD THIS THIS YEAR. I UNDERSTAND THAT IT WOULD BE GREAT IF WE COULD AND WE PROBABLY SHOULD DO IT SOMETIME, BUT I THINK THAT MOST CITIES IN SONOMA COUNTY ARE RELYING ON SELF REPORTING AND ASSISTANCE WITH LEGAL AID AND I AM NOT GOING TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF SPENDING \$72,000 FOR A MONITORING SYSTEM THIS YEAR. AGAIN, IT'S ANOTHER ONE OF THOSE THINGS, I'M NOT GOING TO RACK UP OUR DEBT TO ADD THIS TO OUR PLAN FOR THIS YEAR. I JUST DON'T THINK IT IS THE RIGHT TIME.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

I ABSOLUTELY UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF MONITORING, BUT MONITORING AFFORDABLE HOUSING, THIS DOESN'T SEEM VERY AFFORDABLE. I AM JUST SAYING, I MEAN, I THINK FOR THIS YEAR, I AM GOING TO ECHO COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, I JUST -- I AM ALWAYS VERY CONSERVATIVE AT THIS STUFF, BUT RIGHT NOW, I JUST THINK THAT ONE MORE YEAR OF SELF REPORTING AND ALSO, YOU KNOW, THERE ARE NOT A LOT OF HOMES TO RENT OVER HERE, I HAVE A REAL ESTATE LICENSE, I KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON AND I AGREE WITH COUNCILMEMBER MAURER AS FAR AS THE TURNOVER. I HESITANTLY SAY THAT I DON'T THINK I CAN SUPPORT IT FOR THIS YEAR, BUT I DEFINITELY THINK WE NEED TO REASSESS WHEN WE HAVE , YOU KNOW, MORE MONIES.

DAVID, DID YOU HAVE ANYTHING YOU WANT TO CONTRIBUTE? I STILL HAVE TO WEIGH IN, BUT IT SEEMS LIKE YOU ARE LEANING IN TO SAY SOMETHING. I GUESS MY QUESTION WOULD BE, IT LOOKS LIKE THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT WE ARE NOT GOING TO -- THE \$50,000 -- THE SEVENTH \$2000 AMOUNT FOR MONITORING IS NOT GOING TO NECESSARILY GET A SUPPORTING VOTE HERE, BE CLEAR ABOUT THE CONSEQUENCES. PENALTIES, I MEAN, BE CLEAR WITH US.

AS INDICATED, A LOT OF SMALLER COMMUNITIES DO SELF-MONITORING THAT IS TRUE. ON THE OTHER HAND, STATE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT HAS A NEWER ENFORCEMENT BRANCH AND THEY ARE LOOKING VERY CAREFULLY AT MONITORING AND THE IDEA, AS STATED IN

THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT, YOU WANT TO RETAIN YOUR AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS. BOTH THE CDC AND THE HOUSING LAND TRUST WOULD WORK WITH THE COMMUNITY TO ASSURE THAT, AS RENTALS AND OWNERSHIP UNITS ARE TRANSFERRED, THAT THE RESIDENCE MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR INCOME IN THOSE UNITS. AND THAT, I THINK, WOULD BE VERY SUPPORTED BY HDC AND THE REVIEWERS. EVERY YEAR, YOU HAVE TO DO AN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT. THEY WILL BE LOOKING VERY CAREFULLY AT, WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO ASSURE THAT YOU ARE MAINTAINING YOUR INVENTORY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS?

OKAY. THANK YOU, I THINK YOU ARE BASICALLY REITERATING THE POINTS YOU MADE EARLIER, WHICH I APPRECIATE. AND I THINK THAT COUNCIL CAN TAKE THOSE INTO ANYTHING, BEFORE WE MOVE ON?

ONE MORE THING, IN TERMS OF COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, THE PROPOSAL WE WERE SAVING -- RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSING LAND TRUST, THAT WAS KIND OF A BROAD DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES. THE INTENT WOULD BE, IF THE CITY WOULD GO FORWARD AND SAY, YES, WE WANT A FORMAL SCOPE OF WORK, THEY WOULD MODIFY THAT TO THE PARTICULAR NEEDS OF THE CITY OF SEVASTOPOL. THAT WAS A OVERVIEW THAT THE FORMER DIRECTOR RECEIVED, IT WOULD BE REFINED.

THANK YOU. WEIGHING IN ON THIS ITEM, I AM NOT WILLING TO APPROVE ANY BUDGET PROPOSAL THAT ELIMINATES, REDUCES FUNDING FOR OUR CURRENT COMMITTEES. CLIMATE ACTION COMMITTEE, PLANNING COMMISSION, I AM NOT WILLING TO REDUCE FUNDING FOR CLIMATE ACTION COMMITTEE OR PUBLIC ARTS COMMITTEE FOR DRV, FOR PLANNING COMMISSION, FOR CHANGES THAT WOULD REDUCE THE SUPPORT THAT THEY ARE GETTING. [CAPTIONERS TRANSITIONING] THERE MAY BE SOME AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT OR AGREEMENT BUT I DON'T FEEL I HAVE THAT IN FRENEMY AND I AM NOT WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES, IN TERMS OF FUNDING THAT I AM FULLY WILLING, AT SOME POINT, A LATER POINT TO OPENLY CONSIDER ANY SUGGESTIONS FROM STAFF ABOUT THOSE CHANGES. IN TERMS THE 50,020 2000, I THINK I WOULD SPLIT IT, I COULD SEE SUPPORTING THE 22,000 FOR THE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS WHICH IN MY WORLD ARE WHAT IS REALLY PRECIOUS WITHIN THIS COMMUNITY, THERE 390 ONE OF THEM AND WE HAVE A LOT OF RENTERS IN THIS COMMUNITY THAT ARE SUFFERING, WE DO NOT HEAR FROM AND I FEEL DO NOT HAVE A VOICE WHEN THEY SHOULD. THE 50,000 FOR THE OWNERSHIP HOUSING UNITS, I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT BUT I AM LISTENING TO MY PEERS AND I AM NOT COMFORTABLE ALLOCATING THE MONEY FOR THAT, THAT IS SOMETHING I WOULD LIKE TO SEE COME BACK TO US. SO, IN TERMS OF THE BIG DOLLAR ITEM, 91,800, I CAN'T SUPPORT THAT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT IT DOES NOT REDUCE FUNDING, CURRENTLY, FOR OUR COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS. I AM NOT SURE WHERE THE NUMBERS LEAVE US ON THAT BECAUSE IT IS UNCLER TO ME WHAT MONEY WOULD BE NEEDED. THAT IS MY POSITION ON THESE ITEMS AND I THINK I WOULD ASK STAFF HOW YOU WANT TO DEAL WITH THAT, WHAT WOULD BE A PROPOSAL THAT STAFF, AS A THINK ABOUT THIS \$91,800 AMOUNT, ONE OPTION WOULD BE TO SET ASIDE A PLACEHOLDER FOR THE AMOUNT, 91,800, WITH A SUBJECT TO A LATER STAFF REPORT BROUGHT TO THE CITY COUNCIL WHERE OPTIONS ARE LAID OUT FOR THE 91,800 BEING ALLOCATED TO THESE EFFORTS AND WHERE WE ARE INFORMED, WHAT IMPACT THAT MIGHT HAVE ON OUR COMMITTEE SUPPORT.

SO, THAT WOULD BE ONE IDEA, PLACEHOLDER FOR THE \$91,800 BUT WE CONTINUE THE COMMITTEE WORK UNCHANGED UNTIL THE STAFF COMES BACK WITH A FULL REPORT. I WOULD ASK THE STAFF WHETHER THAT IS WORKABLE?

I WOULD SAY WE CAN GIVE IT OUR BEST SHOT AND WE CAN ASK THAT THE COUNCIL IS OPEN TO THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE BRING THESE BACK ONE OR TWO AT A TIME. MEANING THAT I DON'T THINK WE NEED TO HAVE A PACKAGE DEAL WITH ALL THREE, EACH COMMITTEE HAS ITS OWN ROLE IN THEIR OWN DYNAMICS AND MAYBE THEIR OWN EXPECTATIONS AND NEEDS. I JUST WANT FLEXIBILITY THAT IF WE ARE READY TO BRING PUBLIC ARTS BACK WE CAN BRING IT BACK WHEN YOU'RE READY TO BRING PUBLIC ARTS BACK AND THAT MARY NOT BE WILL TO BRING BACK THE OTHER TWO.

WHAT DOES THIS DO IN TERMS OF THE REVENUE, THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND GRANTS, TO COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS'S QUESTION? BY CONTINUING THE FUNDING FOR THE COMMITTEES, DO WE IN SOME WAY JEOPARDIZE THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND THE GRANTS?

I THINK WE DO PUT SOME OF THAT REVENUE AND REIMBURSEMENT AT REST BUT DAVID, THIS IS TIME FOR REALLY STRAIGHTFORWARD ANSWER, IF YOU COULD.

IS THE IDEA OF LOOKING AT SAY RENTAL VERSUS OWNERSHIP HOUSING IS MAYBE YOUR SUGGESTION AND FOCUSING ON FUNDING THE MONITORING OF RENTAL HOUSING. I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU MAY GO THAT DIRECTION. AT THIS TIME. BUT IN TERMS OF THE COMMITTEES AND THE STAFF TIME, THE ISSUE REALLY IS THE AMOUNT OF STAFF TIME, THREE STAFF MEMBERS ARE DEDICATING TO THE BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS, OVER 200 HOURS CURRENTLY OF THE STAFF TIME IS BEING DEDICATED TO SUPPORT THOSE COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS.

DAVID, I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, THAT THERE IS A LOT OF TIME AND EFFORT BUT I AM SAYING AS A COUNCILMEMBER, IF I AM NOT PREPARED TO MAKE A DECISION ABOUT THE COMMITTEES AND COMMISSION, DO YOU HAVE A PROPOSAL THAT WOULD ALLOW STAFF TO GO FORWARD ON THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, DO YOU HAVE A COUNTERPROPOSAL?

WELL AT THIS TIME , THE STAFF CAPACITY IS EXTREMELY LIMITED. OKAY.

WHAT WE WERE TRYING TO DO IS TO FREE UP STAFF CAPACITY . WE'VE GOT TWO GRANT PROJECTS, THE SDG, WE'VE GOT THE PDA GRANT.

I THINK WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IT IS THAT IT IS WHAT ARE THE OTHER? YOU NEED STAFF CAPACITY TO ADDRESS THESE PROJECTS.

I'M GOING TO GO TO COUNCIL. VICE MAYOR?

I WILL BE BRIEF, MY ISSUE IS THE FACT THAT I DID GET THE UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU WERE GOING TO BRING THIS BACK, DON, THE STAFF REPORT AS SOON AS YOU COULD AFTER YOU TALKED WITH DAVID AND THE COMMITTEES AND GIVE THEM NOTICE. MY ISSUE NOW IS NOTICE. I DON'T WANT TO BE MESSING AROUND WITH THEIR OPERATION BECAUSE AS MAYOR SAID , THEY ARE NOT HERE, WHY WOULD THEY BE HERE? IF THEY THOUGHT THEIR PROGRAM WOULD BE FACING -- LET ME FINISH, MY WHOLE ISSUE HERE IS NOTES. I SUGGEST THAT BASED UPON WHAT YOU ARE PLANNING DIRECTOR HAS SAID, THIS IS AN URGENT THING. PUT THIS ALL TOGETHER IN A STAFF REPORT AND GET IT ON THE NEXT AGENDA AND WE

CAN DO IT, AT LEAST THAT WAY I WILL HAVE PEACE OF MIND THAT THESE PARTICULAR ENTITIES HAVE HAD NOTICE. LIKE AT LEAST TWO WEEKS TO COME AND LIKE ORGANIZE AND SAY YOU WANT TO NOT HAVE US DO IT EVERY WEEK OR EVERY TWO WEEKS OR EVERY MONTH, JUST NOTICE IT, THAT IS MY THOUGHT.

THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER.

I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT THE MAYOR'S COMMENT ABOUT THE MONEY, THE 91,800 , PUT THAT AS A PLACEHOLDER AND THEN BRING IT BACK WITH A FULL STAFF REPORT ON THE ISSUE. WE NEED MORE TIME TO DISCUSS IT.

I'M SORRY, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS, THEN WE JUST NEED TO VOTE .

I JUST WANT TO SAY WE HAVE A DEPARTMENT HEAD HERE TELLING US RIGHT NOW THAT WE HAVE ISSUES AND I UNDERSTAND YOU ARE SAYING BRING IT UP THE NEXT MEETING BUT I WILL UNFORTUNATELY NOT BE HERE. I HEAR YOU AND AS WE SIT HERE AND LOOK AT ALL OF THIS, HERE WHAT YOU ARE SAYING ABOUT NOTICE BUT I SEE ON ZOO, CLIMATE ACTION PEOPLE ON THERE, THEY ARE HEARING. I JUST HEAR THAT 200 HOURS OF STAFF TIME, WE ARE SHORT ON STAFF, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT, WE HAVE GOT REQUESTS FOR STAFFING STUDIES AND ALL OF THIS AND WE ARE CONSTANTLY TALKING ABOUT HOW WE ARE WORRIED ABOUT PEOPLE DOING THREE JOBS BUT WE ARE HEARING PLANNING TELLING US THAT THEY ARE SHORT STAFFED AND DO NOT HAVE TIME AND THE CLIMATE ACTION COMMITTEE, EVERYBODY ON THERE IS A SUPERSMART. I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY THEY NEED TO HAVE STAFF THERE ALL THE TIME TO HOLD THEIR HAND AND WHY WE ARE PAYING FOR THAT WHEN WE ARE HEARING HER OWN DEPARTMENT HAD TO SAY THAT WE ARE SHORT STAFFED AND DO NOT HAVE IT. I JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY EVERYBODY ELSE IS NOT HEARING IT. I KNOW IT IS A PERSONAL CONNECTION FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE, YOU KNOW, FEELING ANGST OVER THIS BUT I AM HEARING THAT WE DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH STAFF, WE HAVE HOTEL THAT WANTS TO GO, ALL THESE DIFFERENT THINGS, MONEY GENERATING ITEMS THAT WE NEED, THAT IS ALL WE TALK ABOUT, WE ARE NICKELING AND DIMING EVERYTHING AND I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT I HEAR YOU AND I THINK IT IS A SHAME WE ARE NOT ADDRESSING IT MORE. WE ARE TALKING MORE ABOUT DEPARTMENT BUDGETS RIGHT NOW AND THAT SEEMS AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME BUT I JUST DON'T THINK, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT COMMUNITIES, NONE OF THEM ARE HERE TO DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY WE ARE NOT HEARING THIS DEPARTMENT HAD RIGHT NOW.

THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS. I WILL CALL FOR A COUPLE OF FINAL COMMENTS AND THEN WE JUST NEED TO MAKE A DECISION.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, DO HAVE SOMETHING TO ADD? THEN I THINK COUNCILMEMBER MAVERICK.

I MEAN ON ONE HAND I AM JUST LOOKING AT THE MONITORING'S AND TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHO ELSE IS PAYING FOR MONITORING IN SONOMA COUNTY AND ALL I CAN FIND OUR BIG CITIES. ON THE OTHER HAND WE ARE NICKELING AND DIMING OVER, I MEAN I THINK IT IS FAIR TO GIVE COMMITTEES A FORMAL NOTICE, NOT JUST THEM HEARING BUT IF WE JUST KIND OF WORKED IN A COUPLE OF MONTHS IT PROBABLY WOULD BE FINE AND ALL KIND OF WORK OUT. I DON'T KNOW. I JUST FEEL LIKE SOMETIMES WE ARE FOCUSED ON THE WRONG THINGS, THAT IS MY OPINION.

OKAY. I THINK WE HAVE ALL MADE OUR OPINIONS KNOWN HERE. SO, I'M TRYING TO FIND WHETHER THERE IS A CONSENSUS ON ANY OF THESE. I'M \$91,800 AMOUNT, I AM HEARING TWO RESULTS SUPPORTED HERE BY COUNCILMEMBERS. ONE, WOULD BE I THINK IS TO ALLOCATE THE 91,800 TWO DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND GRANTS AND IN THIS MEETING, REDUCE SERVICES TO THE VARIOUS COMMITTEES. THE OTHER PROPOSAL WOULD BE TO CONTINUE THE SUPPORT FOR THE COMMITTEES, AS CURRENTLY SUPPORTED AND THAT WOULD BE THE FOUR COMMITTEES WE HAVE DISCUSSED AND I AM HEARING THAT THE 91,800 IS THE AMOUNT THAT WOULD CONTINUE FOR THE YEAR, CONTINUE SUPPORT FOR THOSE COMMITTEES, AS THEY ARE CURRENTLY SUPPORTED. SET ASIDE, AS A PLACEHOLDER, 91,800 IN THE BUDGET. SUBJECT TO A FUTURE FINAL DECISION BY THE CITY COUNCIL, ON WHETHER THAT 91,800 SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND GRANTS, OR SHOULD INSTEAD ALL OR A PORTION CONTINUE TO BE DESIGNATED TOWARD SUPPORTING OUR COMMITTEES. THAT I THINK ARE THE TWO PROPOSALS, IS THAT NOT?

I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE SIMPLER. BASICALLY KEEP IT AS A PLACEHOLDER, JUST KEEP THE AMOUNT AS A PLACEHOLDER SUBJECT TO WHEN THE GM COMMUNICATES WITH ITS PLANNING DIRECTOR ABOUT WHAT IT IS SPECIFICALLY WE NEED TO KNOW FROM THE VARIOUS COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS AND THAT WE CAN MAKE AN EDUCATED DECISION. I WOULD WANT TO KEEP IT AS A PLACEHOLDER.

BUT ALLOW SUPPORT FOR COMMITTEES TO CONTINUE AS IS?

UNTIL A GENERAL MANAGER BRINGS IT BACK IN A STAFF REPORT, YES.

OKAY. I THINK THOSE ARE THE TWO OPTIONS ON THAT ITEM. I AM GOING TO ASK FOR A THUMBS-UP ON THE JUST GO WITH THIS PLAN, WHO IS THUMBS-UP ON ALLOCATING THE 91,800, I AM SORRY, THE CITY MANAGER LOOKS CONFUSED.

I'M NOT SURE WHAT YOU MEAN BY ALLOCATING 91,800.

91 800 AS PROPOSED IN THIS BUDGET.

LEAVY ASSUMPTION ABOUT THE REVENUE AND THE REIMBURSEMENT AS IS IS WHAT YOU ARE, THAT IS WHAT I'M HEARING?

THE ONE OPTION AS I UNDERSTAND WAS PROPOSED IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET IS THAT THE COMMITTEE SUPPORT IS REDUCED AND INSTEAD THERE IS 91,800 THAT IS ALLOCATED TO REIMBURSEMENT OF STAFF TIME FOR REVENUE GENERATING WORK ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND GRANTS, THAT IS WHAT I UNDERSTOOD IS IN THIS PROPOSAL.

IT IS REIMBURSEMENT TO THE GENERAL FUND, BASICALLY. WHAT THEY ARE SAYING IS BY REDUCING THE STAFF TIME TO COMMITTEES THEY WILL BE RECEIVING, THEY ARE ANTICIPATED TO RECEIVE THE 92, I THINK YOU ARE SAYING THE SAME THING BUT IT IS JUST THE REIMBURSEMENT OF STAFF TIME TO THE GENERAL FUND. ONE OPTION IS TO LEAVE IT AS IS WHICH WOULD BE ASSUMING WE ARE GOING TO GET 92,000 FROM A REIMBURSEMENT IF THERE IS NO SUPPORT TO THE COMMITTEES BECAUSE THEN THEY WILL BE WORKING ON DEVELOPMENT AND COUNCIL, OR THE OTHER OPTION OF WHAT I AM HEARING IS TO LEAVE THE 92 ASSUMPTION OF RE-NUMBERS MEANT AS A PLACEHOLDER, CONTINUE THE CURRENT SUPPORT FOR THE COMMITTEES AND COMMISSION, RETURN WITH AN AGENDA ITEM FOR FURTHER COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION.

I THINK THOSE OF THE TWO OPTIONS AND WE ARE THE SECOND ONE AND I THINK YOU TWO ARE THE FIRST ONE. RIGHT? OKAY. I THINK WE HAVE GOT SUPPORT BUT OKAY, THE SECOND OPTION THUMBS-UP OR THUMBS DOWN? COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

I WANT TO GIVE CLIMATE ACTION NOTICE BUT I WISH WE HAD ALREADY DONE THAT.

OKAY. ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. THE MONITORING OF OWNERSHIP HOUSING UNITS, 50,000, OKAY, MONITORING OF HOUSING OWNERSHIP, THUMBS DOWN ON THAT, OKAY. THAT IS THE OWNERSHIP HOUSING UNIT. THE MONITORING OF RENTAL HOUSING UNITS, 22,000, THUMBS-UP OR THUMBS DOWN? OKAY. THAT MAKES IT, 3-2. OKAY. IS THAT SUFFICIENT DIRECTION? I KNOW THAT WAS A COUPLE GET A DISCUSSION BUT IT WAS IMPORTANT. CORRECT. ALL RIGHT. NOW WE ARE ON TO THE BUILDING SECTION AND I SEE THAT THERE IS REVENUE INCREASED ITEMS, IF WE CAN MOVE TO THAT SLIDE, THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL. WE HAVE A COUPLE OF REVENUE INCREASED ITEMS AND I DON'T THINK WE HAVE ANY ITEMS TO APPROVE YOUR. IS THAT CORRECT?

SORRY DID NOT PUT THE NUMBER IN THE SLIDE, THE REVENUE INCREASES ARE ABOUT 1 MILLION.

I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE HAD THAT \$100,000 IN AS WELL.

THE REVENUE INCREASES 900,000 FOR THE CANOPY PROJECT AND 100,000 FOR GAVIN STEEN. 800,000 FROM THE CANOPY PROJECT AND 100,000 FROM RAVEN STEEN COMMONS IS OUR EXPECTATION.

AND 400 GENERIC, RIGHT? 400 FOR MIXED OTHER BUILDINGS.

400 IS OUR NORMAL THAT WE DO EVERY YEAR WITH THE RAYS AND 800 FROM CANOPY AND 100 FROM GRAVENSTEEN COMMONS AND UNDERSTAND THAT ALL OF THESE THINGS ARE SOMEWHAT OF A GUESS BECAUSE, IT COULD BE MUCH MORE THAN THAT OF CANOPY GOES AND BUILDS ALL OF THEIR HOUSES THIS YEAR AND SELLS THEM RIGHT AWAY THEN IT WILL BE MUCH MORE BUT THOSE ARE PRETTY CONSERVATIVE NUMBERS THAT WE HAVE GOTTEN SO FAR.

OKAY , THANK YOU. JUST TO NOTE THERE IS AN INDICATION THAT THERE WILL BE, THE EXPENSES WILL GO UP BY 100,000 IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE CANOPY PROJECT.

50,000.

50,000 AC FOR ASSOCIATED INCREASE IN EXPENSES TO COVER THE COST OF INSPECTIONS AND ALSO 50,000 TO ADDRESS THE ADDITIONAL BUILDING RELATED EXPENSES SUCH AS REVIEW PLANS, PERMITS, ARE THOSE TWO DIFFERENT ITEMS? I AM LOOKING AT THE STAFF REPORT.

I AM HONESTLY CONFUSED. WE RAISED OUR CONTRACT ONLY BY 50 TOTAL.

IT SAYS THERE WILL BE AN ASSOCIATED INCREASE OF 50,000 IN EXPENSES TO COVER THE COST OF EXPENSES NEEDED FOR THE PROJECT AND THEN THE BUILDING OFFICIAL CONTRACT HAS ALSO INCREASED 50,000, I SEE. THE EXPENSES WILL GO UP AND WE NEED TO PAY MORE IN ORDER TO DO THAT WORK. ONLY 50,000, YOU DON'T GET 100,000.

BUT I WILL TAKE 100 IF YOU GIVE IT TO ME.

NOT HAPPENING. COUNCILMEMBER MAURER ?

THERE WAS AN ISSUE OF A FLOODGATE FOR \$10,000, CAN YOU TELL ME, WE HAD TALKED ABOUT ELIMINATING THE COST? WHERE DOES THAT STAND?

WE HAVE REQUESTED THROUGH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ELIMINATE THAT COMPLETELY, UNDERSTAND IT IS A FEDERAL

GOVERNMENT AND THEY DON'T MOVE QUICKLY, QUITE HONESTLY I WOULD BE SURPRISED IF WE KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT BEFORE THE END OF THE YEAR.

IS AN EXPENSE LINE ITEM FOR \$10,000, FOR FLOODGATES?

YES, IN THE CONTRACT SERVICES, THE SAME LINE ITEM OF THE PHILLIPS SEABROOK CONTRACT.

MAYBE WE WILL SAVE \$10,000.

WE VERY WELL MAY COME BACK MID-YOU TO TAKE THAT AWAY. STU AND I WOULD BE NICE. THANK YOU, I THINK WE ARE DONE WITH BUILDING AND WE CAN MOVE ON TO THE NEXT CATEGORY, WHICH IS ENGINEERING.

ENGINEERING IS THE ITEM THAT HAS 163 THOUSAND DOLLARS SAVINGS AS A RESULT OF CONSOLIDATING TWO POSITIONS, WE EXPECT TO GET THAT ITEM, THE APPROVAL OF THAT JOB DESCRIPTION, STAFF WOULD COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL WHEN? MORE OR LESS?

ANTICIPATING AUGUST 6th.

OKAY, THIS POINT WE ARE APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF THAT MONEY FOR THE POSITION?

CORRECT.

WHAT IS THE TOTAL COST OF THE POSITION?

WE ARE REVIEWING THAT AS WE SPEAK BECAUSE WE ARE DOING A REVIEW OF OTHER CITIES AS WELL.

OKAY, \$11,500 REDUCTION IN SHIFTING THE ENGINEERING CONTRACT, AND A SHIFT OF THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONTRACT FOR THE POLICE AND THEN \$5000 TO SUPPORT THE WASTE CONTRACT. IT SEEMS THERE IS AN ADDITIONAL ELEMENT IN ENGINEERING THAT REDUCES SERVICES, ARE WE NOT CAPTURING THAT? IS THAT PART OF CONSOLIDATING THE TWO POSITIONS? OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I'M GOING TO ASK COUNCILMEMBERS, ANY ITEMS? I WILL START WITH OUR BUDGET COMMITTEE, ANY COMMENT ON THESE ITEMS? ANY COMMENT ON THESE ITEMS?

WE SUGGESTED THE ADDITION OF \$5000 SO THAT MONEY CAN HELP US WITH THE GARBAGE SERVICES CONTRACTS, THAT WAS WHAT THAT WAS.

THANK YOU, VICE MAYOR?

I AGREE WITH ALL THIS IN THE 5000 WAS COUNCILMEMBER MAURER'S IDEA AND I AGREE , IF WE HAVE THE EXPERTISE FROM BEFORE WE SHOULD APPLY IT MOVING FORWARD.

THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

I THINK THAT WAS GENIUS THINKING, YES, I ABSOLUTELY AGREE . SORRY. COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

ALL GOOD.

OKAY, THE ONLY THING I WOULD SAY ON THIS IS TO EXPRESS SOME CONCERN FROM THE PUBLIC AND I THINK IT IS REALLY A CONCRETE EXPRESSION OF THE FISCAL SITUATION WE ARE IN, THAT BASICALLY WE ARE REDUCING SERVICES, GHD, LOSING TIME WITH GHD IS GOING TO AFFECT OUR PUBLIC AND THERE WILL BE DELAYS AND THE PUBLIC WILL NOT GET THE SERVICES THAT THE PUBLIC HAS COME TO EXPECT BECAUSE WE CANNOT AFFORD IT. SO, WE CANNOT AFFORD IT. THERE WE ARE. BUT I AM IN SUPPORT OF ALL OF THESE ITEMS ON THE ENGINEERING LIST, THUMBS UP, EVERYONE IN SUPPORT? IS ANYBODY THUMBS DOWN ON ANY OF THESE? OKAY, GREAT. THANK YOU. MOVING ONTO THE NEXT CATEGORY WE HAVE FIRE. ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE FIRE, AD HOC AND BUDGET COMMITTEE. I WILL START WITH

BUDGET COMMITTEE. ANY COMMENTS ON THE ITEMS FROM THE BUDGET COMMITTEE?

IT WAS DISCUSSED AS A TRIAL BASIS, SOMETHING -- THE PILOT PROGRAM.

I DIDN'T GET A LOT OF INFORMATION BUT I TRUST THE AD HOC TO DO WHATEVER IT IS THEY DID AND I GUESS THAT IS HOW WE ENDED UP WITH THAT NUMBER IN THIS BUDGET. SO, I TRUST THEM, YES. I WILL SAY, IN REFERENCE TO THE MAP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD, THAT IN MY MIND IS TIED TO THE \$100,000 TO BE DETERMINED AND THE FACT THAT I SERVE ON A STATEWIDE CAL CITIES COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE AND PART OF WHAT THEY EXPLAINED TO KEEP ALL OF OUR COMMUNITY SAFER IS TO RE-INSERT THE PROGRAM WE USED TO HAVE IN THE COUNTY FOR MANY YEARS, IN THE CITY FOR MANY YEARS AND THEN THERE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT LIABILITY AND EVERYTHING ELSE. THERE IS A LONG BEACH FIRE CAPTAIN THAT SENT WITH THE GOOD SAMARITAN LAWS AND OTHER TYPES OF LIABILITY REDUCTION, REDUCTION MEASURES, THAT THOSE TYPE OF LIABILITY CONCERNS ARE FAR BELOW THE ACTUAL BENEFITS THAT THE COMMUNITIES HAVE AND I BELIEVE OUR CHIEF HAS AGREED TO COMMUNICATE WITH A LONG BEACH FIRE DEPARTMENTS THEY CAN DECIDE AND WEIGH IN ON THIS SHOULD THE ALLOCATED AMOUNT OF \$100,000 OF A PLACEHOLDER WITH OTHER ITEMS TO DO A FULL ANALYSIS ABOUT WHETHER THIS COMMUNITY DOES NEED TO RE-INVIGORATE OR REDUCE THE MAP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD BUT SOMEHOW TO DO AN ANALYSIS AND REPORT BACK TO THE COUNCIL SO WE CAN MAKE A FORMAL DECISION BUT YES, THAT IS PART OF WHERE THE \$100,000 IS. ALSO TO BE ABLE TO INVEST IN OUR NONPROFITS THAT DO SLIP AND FALL BECAUSE I CANNOT EMPHASIZE ENOUGH THAT 60% OF OUR FIRE CALLS ARE SLIP AND FALL RELATED. IT IS A MATTER OF WORKING WITH THEM TO REDUCE THE RISKS, TO REDUCE THE WEAR AND TEAR ON OUR FIRE FOLK, TO BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO THIS. PART OF THAT MONEY IS ALSO TO GET OUR LOCAL HOSPITALS INVOLVED AND TO REALIZE IT WOULD BE IN THEIR BEST INTEREST TO PARTNER UP WITH MUNICIPALITIES LIKE OURS THAT ARE STRUGGLING IN ORDER TO ALL WORK TOGETHER TO REDUCE THE RISKS SO WE DON'T HAVE TO RESPOND, THERE WILL NOT BE WEAR AND TEAR OR CLAIMS ON SAFETY OFFICERS, ET CETERA, THAT IS A PART OF THE 100,000 DOLLARS AND I SUPPORT THAT.

THANK YOU, VERY MUCH, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR McLEWIS, ANY COMMENTS? THERE ON THE AD HOC , IMPORTANT TO LISTEN TO THESE COMMENTS.

GOING THROUGH THESE NUMBERS , FIRST OF ALL WE THINK, I DON'T WANT TO SPEAK FOR BOTH OF US BUT WHERE WE HAVE DISCUSSED THIS, AS FAR AS THE STIPEND MONIES THERE, I SUGGEST THAT WE ACTUALLY HOLD THAT AS A PLACEHOLDER BECAUSE WE WOULD LIKE TO COME BACK, WE ARE DOING A STIPEND STUDY AND I ALSO WANT TO WORK WITH GOLD RIDGE TO GO THROUGH THAT AND WE WOULD LIKE TO BRING IT BACK FAIRLY SOON BUT I THINK FOR NOW I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT AS A PLACEHOLDER, SO WE CAN BETTER EVALUATE HOW WE PLAN TO UTILIZE OUR VOLUNTEERS AND IN THE STIPEND BUT THERE IS ALSO SOMETHING ELSE THAT WE DISCUSSED THAT WE BELIEVE WITH THAT EXTRA REMAINING 300,000, PROPOSING HIRING TWO STAFF FIREFIGHTERS AND THAT WAY WE WOULD ACTUALLY HAVE FOUR AND YOU KNOW, WE HAVE A RESPONSE ISSUE AND I THINK THAT IF WE WERE

ALL TO AGREE TO THAT WE COULD GET THAT IN THE WORK AND THAT WILL BE A POSITIVE FOR OUR ENTIRE COMMUNITY. IN ADDITION, DURING THAT TIME WE WOULD DO THE STIPEND STUDY AND WORK WITH THE CHIEF, WHO IS HERE, AND COME BACK WITH A PROPOSAL AND AN OUTLINE OF HOW WE THINK WE CAN BETTER UTILIZE OUR VOLUNTEERS. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT HELPS ANY, LET ME LOOK, AS FAR AS -- PROGRAM, I'M FAMILIAR WITH IT AND I'M OF THE BELIEF THAT WHILE WE GO THROUGH THE PROCESS OF CONSOLIDATION AND WE ARE ASSESSING ALL OF THESE THINGS, I AM NOT AGAINST CERT BY ANY MEANS AND I'VE SPENT TIME WORKING IN THE E.R. AS A RISK PONDER. I THINK PERSONALLY IT WOULD BE PREMATURE TO PUT MONEY TOWARDS THAT RIGHT NOW AND I TRULY BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD WORK TO THE CONSOLIDATION, FIGURE OUT WHERE WE HAVE CRACKS AND WHAT WE NEED TO FILL WITHIN OUR COMMUNITY. ONCE WE HAVE A CONSOLIDATION AND FIGURE THINGS OUT AND WHO IS COVERING WHAT, I'M NOT OPPOSED TO IT BUT I THINK IT IS EARLY TO DO THAT, GIVEN THE PROCESS THAT WE ARE GOING THROUGH RIGHT NOW. I UNDERSTAND THE VALUE OF MAP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THAT WHATSOEVER BUT AS FAR AS CERT, THAT IS WHAT I WOULD RECOMMEND. I'VE WORKED WITH THE FOLKS BEFORE DURING ALL OF THE FIRES AND I WAS ONE OF THE PEOPLE HERE RUNNING THE EVACUATION CENTERS. I AM A VERY SUPPORTIVE OF ALL THE STUFF BUT I THINK IT IS PREMATURE, WE HAVE NOT DISCUSSED THAT ON THE FIRE AD HOC AND THAT IS MY OPINION I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT TO WEIGH IN ON THE FIRE? YES, AS COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS HAS DISCUSSED, WE ARE , WE WOULD LIKE PLACEHOLDERS BECAUSE IT LOOKS LIKE OUR INTENTION IS TO RECOMMEND TO BRING ON TWO FULL-TIME FIREMEN, FIREFIGHTERS, SORRY. I ALWAYS DO THAT. USING THE MEASURE H MONEY AND TO REVIEW THE STIPEND MONEY. THE PILOT PROGRAM THAT WE CONTINUE TO REFER TO WAS TRIED OUT AND IT WAS NOT, WE WERE NOT FULLY AWARE OF IT WHEN IT WAS STARTED. SO, IT DID COME UP WITH SOME GOOD FEEDBACK FOR US THAT GAVE US THE IDEA THAT WE REALLY NEED SOMEBODY IN THE FIREHOUSE THAT THEY CAN RESPOND TO, ESPECIALLY OVERNIGHT TO FIRES AND EMERGENCIES MUCH MORE QUICKLY AND SO WE HAVE BEEN TRYING TO COME UP WITH A PLAN FOR THAT. I AM ALSO NOT SUPPORTIVE OF CERT IS A PLACEHOLDER AT THIS TIME , I'M VERY FAMILIAR WITH CERT PROGRAM THAT SEBASTOPOL HAD BEFORE AND WHILE WE GO THROUGH THIS CONSOLIDATION PROCESS IT JUST SEEMS LIKE THE WRONG IDEA AT THE WRONG TIME KIND OF THING. I WILL NOT BE SUPPORTING THAT TODAY. OKAY. MY COMMENT ON ALL OF THIS IS THAT REDUCING SALARY FOR NOT FILLING THE FIRE CHIEF POSITION IS GREAT, SAVINGS. IN TERMS OF THE CONTRACT EXPENSES FOR THE FIRE TO CONTRACT, CERTAINLY IN SUPPORT OF THAT, GETTING VALUE-ADDED THERE. I HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT THE \$95,000 FIRE CONSOLIDATION EXPENSE? IS THAT A SET EXPENSE, AN ESTIMATE, WHERE DOES THAT NUMBER COME FROM? JUST A BRIEF ANSWER FROM SOMEBODY. THAT COMES FROM SEVERAL COMPONENTS. LET ME TAKE A QUICK LOOK. ONE, POTENTIAL FOR AN OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR OR FIRE EXPERT TO HELP US IN NEGOTIATING PROCESSES, WE HAVE \$50,000 ITEM FOR THAT AND WE DON'T KNOW IF WE WILL NEEDED. AT THIS POINT I THINK WE PROBABLY WILL NOT NEED THAT MUCH. SOME COMMUNITY RELATIONS AROUND

CONSOLIDATION FOR 15,000 AND THEN OUR LAFCO COST FOR CONSOLIDATION IS ABOUT 80,000, SO ABOUT 95.

THIS IS A PLACEHOLDER, REALLY, IT IS MONEY SET ASIDE, YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE MONEY SET ASIDE BUT, I SEE A LOT OF THIS IS MONEY BEING SET ASIDE SUBJECT TO A FINAL REPORT OUT FROM THE FIRE AD HOC AND DIRECTION FROM THE FIRE AD HOC COMING BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL, IS THAT ACCURATE?

WELL WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO DO, WE DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH , WE HAVE 50,000 SET ASIDE AND WE DON'T KNOW IF WE WILL SPEND THAT, IN THAT INSTANCE WE WOULD HAVE THAT AS A PLACEHOLDER BUT THE FIRE AD HOC WOULD BE RINGING THE ITEMS BACK FOR FINAL APPROVAL, YOU KNOW OF THE FUNDING ALLOCATION.

OKAY. WITH THAT BEING TERMS THE STIPEND AMOUNTS, SOUND LIKE THE SAME AMOUNT YOU WOULD LIKE US TO HAVE A PLACEHOLDER OF THE 80,000, SUBJECT TO YOU COMING BACK?

LET ME CLARIFY, I THINK 50,000 IS A PLACEHOLDER BUT THE OTHER LAFCO FEES ARE FIRM, RIGHT?

I WOULD CONSIDER THOSE FIRM AND COMMITTED.

THE 50,000 WOULD COME BACK?

RIGHT. AS FAR AS THE 40 AND THE 40, WE ARE FULLY COMMITTED TO WORKING THROUGH THIS CONSOLIDATION WITH GOLD RIDGE AND WE JUST WANT TO SPEND THE TIME THAT IS NEEDED TO ENSURE THAT HOW WE USE THESE MONIES IS APPROPRIATE AND YOU KNOW, WE FEEL LIKE WE NEED A LITTLE MORE TIME AND IT SEEMS PRUDENT AND MADE SENSE TO ASK FOR IT. NOW, HOLD IT AND WE CAN COME BACK FOR YOUR APPROVAL AND WE WILL BRING SOMETHING BACK FOR EVERYONE TO APPROVE. BUT WE ARE ASKING TONIGHT, IF YOU ALL WOULD BE WILLING TO APPROVE USING THE MEASURE H MONEY, THAT WE KNOW WILL BE COMING THIS YEAR, 300 K THAT HAS AND SET ASIDE FOR HIRING TWO STAFF FIREFIGHTERS. THAT WOULD REDUCE THE AMOUNT THAT WE NEEDED, THAT COULD POSSIBLY REDUCE STIPEND MONEY, I AM NOT POSITIVE BECAUSE WE HAVE TO GO BACK AND LOOK AT IT BUT WE ARE TRYING TO BE AS PRUDENT AS POSSIBLE BUT ALSO HAVE ENOUGH STAFF SO THAT WE CAN RESPOND APPROPRIATELY.

I GUESS MY QUESTION ON THAT WOULD BE , WE STILL NEED AND I AM REALLY HOPING WE WILL GET TO THE REPORT TONIGHT BUT WE STILL NEED TO HEAR BACK FROM THE FIRE AD HOC AND THE FIRE AD HOC IS STILL DOING ITS DUE DILIGENCE. IS THERE A WAY, I WOULD BE HESITANT TONIGHT, TO APPROVE THE HIRING EFFECTIVE OF TWO FIREFIGHTERS AND I AM WONDERING, IT IS A POLICY DECISION THAT I FEEL LIKE WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION ON. I AM WONDERING IF THERE IS A WAY TO REQUEST, TO REQUEST THAT THE FIRE AD HOC COME BACK TO ALLOCATE THE MONEY IN SOME WAY, IT IS ALREADY HERE PROPOSED, 300,000 FOR MEASURE H, ALLOCATE THE TOTAL 80,000 FOR STIPENDS AS A PLACEHOLDER WITH, SUBJECT TO THE FIRE AD HOC COMING BACK TO GET APPROVAL FOR WHATEVER THE OVERALL PLAN IS? I'M ARTICULATING IT? BUT THE POINT IS TO HAVE THE MONEY SET ASIDE FOR YOU, HAVE YOU COME BACK AND GIVE US A SENSE OF WHAT EXACTLY AND WHY THE MONEY SHOULD BE ALLOCATED IN A SPECIFIC WAY. DOES THAT MAKE ANY SENSE?

I UNDERSTAND THAT. WE HAVE BEEN JUST TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN GET THINGS BACK ON THE AGENDA. SO THAT WE DO NOT HAVE A

PROBLEM WITH RESPONSE AND THAT IS OUR CONCERN. IT IS REALLY UP TO THE FULL BOARD BUT I WOULD ENCOURAGE OUR AGENDA REVIEW COMMITTEE, WE NEED TO GET IT BACK ON THE AGENDA SOONER VERSUS LATER. SO WE DO NOT HAVE A LACK OF RESPONSE.

I WANTED TO SAY, FOR ME TO SLEEP AT NIGHT, I ALWAYS CHOOSE PEOPLE OVER POLICY, YOU KNOW? THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE A TIME WHEN WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH PEOPLE RESPONDING, THAT IS YOU OR A FAMILY MEMBER WE DON'T HAVE SOMEBODY RESPONDING, THAT WOULD JUST BE DEVASTATING AND EVERY DAY I THINK ABOUT THAT AND THAT IS WHY I WAS BRINGING IT UP TONIGHT THAT WE CAN BRING ON TWO FULL-TIME PEOPLE, HOW FABULOUS WOULD THAT BE? AND I FEEL LIKE WE COULD ALL SLEEP AT NIGHT KNOWING WE HAVE TAKEN CARE OF OUR COMMUNITIES. THAT IS WHY I BRING IT UP. THAT IS MY MANTRA, PEOPLE OVER POLICY. I GOT IT. COUNCILMEMBER MAURER?

I AGREE WITH EVERYTHING ON THE FIRE, EXCEPT FOR THE 100,000 TO BE DETERMINED, ON THE BUDGET ON PAGE 84 IT SAYS THE USES WOULD BE TO ASK FLOOR CERT AND FALL PREVENTION. THIS IS WHERE VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN AND I DISAGREED, WE NEED TO GIVE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT 10% OF THE BUDGET, THAT WAS SOMETHING WE AGREED ON. THE 100,000 WAS SORT OF A PLACEHOLDER WITH UNDETERMINED USES BUT IT IS IN THE BUDGET IS SOMETHING DIFFERENT. IT IS NOT THAT I DO NOT SUPPORT CERT BECAUSE I WOULD BUT IT SEEMS, 100,000 SEEMS LIKE A LOT TO GET A PROGRAM GOING AND I BELIEVE ONE OF THE FORMER FIRE CHIEFS HAD GOTTEN A GRANT TO GET CERT STARTED IN SEBASTOPOL AND WE ARE ALSO FUNDING MEET YOUR NEIGHBOR. FOR ME IT WAS CONFLICT. AND THEN THE FALL PREVENTION, IN MY OPINION THAT WOULD FALL TO THE SENIOR CENTER. I WOULD SUPPORT, USING THE 100,000, POSSIBLY FOR ONE STAFF, INSTEAD, ACTUALLY THE WAY WE ENDED UP IS THAT WE WERE GOING TO DEFER THE 100,000 TO THE FIRE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS AND BRING BACK TO THE COUNCIL. THAT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING AND IT IS WRITTEN HERE IN THIS. IT SAYS FRUIT USES TO BE DETERMINED. THAT WAS MY MEMORY. I WOULD SUPPORT USING THE 100,000 FOR SOMETHING ELSE THAN THE FIRE DEPARTMENT, MAYBE ONE STAFF.

HAVE TO RESPOND TO THE FACT THAT THAT WAS DEFINITELY NOT WHAT I HEARD DURING HER BUDGET MEETINGS, THE FACT THAT THE 100,000 COULD ALSO BE USED FOR A FIREFIGHTER AND I THINK WE ALREADY DISCUSSED IT, WE CAN HAVE PLACEHOLDERS FOR EVERY AMOUNT THAT IS THERE WITH THE STAFF REPORT, BEFORE ALL OF US NOTICE TO GET THE SPECIFICS FOR THAT BUT WHEN I MENTIONED THE 100,000, IT IS NOT JUST FOR THE FIRE RESPONSE AND SLIP AND FALLS, WE WILL HEAR FROM OUR POLICE CHIEF, THE AMOUNT OF CALLS THAT HE HAS, UPWARDS OF 50%, IT IS NOT JUST IMPACTING ONE DEPARTMENT BUT TWO, THE CARRYOVER IS A BIG ISSUE FOR THE COMMUNITY AND IT IS IMPACTING THIS PARTICULAR BUDGET AND THE POLICE BUDGET.

I HAVE ONE MORE QUESTION.

YES.

THE 300 NEEDS TO BE FLEXIBLE WITH CONSOLIDATION AND 300 MORE FOR MEASURE H, ARE WE EXPECTING 300 MORE THAT WAS NOT BUDGETED?

ESSENTIALLY A FEW HUNDRED HAVE NOT BEEN ALLOCATED, MEANING WE HAVE A MEASURE H SPECIAL FUND AND THAT IS SITTING AND NOT ALLOCATED AT THIS POINT.

OKAY.

THAT IS A 300 WE ARE PROPOSING THAT IS SET ASIDE THAT WE UTILIZE FOR STAFF BUT I HAVE A QUESTION FIRST. I KNOW WE HAVE IS 100 WE ARE NOT SURE WE WANT TO DEVIATE FROM THE FIRE DEPARTMENT BUT I RECALL A PUBLIC COMMENT READING, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT FALLS BUT WE HAVE RECEIVED A NUMBER OF EMAILS FROM PEOPLE WHO HAVE FALLEN IN IVES PARK AND TRIPPED OVER STUFF AND I'M JUST WONDERING, YOU KNOW, I JUST THOUGHT THAT WAS A FAIR POINT, WE HAVE HAD PEOPLE BREAK THEIR ARM STRIPPING. THAT IS ALSO A TRIP AND FALL, IS IT POSSIBLE TO USE MONIES TO FIX THAT? JUST CURIOUS. IT WAS AN INTERESTING PUBLIC COMMENT AND I'M JUST WONDERING IF THE MONEY CAN BE USED THAT WAY AS WELL?

I DON'T THAT WE CAN USE IT FOR THIS BUDGET .

JUST WONDERING.

I'M GOING TO TRY TO WRAP UP THIS ITEM. GO AHEAD COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, A COMMON?

I THINK CERT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT AND I AM IN FAVOR OF LEAVING THAT AS A PLACEHOLDER IN THE FIRE DEPARTMENT BUDGET FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO PUT TOGETHER SOME NUMBERS AND BRING IT BACK, RECOMMENDATIONS.

SO, MY THOUGHT HERE IS THAT I WOULD BE IN SUPPORT OF APPROVING THE FIRST ITEM WHICH IS REDUCTION IN SALARY, THE SECOND ITEM AS PROPOSED, CONTRACT EXPENSES FOR FIRE CHIEF AND THEN SKIPPING DOWN TO THE 11,000 TO CONTINUE THE MEET YOUR NEIGHBOR PROGRAM. I WOULD BE IN SUPPORT OF APPROVING ALL OF THOSE AND WHAT I PROPOSE IS THAT THE REMAINING ITEMS OF WHICH THERE ARE NUMEROUS, 95,000, 40,000, 40,000, 20,000, 100,000, BE SET ASIDE AS PLACEHOLDERS WITH THE FIRE AD HOC TO COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL WITH A FULL REPORT TO PROPOSE WITH THE INPUT OF THE FIRE CHIEF, WHICH I THINK IS A SUPER IMPORTANT. HOW THOSE MONIES SHOULD BEST BE SPENT AND I WOULD ASK THAT THE SAME THING TO BE DONE IN TERMS OF THE 300,000 FOR MEASURE H, I UNDERSTAND AND SYNTHESIZE AND ACTUALLY REALLY APPRECIATE THE SAFETY CONCERNS BEING EXPRESSED HERE REGARDING POSITIONS BUT I DO NOT FEEL THAT I PERSONALLY HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION TO BE ABLE TO DECIDE WHETHER THAT IS THE APPROPRIATE WAY TO SPEND THIS MEASURE H MONEY AND THAT IS KIND OF HOW I WOULD FALL IN ALL OF THIS AND I WOULD ASK AS A FOLLOW-UP TO OUR CITY MANAGER, WHETHER IT, I THINK I'M HEARING, I THINK COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS POINTED THIS OUT. THAT THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT THAT NEEDS TO BE SPECIFICALLY ALLOCATED FOR LAFCO, MAYBE OUT OF THE 95,000 AND SOUNDS LIKE 45,000, IT REALLY WE NEED TO ALLOCATE TONIGHT FOR LAFCO FEES AND FOR SOME OTHER PURPOSE, IT WAS THE 50,000 THAT WAS A PLACEHOLDER. IS THAT CORRECT? I WOULD LIKE TO JUST PUT THAT PROPOSAL OUT THERE. ALL OF THAT MONEY IS A PLACEHOLDER WITH FIRE AD HOC TO COME BACK WITH A PROPOSAL EMBEDDED BUYER FIRE CHIEF AND EVERYONE ELSE IN THE FIRE AD HOC WITH TIME TO CONSIDER IT BUT I WANT TO KNOW FROM OUR CITY MANAGER, ICU COUNT NUMBER MAURER BUT I WANT TO HEAR FROM THE

FIRE CHIEF ALSO, IS THAT WORKABLE? IS THERE A PROBLEM WITH THAT? IS THAT BAD? WHAT ARE THE NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES?

I DON'T KNOW OF ANY NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCE IS BUT I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE CLEAR THAT THE 300,000 HAS REAL CLEAR INTENTIONS BEHIND GREAT FOR MEASURE H, DATA STAFFING, THAT WAS ONE OF THE MAIN OBJECTIVES AND WHY THE CITY OF SEBASTOPOL HAS ALLOCATED THE MONEY THEY ARE ADVOCATING, TO ACHIEVE STAFFING. THERE WILL BE AN EXPECTATION BY THE TAXPAYER THAT AS THE REVENUE COMES AVAILABLE THAT WE MOVE TOWARD STAFFING. EVERYTHING IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET IS REALLY FLEXIBLE OR NEEDS TO BE FLEXIBLE BUT IT IS FOR THE PURPOSE OR THE GOAL TO ACHIEVE THE STAFFING PLAN AND MODEL THAT WAS PROPOSED THAT YOU GUYS ALL, BASICALLY CHOSE AND WANTED TO GO THAT DIRECTION IN THE FIREHOUSE.

AZHAR FIRE CHIEF CURRENTLY, DO YOU FEEL IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE 300,000 BE ALLOCATED TO STAFFING NOW, TONIGHT?

NOT TONIGHT BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE THAT MONEY, WE ANTICIPATED TOWARDS THE END OF JANUARY.

THE FIRST PAYMENT I BELIEVE IS THE END OF JANUARY AND WILL COME SEVEN OR EIGHT MONTHS AFTER THAT.

THE URGENCY OR THE ASK TO WHAT I WOULD CALL IS A STOP-GAP OF THE \$40,000 AND THE ADDITIONAL \$40,000, NOT KNOWING WHEN WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO STAFFING AT THE SAME TIME RECOGNIZING A REAL PROBLEM WITH OUR ABILITY TO RESPOND, ESPECIALLY AT NIGHT. THAT IS I BELIEVE WHAT SPAWNED THE PILOT PROGRAM AND ULTIMATELY WIDE IS BEING ASKED FOR NOW IS A STOP-GAP, FOR THE TIME THAT WE ARE ABLE TO STAFF APPROPRIATELY.

MY QUESTION IS, THE PROPOSAL THAT I MADE , THAT THESE DOLLAR AMOUNTS BE SET ASIDE AS A PLACEHOLDER THAT THEY NOT BE SPENT UNTIL THE FIRE AD HOC COMES BACK TO PROPOSE, IS THAT ACCEPTABLE?

THAT IS ACCEPTABLE, THERE IS SOME URGENCY BUT WE RECOGNIZE WE NEED TO VET AND BETTER UNDERSTAND STIPENDS ON THE USE OF STIPENDS AND COME BACK WITH THAT INFORMATION.

WE HAVE NOT COMPARED NOTES BUT I HAVE SOME CONCERNS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN RAISED.

WE HAVE NOT CONNECTED ON ALL OF THIS.

SO, ON THE 95,000 I THINK WE NEED TO PLAN ON 30,000 FOR LAFCO BECAUSE HE MADE A COMMITMENT BACK IN APRIL AND HE THINKS IS THE RIGHT AMOUNT AS BEST WE KNOW . THE 15,000 FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS, I THINK THE SAME, WE SHOULD PLAN ON THAT. 50,000 FOR CONSULTING ASSISTANCE, I DON'T THINK WE ARE GOING TO NEED THAT, ORIGINALLY AS WE WERE THINKING BUT WE WILL NEED IT FOR SOME ATTORNEY HELP ON THE CONSOLIDATION AND UNDERSTANDING SOME OF THE FINANCING ASPECTS OF IT AND TO ME THE 50,000 SHOULD BE AVAILABLE AND REALLY AT OUR IMMEDIATE USE BECAUSE WE NEED TO START DOING SOME OF THIS WORK LIKE RIGHT NOW, AROUND ANALYZING SOME OF THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS, LEGAL REQUIREMENTS, ET CETERA. I WOULD NOT WANT TO HAVE TO COME BACK TO GET PERMISSION FROM THE FULL COUNCIL TO START ANALYZING SOME OF THESE ISSUES. IT IS NOT THE ORIGINAL INTENT BUT IT IS SOMETHING WE NEED TO DO AND I WOULD RATHER PAY FOR IT OUT OF THIS BUDGET THEN PAY FOR IT OUT OF THE CITY GENERAL FUND. IN A SENSE OF

WHAT MIGHT BE GENERAL FUND AND ORIGIN INSTEAD NEEDS TO BE SPENT ON FIRE. FROM WHAT I HAVE HEARD FROM THE FIRE FOLKS IS THAT \$20,000 FOR THE RADIOS IS REALLY IMPORTANT THAT YOU GUYS HAVE RADIOS THAT NEED TO BE IMPROVED QUICKLY.

YES.

I WOULD NOT WANT TO PUT THAT ON HOLD.

CORRECT.

OKAY BUT I HAVE A QUESTION. I AM CONCERNED, IT SOUNDS LIKE WE ARE NOT GOING TO GET A REPORT FROM THE FIRE AD HOC THAT WOULD OUTLINE A PLAN FOR SOMETIME. IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU ARE HESITANT TO THE EXTENT THAT THE MONEY IS NOT ALLOCATED TONIGHT FOR RADIOS, THE RADIOS WILL NOT BE ABLE TO BE PURCHASED IN TIME AND TO THE EXTENT THAT THE 50,000 IS NOT ALLOCATED FOR A CONSULTANT, YOU CANNOT DO THE NECESSARY ATTORNEY OR OTHER INQUIRIES.

MAY I JUST ADD IN, I FEEL LIKE SOMETHINGS ARE KNOWN TONIGHT, THE RADIOS FOR EXAMPLE.

OKAY.

WE SHOULD INCLUDE THEM IN OUR BUDGET LIKE OTHER DEPARTMENTS. THE LAFCO FEE FOR EXAMPLE.

OKAY.

WE KNOW WE NEED TO FIGURE OUT THE TAX RATIO OF WHAT AND LIKE DONNA NEEDS HELP GETTING THE CONTRACT DONE WITH GOLD RIDGE AND WE NEED THAT NOW. WE CANNOT REALLY WAIT ON THAT AND THAT IS WHAT WE ARE WAITING FOR, WE MAY NOT NEED ALL THE 50,000 BUT WE ARE ASKING FOR AUTHORIZATION TO MOVE ON THAT. SO, THOSE THINGS, THE THINGS WE NEED TO BRING BACK ARE THE STIPENDS, HOW WE RECOMMEND, EVEN THOUGH WE WANT TO DO IT QUICKLY, THE FIREFIGHTER POSITION, THOSE THINGS WE ARE SAYING, WE NEED TO VET MORE AND BRING BACK THE FULL COUNCIL THAT WE ARE ASKING FOR APPROVAL ON SOME OF THESE THINGS THAT WE KNOW WE NEED. THE RADIOS NEED TO WORK.

YES. MAYBE I DID NOT SAY THE RIGHT WAY BUT YES. I CONCUR WITH WHAT YOU JUST SAID.

I THINK I UNDERSTAND THE PROPOSAL HERE TO BE 156,223 REDUCTION, 136 799 AND CONTRACT EXPENSES FOR FIRE CHIEF, 95,002 FUND THE COSTS THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AND REQUESTED BY THE FIRE AD HOC IN OUR CITY MANAGER WHICH WOULD INCLUDE 30,000 TO LAFCO, 15,000 FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES, +50,000 FOR CONSULTANTS OF SOME KIND. AND THEN APPROVAL FOR 11,000 ON THE MEET YOUR NEIGHBOR AMOUNT AND THE 20,000 FOR THE ESSENTIAL RADIOS, WITH THE SET ASIDE, THE PLACEHOLDER BEING 80,000 IN STIPEND AMOUNTS AND I THINK ALSO, 100,000 AS JUST A PLACEHOLDER, TO BE DETERMINED. AM I CAPTURING THAT? AND DID YOU FOLLOW THAT, MARY GURLEY?

I FOLLOWED IT BUT I WANT TO MAKE SURE I HAVE THE COUNTS CORRECT BECAUSE I DIDN'T GET AMOUNT FOR ALL OF THE ITEMS.

LET ME GET COUNCILMEMBER COMMENTS.

I WANT TO INCLUDE THE FACT THAT I'M NOT SUPPORTIVE OF THE 11,000 TO CONTINUE TO MAP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD UNLESS IT IS PUT INTO THE GENERAL POOL BECAUSE WE DISCUSSED THE NEED FOR AN ANALYSIS OF HOW MAP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD MEASURES WITH CERT OR WHATEVER, I

AM FINE WITH PUTTING ALL OF THAT IN TO WORK WITH EVERYBODY I DON'T WANT SPECIFIC CALLOUT FOR MAP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD.

LET'S JUST DO A THUMBS UP SENSE THAT HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED.

LET'S DO A THUMBS UP ON THE WHOLE THING.

LET'S JUST GO DOWN, EVERYONE OKAY WITH THE REDUCTION? 136 799 THE FIRE CHIEF CONTRACT, EVERYONE OKAY WITH THAT? THE 95,000 INCREASE, IS EVERYONE OKAY WITH THAT? THAT IS TO FUND THE VARIOUS COSTS RELATED TO CONSOLIDATION. YES? OKAY. UNANIMOUS. OKAY. SO, THE 40,000 FOR FIREFIGHTER EXPENSES TO EXPAND COVERAGE AND SHIFTING AN ADDITIONAL 40,000 FOR RETENTION OF FIREFIGHTERS TO EXPAND COVERAGE. I THINK WHAT WE ARE HEARING FROM FIRE AD HOC IS THAT THEY ARE OKAY WITH A PLACEHOLDER FOR THAT AMOUNT, IS EVERYBODY IN SUPPORT OF THAT AS A PLACEHOLDER? TO COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL. OKAY. LET'S GO TO THE 20,000 INCREASE IN AGREEMENT TO REPLACE ESSENTIAL RADIOS, THEY ARE SAYING WE NEED IT, THUMBS UP OR THUMBS DOWN. OKAY. NOW WE ARE DOWN TO 11,000 FROM YOUR NEIGHBOR. THUMBS UP, THUMBS DOWN. OKAY. 4-1. DID YOU GET THAT? OKAY. 100,000 AS A LEASEHOLDER TO COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR DESIGNATION OF USE, THUMBS UP? BUYER AD HOC? THUMBS UP ON THE 100,000 TO COME BACK AS A PLACEHOLDER TO GO BACK TO CITY COUNCIL, ALL RIGHT.

CAN WE ADD THE LANGUAGE IN THE BUDGET, THAT IT IS TO BE DETERMINED.

YES. THE DETAILS PAGES DO NOT SPECIFY PARTICULARLY THE \$100,000 USE IN ANY WAY, INSTEAD IT IS JUST THAT WE WILL HEAR ABOUT IT FROM THE FIRE AD HOC. OKAY. THEN A 300,000 FOR MEASURE H, DELPHIC WE NEED TO TAKE ANY ACTION ON, CORRECT?

THAT IS CORRECT RIGHT NOW.

OKAY ANYTHING ELSE? ON FIRE.

WE ARE COMBINING 40 AND 40 .

YES. TO CLARIFY, THE TWO ITEMS, 40,000 INCREASE AND THE SHIFTING OF 40,000 FOR RETENTION. ALL RIGHT. NOW I WILL CHECK IN WITH THE COUNCIL. WE STILL HAVE POLICE AND PUBLIC WORKS AND NON-DEPARTMENTAL. WE ALSO HAVE SALES TAX TONIGHT WHICH WE WOULD LIKE TO GET TO AND THE FIRE AD HOC REPORT. IT IS NOW 10 MINUTES TO 10. WE CAN OF COUNSELORS AGREE STAY UNTIL THE VERY LATEST WHICH I THINK IS 11:30, THAT CORRECT? IF WE DO NOT I JUST WANT TO EXPRESS CONCERN, COUNCIL MEMBERS DO HAVE A RIGHT AT 10:30 AND THERE'S A GOOD REASON FOR THAT, WE'VE BEEN HERE SINCE 4:00, AND HE COUNCIL NEVER CAN DECIDE THAT WE ARE DONE WITH THE MEETING. HOWEVER THAT LEAVES A REALLY ESSENTIAL DISCUSSION WHICH IS SALES TAX FOR OUR NEXT COUNCIL MEETING AND I WANT TO POINT OUT THAT HER NEXT COUNCIL MEETING WE ONLY HAVE THREE COUNCILMEMBERS. I AM HOPING THAT. I AM HOPING THAT ALL OF US WILL BE ABLE TO STAY TO ADDRESS THE SALES TAX ISSUE AND I KNOW WE ARE ALL TIRED, BELIEVE ME I AM TOO. BUT I WANT ALL OF US HERE FOR HOWEVER THE OUTCOME IS. I'M JUST GOING TO ASK. IS EVERYBODY OKAY STAYING UNTIL 11:30? I KNOW. I KNOW. I DID NOT SAY, ARE YOU HAPPY? ARE YOU OKAY? AND I REALLY, REALLY HOPE, THE FIRE AD HOC IS IT , DID WE GET TO THE FIRE AD HOC REPORT?

THE PUBLIC HAS BEEN ASKING BUT I DON'T KNOW BUT WE JUST HAVE TO BUDGET, --

I THINK IT IS ESSENTIAL TO GET TO THE SALES TAX MEASURE. I DON'T KNOW. MAYBE WE SHOULD SET THIS ASIDE AND COME BACK TO IT. I HATE TO DO THAT.

A SUGGESTION HERE FROM , THE QUESTION FROM COUNCILMEMBER MAURER IS WHETHER WE SHOULD SET ASIDE AT THE BUDGET DECISION AND ADDRESS SALES TAX AND COME BACK TO THE BUDGET. I THINK WE NEED TO DO BOTH. ARE YOU WILLING TO STAY COUNCIL MEMBER MAURER? UNTIL 11:30 ? OKAY, LET'S TRY TO DO IT FASTER, HOW IS THAT? OKAY, LET'S GO. POLICE. WE ARE IN THE POLICE BUDGET. WE HAVE THAT SHEET IN FRONT OF US AND THANK YOU TO THE FIRE AD HOC INTO OUR FIRE CHIEF, ALL STAFF IS HERE AND ALL APPRECIATED AND I NOTICE A LOT OF WORK. WE HAVE A NUMBER OF ITEMS HERE, REDUCTION IN EXPENSES WHICH I AM SURE WE WILL ALL APPROVE. 20,000 INCREASED TO FUND, AND THAT IS A PLACEHOLDER UNDERSTAND FOR THE EEOC. AND THEN 4465 TO SHIFT THE WARMING CENTER FUNDS TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. THESE ARE ACCOUNTING FUNDS ARE ALLOCATED TO US, JUST A SHIFT. 11,500 TO INCREASE SHIFTING THE TRAFFIC AND ENGINEERING PIECE TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THEN AN \$8000 INCREASE TO 16,000 TOTAL TO INCREASE CAPACITY FOR TOWING RVs. I AM GOING TO START WITH THE BUDGET COMMITTEE AS COUNCILMEMBER MAURER. HE SUMMING FROM THE CITY MANAGER.

THE ADDITIONAL 10,000 FOR WARMING AND COOLING CENTERS I WANTED TO CARRY FORWARD.

THANK YOU. AND THAT IS NOT ON THE CURRENT PROPOSED BUDGET. CORRECT.

SO THERE WAS AN ISSUE OF POLICE STAFFING? ONE POLICE OFFICER , ONE POLICE OFFICER AND ONE DISPATCH OFFICER AND WE HAD A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION ON THIS BUT I DO NOT SEE THAT HERE IN THE BUDGET BUT I AM SUPPORTING MAINTAINING THE POLICE POSITIONS, BOTH POSITIONS AND SO, I SUPPORT ALL OF THIS.

THANK YOU FOR THE COMMENT. TO POINT THIS OUT, THERE IS, CURRENTLY PROPOSED BUDGET, FUNDING FOR TWO POSITIONS, 121,000 FOR AN OFFICER AND 106,000 FOR A DISPATCHER, THOSE ARE IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET. WHAT IS NOT IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET IS FUNDING FOR A SAFE PROGRAM. CORRECT? IN THE ADDITIONAL ASKS, I DON'T THINK THE SAFE PROGRAM WAS IN THE ADDITIONAL ASKS.

CORRECT.

SO. I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT. THIS IS A QUESTION OF WHETHER WE APPROVE THE ALLOCATION TO THESE POSITIONS OR IF WE INSTEAD PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE OPTION THAT WOULD ALLOW ALLOCATION OF THE MONEY TO A SAFE PROGRAM, I THINK THAT IS THE OPTION, CITY MANAGER?

I AM NOT SUPPORTING THE SAFE PROGRAM AT THIS TIME BECAUSE I THINK WE NEED TO LEARN A LOT MORE ABOUT WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT WILL DO. IT HAD A PRETTY HIGH PRICE TAG AND A START UP COST. I THINK IT WAS 270,000 FOR 40 HOURS, PLUS \$175,000 FOR A VAN. AND WE LEARNED TODAY THAT THE COUNTY IS PAYING FOR -- PARK TO HAVE THIS SERVICE, THIS SAFE SERVICE OUT OF MEASURE O FUNDS. I THINK IT WOULD BE GREAT IF WE COULD HAVE THE COUNTY HELP US OUT HERE.

THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER. JUST TO BE CLEAR, WHAT IS IN THE BUDGET ARE THE TWO OFFICER POSITIONS, 121,000 AND 106,000, WHAT IS NOT IN THE BUDGET IS THE AMOUNT THAT WOULD BE NEEDED FOR ONE YEAR OF SAFE AND THAT IS 270,000 FOR THE ANNUAL COST +175 FOR START UP COSTS WHICH INVOLVES PURCHASES OF OTHER EXPENSES AND A VAN. VICE AD HOC ZOLLMAN, ANY COMMENTS ON THAT OR ANY POLICE ITEMS? YES, THE REST OF THE PLACE ITEMS ARE FINE AND I'M WITH INCREASING THEM FOR THE WARMING AND COOLING CENTER BUT WHERE WE LEFT THIS WITH THE BUDGET WAS THAT COUNCILMEMBER MAURER ONE OF THE TWO FULL , OPEN VACANCIES TO BE FILLED AND I AM ARGUING, BASED UPON THE CONTENTS THAT WERE IN THE TRANSMITTAL LETTER ALONG WITH THE POLICE CHIEF, ALONG WITH COMMENTS THAT WE ALREADY HEARD FROM OUR FIRE CHIEF ABOUT THE NUMBER OF COLLEGE THEY HAVE FOR THOSE THAT ARE NOT SHELTERED AND THAT IS A TOPIC THAT IS RANKED HIGH AMONGST OUR COMMUNITY MEMBERS AND WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO WITH THEM? ARE WE GOING TO CONTINUE TO DEPLOY PEOPLE THAT HAVE MANY SKILLS BUT NOT SO MUCH DIRECTLY WITH OUR UNSHELTERED. IT IS NOT JUST ABOUT THE UNSHELTERED, THE MENTAL HEALTH DECOMPENSATION, OUR OWN RESIDENCE. WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IS THAT THE MONEY THAT HAS BEEN SET ASIDE FOR TWO POSITIONS, THAT IT BE AUTHORIZED FOR THE SAFE PROGRAM AND I AM SURE THAT I'M GOING TO GET VOTED DOWN ON THIS BUT IF IT DOES HAPPEN THAT WAY THEN I WOULD BE STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF CREATING AN AD HOC BECAUSE THERE ARE THINGS THAT WE CAN CONTINUE TO EXPLORE OVER THE NEXT YEAR WHICH IS AS WHAT COUNCILMEMBER MAURER INDICATED AND WHAT I HAD MENTIONED EARLIER ABOUT THE POTENTIAL FOR COUNTY MEASURE O FUNDING AND ALSO I THINK THE CHIEF REFERENCED IT, THAT OUR SONOMA COUNTY LEASE AS A WHOLE ARE LOOKING FOR WAYS TO FIND EVERYTHING IN THE WEST COUNTY, ALONG WITH GETTING MONEY FROM OUR HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS, ET CETERA. I THINK THAT EXPLORING THOSE PARTICULAR FUNDING STREAMS, SO THAT NEXT YEAR WE WILL BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO HAVE DATA TO SAY WHETHER WE NEED TO CONTINUE TO ALLOCATE MONEY FOR POLICE WHO ARE IN THE COMMUNITY TO DEAL WITH SERIOUS VIOLENT CRIMES OR WHETHER WE NEED TO CONTINUE FUNDING THAT PARTICULAR STRUCTURE, WHICH ALSO ENCOMPASSES THE FACT THAT I THINK ARE POLICE CHIEF WOULD AGREE THAT EVEN IF WE FULLY FUND ALL OF THESE POSITIONS HE CANNOT GUARANTEE THAT THERE WILL NOT BE OVER TIME, RIGHT? HE SHAKING HIS HEAD, NO, HE CANNOT GUARANTEE THERE WILL NOT BE OVERTIME BUT IF WE DEPLOY THE RIGHT LEVEL OF PEOPLE TO WHAT IS NEEDED IN THE COMMUNITY, MAYBE WE WILL NOT NEED AS MANY LAW OFFICERS TO RESPOND TO SITUATIONS THAT THEY DO NOT EVEN REALLY WANT TO RESPOND TO BUT HALF TO RESPOND TO AND WE CAN LET MENTAL HEALTH CLINICIANS AT A MUCH LOWER RATE, COME IN AND TAKE CARE OF THOSE ISSUES. AT SOME ARGUMENTS.

THANK YOU, VERY MUCH. COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS ? THAT AFTER INITIAL COMMENTS I THINK WE NEED TO ASK HER POLICE CHIEF TO WEIGH IN TOO. COMMENTS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS? SORRY, COUNCILMEMBER HINTON? SO, ARE POLICE CHIEF, IF YOU COULD WEIGH IN ON THE QUESTION OF OFFICERS AND/OR THE SAFE PROGRAM. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU, ARE THESE POSITIONS, THEY POSITIONS THAT

HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL THAT ARE VACANT CURRENTLY?

THEY WERE APPROVED IN LAST YEAR'S BUDGET THAT DUE TO ATTRITION, PEOPLE LEAVING THE DEPARTMENT, THEY HAVE BEEN VACANT AND HAVE REMAINED VACANT.

THANK YOU, GO AHEAD.

I LOVE THE IDEA OF A SAFE TEAM, DO NOT GET ME WRONG. I FULLY SUPPORTED AND I WOULD LOVE TO HAVE IT AS A TOOL. I THINK IT WOULD SERVE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT WELL. IT WOULD PROVIDE A TEAM OF PEOPLE WITH A HIGHER LEVEL OF TRAINING AND EXPERTISE TO DEAL WITH SOME OF OUR MOST VULNERABLE AND IT WOULD REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF IMPACTS ON THE POLICE AND ALLOW US TO FOCUS ON MORE TRADITIONAL POLICING ASPECTS, INCLUDING TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT, BEING VISIBLE, PATROLLING THE PARKS, PATROLLING THE NEIGHBORHOOD MORE. OUR AMOUNT OF TIME THAT WE ARE SPENDING ON THE HOMELESS IS SIGNIFICANT. AND MANY OF THOSE PEOPLE AS WE KNOW SUFFER FROM MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES AS WELL. THE OFFICERS TELL ME IT IS APPROXIMATELY 50% OF THEIR TIME AND IT MIGHT BE MORE. I DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY TO QUANTIFY THAT RIGHT NOW, THAT SAID THESE MODELS WERE NEVER DESIGNED TO SUPPLEMENT POLICE STAFFING, IT TAKES A CERTAIN NUMBER OF POLICE OFFICERS AND DISPATCHERS TO STOP AN OPERATION 24/7 AND TO PROVIDE A LEVEL OF SAFETY FOR THE COMMUNITY, THE OFFICERS AND FOR THE PEOPLE WHO MAY BE GOING THROUGH CRISIS AND THERE WILL BE TIMES EVEN WITH THE SAFE TEAM WHERE THEY WILL HELP MAKE A DETERMINATION ALONG WITH US WHETHER WE NEED TO RESPOND. A LOT OF THE ROUTINE TYPE OF SITUATIONS WE WILL NOT HAVE TO RESPOND WITH THEM BUT RIGHT NOW, IN EVALUATING WHERE WE ARE AT AS A POLICE DEPARTMENT, THE IMPACTS BEING DOWN IN THESE POSITIONS IS HAVING ON WORKLOADS ON BOTH DISPATCH AND POLICE, EVERYBODY IS HAVING TO ABSORB THE WORKLOAD, THE AMOUNT OF OVERTIME THAT IS HAVING TO BE EXPENDED TO FILL SHIFTS AND TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE STAFFING AND SAFETY TO THE COMMUNITY, MY PRIORITIES TO STAFF THOSE TWO POSITIONS. THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE OPTION AS WELL. VICE MAYOR MENTIONED THE FORMATION OF A AD HOC COMMITTEE, REGARDLESS OF WHICH DIRECTION WE GO I THINK WE SHOULD FORM A AD HOC COMMITTEE AND EXPLORE FUNDING OPTIONS, AS WAS MENTIONED EARLIER TODAY, COUNTY MEASURE O FUNDS MAY BE AVAILABLE TO US AND LIKELY COULD BE USED TOWARD THAT BUT I WILL SHARE WITH YOU, IN A CONVERSATION I HAD THE -- POLICE CHIEF A FEW WEEKS AGO THAT THEIR SHARE OF THE MEASURE O FUNDS ONLY ABOUT \$100,000 AND THEY CANNOT PARTICIPATE WITHOUT THE FUNDS BUT IT WILL NOT FUND THE ENTIRE PROGRAM BUT AS THE VICE MAYOR ALSO ALLUDED TO, SHERIFF INGRAM HAS HAD CONVERSATIONS WITH THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND HAS EXPRESSED INTEREST TO PROVIDE A SAFE MODEL TEAM TO THE ENTIRE WEST COUNTY BECAUSE OTHER THAN SEBASTOPOL, THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ENTIRE WEST COUNTY AND THERE COULD BE A JOINT VENTURE WHERE WE RECEIVE THE BENEFIT OF HAVING A SAFE TEAM BUT SHARE THE COST WITH THE COUNTY IN CONJUNCTION WITH SOME OTHER FUNDS AND WE CAN EXPLORE OTHER FUNDING OPTIONS TO GRANTS AND WHATNOT.

OKAY. THANK YOU. COMMENT ON THE POLICE BUDGET IN GENERAL? OR THE SPECIFIC TOPIC OF THE SAFE PROGRAM FROM COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR COUNCIL MEMBER McLEWIS? COUNCIL OF HER HINTON GO AHEAD.

I'M NOT WILLING TO FORFEIT THE TWO POSITIONS IN OUR POLICE DEPARTMENT , THAT IS THE BOTTOM LINE. I KNOW IT IS IMPORTANT THAT WE HAVE A FULL STAFF, FOR SO MANY REASONS. AND HAVING WORKED, MYSELF, WITH FOLKS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS, I HAVE PERSONALLY BEEN IN A SITUATION WHERE ALL OF A SUDDEN YOU THINK YOU HAVE IT HANDLED AND THEN ALL THE SUDDEN IT IS A LITTLE OUT OF HAND. I MEAN I THINK PROGRAMS LIKE THIS HAVE TO WORK WITH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BECAUSE YOU JUST DO NOT KNOW WHAT WILL HAPPEN SOMETIMES. AS FAR AS AN AD HOC GOES MY FIRST INITIAL WAS THAT WE HAVE SO MUCH GOING ON, IS NOW THE TIME TO OPEN UP A AD HOC FOR THIS AS WELL? I NEVER WANT TO MISS OUT ON FUNDING BUT I HESITATE TO OPEN AN AD HOC TONIGHT WHEN WE ARE SURE TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THIS AND MAYBE THAT IS THE TIME TO OPEN THE AD HOC. BUT I AM WILLING TO GO WITH THE WILL OF THE COUNCIL ON THAT.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

IT WOULD BE NO SURPRISE THAT I'M NOT WILLING TO FORGO THE POSITIONS. I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT FOR US TO BE PROPERLY STAFFED. I KNOW THE IMPACT IT HAS ON THE STAFF, THE MORALE AND PERSONALLY, THE CHIEF KNOWS, I HAD A SITUATION ON THE TRAIL THIS WEEKEND THAT FRANKLY FRIGHTENED ME TO THE POINT WHERE I WENT TO THE POLICE AND REALIZED I ACTUALLY COULD'VE BEEN, IT COULD'VE BEEN A LOT WORSE. THAT MAYBE THINK LONG AND HARD ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON WITH OUR POLICE DEPARTMENT AND WHETHER WE HAVE ENOUGH PEOPLE, IT WAS AN UNFORTUNATE SITUATION THAT I DON'T WANT TO THINK ABOUT, SO, NO, I WILL NOT, I AM IN SUPPORT OF KEEPING THE POSITIONS HAVING WORKED IN HEALTHCARE AND WITH ADDICTS AND HOMELESS AND EVERYTHING. I UNDERSTAND THE NEED FOR THE MENTAL HEALTH AND FOR THE TEAM BUT I BELIEVE WE NEED TO DO IT RIGHT. I AM NOT SURE ABOUT SUPPORTING AN AD HOC TONIGHT SIMPLY BECAUSE WE DO HAVE SO MUCH GOING ON AND WE HAVE ANOTHER REQUEST FOR ANOTHER AD HOC I BELIEVE THAT IS OUT THERE BUT I DO BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD EXPLORE FINDING FUNDS AND HAVING THE HIGHEST PERCENTAGE IN THE COUNTY OF HOUSING THE UNHOUSED, I CANNOT BELIEVE A LOT OF PEOPLE KNOCKING ON OUR DOOR OFFERING TO HELP. I THINK THE COUNTY AND EVERYBODY ELSE SHOULD BE HELPING GIVING THE AMOUNT THAT OUR COMMUNITY DOES FOR THE UNHOUSED ALREADY. THAT IS WHERE I AM AT WITH THAT. I DON'T KNOW IF WE NEED TO ADDRESS ALL THESE OTHER THINGS.

IS THERE ANYTHING THAT YOU HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT? OR ANYTHING YOU WANT TO WEIGH IN ON IN THE LIST HERE?

I WILL GO WITH WHATEVER THE CHIEF RECOMMENDS. AND I SUPPORT KEEPING THESE TWO POSITIONS AND I HOPE WE CAN FIND STAFF TO FILL THEM.

OKAY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I WILL WEIGH IN ON THESE ITEMS. I DO HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT THE EEOC ITEM, IS THAT AN AMOUNT THAT WE ARE BEING REQUESTED TO FUNDS NOW? THE 20,000 NEEDED FOR THE EEOC, NOT A PLACEHOLDER BUT AN AMOUNT THAT NEEDS TO BE ALLOCATED FROM THE STAFF'S PERSPECTIVE? OKAY. I AM IN SUPPORT OF ALL OF THESE

ITEMS, I AM SADDENED TO SEE THAT WE NEED MORE MONEY FOR RV TOWING, THAT MAKES ME VERY SAD BUT I UNDERSTAND THAT IS REAL. IN TERMS OF THE 10,000 FOR THE WARMING AND COOLING CENTER BUDGET, I WOULD SUPPORT THAT. ESPECIALLY OVERSEEN BY OUR POLICE CHIEF WHO HAS BEEN WORKING VERY EFFECTIVELY WITH THE CONTRACTOR WHO THE CITY MADE ARRANGEMENTS WITH TO PROVIDE WARMING AND COOLING CENTER SERVICES. I THINK THAT ALSO SPEAKS EFFECTIVELY TO THE COUNTY, IF WE ALLOCATE, SAY ALLOCATED \$10,000 LAST YEAR, IT WILL BE EASIER TO ASK THE COUNTY FOR FUNDING, LINDA HAWKINS NUMBER FUNDS, IF WE HAVE DONE OUR PART TO TRY TO ALLOCATE SOME FUNDS. GO AHEAD? PLEASE.

REGARDING THE FUNDING, I UNDERSTAND THE \$10,000, IT CAN BE ENOUGH TO EAT QUICKLY. [INAUDIBLE] I'M OPTIMISTIC IF IT IS MANAGED CORRECTLY WE DON'T HAVE A STREAM OF BAD WEATHER THAT WE CAN REVISIT IT MIDYEAR.

THANK YOU. AND WE WILL MAKE A REQUEST OF LINDA HAWKINS WHO IS OPEN TO THAT REQUEST. COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

THAT IS ONE THING HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT, LASTER THE COUNTY FUNDED THE 10,000, ARE YOU SAYING YOU'RE ASKING THEM AGAIN THIS YEAR? ARE YOU CONFIDENT THAT THEY WILL? DID I MISS SOMETHING?

LAST YEAR THE CITY FUNDED I THINK \$10,000 AND SUPERVISOR HOPKINS ALSO RESPONDED TO OUR REQUEST AND GRANTED \$10,000. THERE IS 4500 REMAINING AND THE PLAN IS TO HOPEFULLY REQUEST FUNDING FROM THE GENERAL FUND. BUT ALSO TO FOLLOW UP WITH LINDA HOPKINS TO REQUEST \$10,000 FROM HER ONCE AGAIN. SHE HAS EXPRESSED OPENNESS TO THE REQUEST BUT IT IS TOT FUNDS AND IT DEPENDS ON THE OTHER REQUEST THAT SHE HAS. BUT SO FAR SHE HAS SAID I WILL GIVE IT TO YOU.

I SEE. OKAY.

THOSE ARE THE ITEMS, IN TERMS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE. I THINK I AM'S IN SUPPORT OF A AD HOC BUT I THINK THAT WILL DEPEND ON WHETHER WE HAVE TWO COUNCILMEMBERS WHO ARE WILLING TO PUT THE TIME IN.

I HAVE A RECOMMENDATION THAT WE TAKE THOSE IDEAS FOR THE AD HOC AT THE END OF THIS FULL PACKET, THERE IS SUGGESTIONS FOR AD HOC , NEXT STEPS AND I THINK, LET'S TAKE THAT OUT OF TONIGHT'S DISCUSSION, THE FOLLOW-UP AND THE AD HOC, LET'S TAKE IT OUT AND GET THROUGH THE BUDGET , GET THROUGH THE SALES TAX. BECAUSE OF THE TIMING. IT IS ALMOST --

WE CAN CERTAINLY LEAVE THE AD HOC UNTIL LATER IN THIS DISCUSSION. I THINK WE CAN COME BACK TO THE AD HOC. OKAY. ON THE POLICE BUDGET, THEY NEED TO GO THROUGH EACH ONE. HUNDRED 20,830 REDUCTION, THUMBS UP? 20,000 INCREASE TO FUND THE EEOC? THUMBS UP, THUMBS DOWN. 4465 TO SHIFT THE WARMING CENTER FUNDS TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT? GOT IT. 11,500 TO INCREASE WITH THE SHIFT TO REDUCE CONTRACT FOR TRAFFIC AND ENGINEERING TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, THUMBS UP? OKAY. \$8000 INCREASE TO THE RECREATIONAL VEHICLES TOWING? OKAY. WHAT IS NOT HERE WHICH WOULD LIKE TO SEE A THUMBS UP FOR, BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN A SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION OR THUMBS DOWN, THE ALLOCATION OF 121,000 AND 106,000 FOR THE OFFICER POSITIONS, NO CHANGE IN THE ALLOCATION OF THOSE FUNDS, THUMBS UP OR THUMBS

DOWN? OKAY. 10,000, WARMING AND COOLING CENTER? FOUR THUMBS UP, ONE THUMBS DOWN AND THEN THE AD HOC COMMITTEE , I THINK WE CAN DISCUSS WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE OTHER AD HOC COMMITTEE.

IF THAT IS THE CASE, WE'RE GOING TO DISCUSS THE AD HOC WHEN WE GET TO THE PUBLIC WORKS? BECAUSE THAT INVOLVES THE SPECIFIC ENTITY WE ARE TALKING ABOUT.

OKAY, LET'S TALK ABOUT THE AD HOC, IS THERE A GENERAL , WHO WOULD LIKE TO BE ON A AD HOC FOR SAFE? OKAY. WE CANNOT ADD A AD HOC BECAUSE WE NEED TWO PEOPLE. IS THERE A ROLE FOR AN INDIVIDUAL COUNCILMEMBER AND INQUIRING INTO THE SAFE POGROM? NO? IS THERE A ROLE FOR AN INDIVIDUAL COUNCILMEMBER IN PURSUING AN INTEREST REGARDING THE SAFE PROGRAM?

WE DID IT FOR THE LIBRARY.

AND WORKING WITH THE CHIEF?

IT WAS A LIBRARY AD HOC THAT WAS CREATED IN THE COUNCIL GAVE DIRECTION FOR ONE OF US TO APPEAR , SO THERE IS PRECEDENT FOR JUST ONE COUNCILMEMBER DOING AN AD HOC.

SO, GIVEN TIMING AND OTHER TOPICS WE NEED TO COVER I THINK, LET'S LEAVE IT IN VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN'S COURT TO BRING FORWARD AN ITEM IF HE SO CHOOSES TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT WOULD PROVIDE A ROLE FOR THEM TO PURCHASE PAID IN PURSUIT OF A SAFE PROGRAM.

HOW IS THAT DIFFERENT THAN ALL THE WORK WE HAVE DONE? THE POLICE CHIEF HAS ALREADY WRITTEN A MEMO, WHAT ELSE DO I NEED TO BRING?

SO MAYBE THERE'S NOTHING MORE TO BE DONE? I DON'T KNOW.

GREAT.

I DON'T KNOW I'M JUST SAYING THERE'S NO SUPPORT FOR AN AD HOC TONIGHT BUT YOU CAN SEE ON THE COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL WITH A PROPOSAL OF SOME KIND.

SO, TWO POINTS, MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THERE WILL BE A PRESENTATION AT AN UPCOMING MEETING MOBILE SUPPORT TEAM WHICH IS ESSENTIALLY THEIR VERSION OF A SAFE TEEN AND THAT THE INFORMATION I BE INTERESTING FOR THIS CONVERSATION. THE SECOND IS THAT IF WE DO SOME KIND OF MINI-GOALSETTING PROCESS IN A MONTH OR TWO THAT IN TERMS OF POLICE AND STAFF SUPPORT AND WHAT YOU WOULD WANT, THAT WOULD BE ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE THE POSSIBILITY OF DOING THIS WORK ALONG WITH ANY OTHER WORK.

THANK YOU. AND I WILL OFFER TO BE ON AN AD HOC WITH VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN TO INQUIRE INTO THE SAFE PROGRAM AND HE AND I WILL PARTNER TO BRING A REPORT BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT MIGHT PROPOSE THAT AND THE CITY COUNCIL CAN THEN MAKE A DECISION, IS THAT ACCEPTABLE? TO THE CITY COUNCIL. DON'T HAVE TO APPROVE AN AD HOC I AM JUST SAYING WE WILL BRING IT BACK. I GUESS I DON'T NEED CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL. MARY GIRLIE?

YOU ARE CORRECT, IF YOU ARE NOT CREATING TONIGHT THEN YOU DON'T NEED COUNCIL APPROVAL.

YES. WE ARE JUST INFORMING THE CITY COUNCIL THAT VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN AND I ARE CONSIDERING THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN AD HOC TO INQUIRE INTO THE SAFE PROGRAM AND IF WE DECIDE TO DO THAT WE WILL DECIDE TO DO IT AND BRING IT BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL, AND THAT CLOSE THE ISSUE PROPERLY?

YES. DO YOU NEED ANYTHING ELSE FROM US ON POLICE OR CAN WE MOVE ON TO PUBLIC WORKS?

OKAY.

PUBLIC WORKS. ALL RIGHT, THIS IS A BIG TOPIC. WE HAVE PUBLIC WORKS ON THE BOARD, WE HAVE DANTE READY TO BE GRILLED. I AM GOING TO START, AND WE HAVE NOT ADDED ANYTHING TO THE PUBLIC WORKS BUDGET, THERE ARE NO ADDITIONAL ASKS, IS THAT RIGHT? OKAY. STARTING WITH THE BUDGET COMMITTEE, COMMENTS ON THE PUBLIC WORKS PROPOSAL?

YES. I SUPPORT THE PUBLIC WORKS BUDGET.

OKAY. VICE MAYOR?

I DO TOO, THE INITIAL PART OF THE SCREEN WE'RE LOOKING AT, I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH ANY OF THAT. BECAUSE IT IS JUST THAT SCREEN BUT WHEN WE MOVED DOWN TO THE SPECIFIC ENTITIES WE DEFINITELY DIFFER.

OKAY. COMMENTS FROM COUNCILMEMBER HINTON? GO AHEAD.

SURE. I SUPPORT MOST OF IT TONIGHT BUT I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF REPLACING THE LANDSCAPING FOR \$20,000 AT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. THAT IS THE THING THAT WOULD BE NICE TO DO BUT I CANNOT SUPPORT THAT. I ACTUALLY LIKE THE LITTLE REFLECTIVE POLES AND I COMMENTED ON THEM BUT I WILL NOT SUPPORT THAT AT THE TUNE OF \$15,000. I JUST DON'T FEEL LIKE WE HAVE THAT IN THE BUDGET TO SUPPORT THOSE ALL AROUND TOWN AND I'M NOT SURE THEY ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT SAFETY MEASURES IF WE HAD TO MAKE CHOICES.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS .

WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IS, I HAVE BEEN TRYING TO KEEP A TALLY OF WHERE WE ARE AT IT I'M JUST WONDERING, ANNA, IF YOU COULD GIVE US AN IDEA OF SOME OF THE THINGS WE HAVE NOT APPROVED HERE AND WHERE WE ARE AT, AS FAR AS THAT NUMBER, I DON'T KNOW IF MY NUMBER IS --

IF YOU NEED A FEW MINUTES WE CAN CONTINUE OUR DISCUSSION.

I'M ASKING BECAUSE WE'RE LOOKING AT 64,000 REDUCTION IN MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES AND SUCH TO THE COMMUNITY, I PERSONALLY, IF WE HAVE EXTRA MONEY HERE, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT PUT BACK IN FOR THE ITEMS THAT ARE REDUCTIONS BECAUSE I THINK FOR OUR COMMUNITY, WE ALREADY TALK ABOUT ISSUES THAT WE HAVE WITH OUR WALKWAYS AND DIVES AND OUR ROADS AND I WROTE DOWN THAT DANTE HAD SAID WE ARE TALKING ABOUT ASPHALT, A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN CUT. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE WHERE WE ARE AT THE POSITIVE.

SO, ANNA, WHERE ARE WE IN TERMS OF THE NET DEFICIT AT THIS POINT? KEEPING IN MIND FOR ALL OF US THAT WE ARE IN A DEFICIT.

IT IS STILL A DEFICIT BUT IT IS NOW IT 69758 SIX.

AND IT WAS ?

669 BEFORE AND NOW IT IS 697.

I'M SORRY WHAT WAS IT BEFORE?

BEFORE IT WAS IN THE BUDGET , IT WAS 670, ROUNDING.

LET'S NOT AROUND.

69.18 SIX AND RIGHT NOW IT IS 697, 586.

THE DIFFERENCES?

WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IT WENT UP?

YOU HAVE REDUCTION IN CITY MANAGEMENT, INCREASE IN STAFFING STUDY , YOU HAVE MULTIPLE THINGS GOING ON.

WE ADDED A 30,000, REMEMBER THE ADDITIONAL ASKS?

OKAY. THAT WAS NOT CLEAR TO ME.

WE HAVE NOT GAINED ANY MONEY. OKAY.

I AM SORRY, THAT WASN'T CLEAR TO ME.

MY TALLY HAS THE ADDED 5400 WHICH IS ALL THE ADDITIONAL ITEMS HE HAD AND THE REDUCTION OF 27,000 , 4000, 20,000 AND 3000 FOR THE TRAINING.

YOUR NUMBERS ARE ALIGNED WITH WHAT ANA KWONG HAS SAID?

WE TOOK 50 K OUT FOR MONITORING SERVICE RIGHT THERE.

THAT WAS THE GENERAL FUND AND THE 22 WAS OUT OF THE SPECIAL HOUSING FUNDS.

I SEE. I AM GLAD I ASKED.

SO, COMMENTS ON THESE ITEMS, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

LET'S SEE HERE. OH, DID YOU HAVE SOME THING?

I HAVE TO ADD, IF WE TOOK AWAY 35,000 AND I WOULD BE FOR PUTTING THAT BACK UP ABOVE INTO MAINTENANCE, JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT.

I WAS GOING TO SAY THAT . RIGHT NOW IN MY MIND REPLACING THE LANDSCAPING IN THE REFLECTIVE POLES, I WOULD RATHER SEE THAT GO BACK TO MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES, IF THAT IS SOMETHING IS THE WILL OF THE COUNCIL. OTHER THAN THAT, THOSE ARE THE TWO THINGS I AM NONSUPPORTIVE BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT DARN CHAIN-LINK FENCE THAT LOOKS LIKE IT IS FROM THE 70s REPLACED. IN IVES PARK.

COMMENTS FROM DANTE?

SORRY THE LIGHT DOESN'T WORK GREAT I APOLOGIZE.

I KNOW.

I COULD MAKE A SUGGESTION , THE 20,000, THERE IS NO INTEREST IN REPLACING THE LANDSCAPING AT THIS TIME, TURNING THE LAWN INTO A DIFFERENT KIND OF LANDSCAPING, IF WE REDUCE THAT AND I DO BELIEVE THAT I COULD DO A YEAR OR TWO IMPLEMENTATION OF REFLECTIVE SIGN POLES AND MAKE A NOTICEABLE DIFFERENCE FOR 5000 AND WE CAN DO A BIG CHUNK OF THE CITY, THERE IS 35,000 RIGHT THERE. SO, ELIMINATE REPLACING THE LANDSCAPE OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND REDUCE THE 15,000 TO FIVE.

OKAY, THAT IS 30,000.

30 RIGHT THERE. SORRY.

30,000. AND I'M SORRY, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS, DID YOU FINISH YOUR COMMENTS?

YES.

OKAY. I AM VERY MUCH IN FAVOR OF WHAT DANTE HAS PROPOSED. I WOULD ASK ON THE LANDSCAPING OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, WHAT WAS THE MOTIVATION?

MAY ADDRESS THAT?

YES.

WAS TO REMOVE THE GRASS TO PUT IN DROUGHT TOLERANT LANDSCAPING BECAUSE THE GRASS TAKES UP A LOT OF WATER AND THAT WAS THE IDEA.

HOW MUCH IS THE COST TO WATER THE LAWN ?

A LOT.

BECAUSE OF THE COST MORE THAN \$10,000 TO WATER THE LAWN THEN MAYBE IT IS A SHORT-TERM/LONG-TERM ISSUE. WHAT WOULD BE THE COST. WHAT SAVINGS WOULD WE GET?

SAVINGS AGAIN THE VOLUME CHARGE WHICH WOULD BE ABOUT \$1000 PER YEAR.

OKAY. THERE IS ALSO THE CLIMATE ACTION PIECE BUT I WOULD BE IN SUPPORT OF ALL OF THE ITEMS UNDER THE BUDGET COMMITTEE REQUESTS I SUPPORT THE WOODLEY PARK FENCING, 20,000, I WOULD SHIFT THE 20,000 IN LANDSCAPING, I AM SORRY, DANTE, DO YOU HAVE A SUGGESTION FOR A REDUCED AMOUNT? I DON'T THINK SO, JUST LEAVE IT ALONE?

IS A PROJECT AS A WHOLE AND IT CANNOT BE , WELL I GUESS WE COULD DO IT IN PIECES AND PARTS OF THE LAWN BUT IT DOESN'T REALLY MAKE SENSE TO DO IT THAT WAY.

IF I CAN ADD SOMETHING , THERE IS GOING TO BE NEW LEGISLATION THAT IS COMING OUT FROM THE STATE, PROBABLY EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1st OF 2027 IT SAYS THAT NON-FUNCTIONAL TURF, WHAT THEY CALL IT, WILL HAVE TO BE REPLACED WITH A DROUGHT TOLERANT BUT THAT IS IN 2027.

OKAY. I AM IN SUPPORT OF LEAVING THE LIBBY FENCE UP, 20,000 AS IT HAS BEEN PROPOSED, SHIFTING TO THE 20,000 FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT LANDSCAPING, SORRY, POLICE CHIEF, UP TO INSTEAD THE MAINTENANCE SERVICES AND SUPPLIES AND REDUCING THE REFLECTIVE SIGN POLES TO 5000 HAS BEEN PROPOSED WHICH WOULD MOVE THE BALANCE OF 10,000 UP TO MAINTENANCE SERVICES SUPPLIES, THAT WOULD BE MY PROPOSAL, IS EVERYBODY IN FAVOR OF THAT?

IS THAT BECAUSE WE HAVE TWO THERE THAT ARE REDUCED, I AM JUST WONDERING, DOES IT MAKE SENSE FOR US TO PUT IT ALL IN THAT ONE CATEGORY? I AM JUST CURIOUS.

SUPPLIES AND SERVICES IS THE MOST FLEXIBLE, TRY TO IDENTIFY CONTRACT SERVICES FOR SPECIFIC, ANNUAL, REOCCURRING MAINTENANCE. SO, THIS GIVES MORE FLEXIBILITY. BUT FOR ACCOUNTING PURPOSES SUPPLIES AND SERVICES MAKES NO SENSE.

OKAY, THAT WOULD INCREASE THE NUMBER FROM 56,000 86,000.

IT WOULD DECREASE IT.

IT WOULD DECREASE THE REDUCTION. THANK YOU, SO MUCH.

YES, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER?

I AM WONDERING IF WE CAN DO SOMETHING WITH THE FENCING AT IVES PARK ? WAS THERE A CONFLICT WITH THE BIGGER PLAN AND WHY CAN'T WE GET THE FENCE REMOVED?

THERE IS AN IVES PARK MASTER PLAN THAT INCLUDES A LOT OF WATERWAY, A DRAMATIC PLAN IS PUT TOGETHER YEARS AGO IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES IN THE FUTURE. THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE THAT ARE VERY PASSIONATE ABOUT MOVING THE CREEK AND OPENING ACCESS TO THE CREEK AND I BELIEVE THAT CAN BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE BIGGER PLAN. IN THE CURRENT CONFIGURATION IT WILL NOT ALLOW FOR IT BECAUSE THEIR SHARP EDGES AND FALL AREAS THAT WILL REPRESENT A LIABILITY TO THE CITY. CAN WE DO FENCING? IT IS EXPENSIVE.

I'LL INTERJECT THAT THIS IS A COMP LOCATED ISSUE.

I DON'T HAVE AN ESTIMATE BUT YOU DO A CIRCLE AROUND THE POND, JUST THE ONE CIRCLE FROM THE RESTROOM AREAS, I WOULD ESTIMATE IT AT \$50-\$60,000 TO REPLACE THAT.

WE NEED TO FIND A DONOR.

LET'S GO THROUGH TWO THUMBS UP, THUMBS DOWN. 218 REDUCTION, THUMBS UP. 72,000 REDUCTION WITH SHIFT OF THE LABOR TO FOCUS ON WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS, THUMBS UP. 66,000 IN REIMBURSEMENT FROM GRANDSON CITIES BUILDING RESERVE FUND FOR PROJECTS. THUMBS UP. 64,000 REDUCTION MAINTENANCE RELATED CONTRACTS, THUMBS UP. \$56,000 REDUCTION, NOT 56 BUT \$26,000 REDUCTION MAINTENANCE SERVICES AND SUPPLIES. \$52,000 INCREASE IN CONTRACT SERVICES WITH SHIFT OF WEST COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICES CONTRACT FOR PUBLIC WORKS. 20,000 ADDITION FOR LIBBY PARK FENCING MATERIALS. NEXT ON THE LANDSCAPING FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, IS EVERYBODY THUMBS UP ON NO POLICE DEPARTMENT LANDSCAPE FUNDING? OKAY. THE ZERO ADDITION FOR REPLACING LANDSCAPING OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, EVERYBODY'S AN AGREEMENT? THEN THE ADDITION FOR REFLECTIVE SCIENCE, \$5000 ADDITION, THUMBS UP? OKAY. ALL RIGHT. NOW WE ARE AT THE SENIOR CENTER, COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER AND IVES POOL. DANTE, WE HOPE YOU'LL STICK AROUND FOR THIS.

I AM HERE.

OKAY. THIS ITEM INCLUDES A REDUCTION IN THE SENIOR CENTER AMOUNT TO ZERO, RIGHT? THIS WAS YOUR OUTER OPERATIONS FOR THE SENIOR CENTER?

ZERO SUPPORT FOR THEIR OPERATIONS, RESOLVE ALLOCATIONS FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE FACILITY, ALTHOUGH IT HAS BEEN REDUCED.

OKAY.

I DO HAVE A COMMENT ON THAT BEING THE COUNSELEES ONTO THE SENIOR CENTER. WHILE THERE WERE SOME HITS AND MISSES ABOUT APPROACHING THIS I THINK WE HAVE LEARNED OUR WAY TO APPROACH NONPROFITS, ULTIMATELY THEIR BOARD SAID THEY WERE FINE WITH THIS BUT I JUST WANT TO MAKE A SPECIAL NOTE THAT IT IS LIKE IF THEY ARE WILLING TO TAKE A HIT THEN I AM EXPECTING ALL OTHER ENTITIES TO TAKE A HIT, ESPECIALLY BECAUSE THE SENIOR CENTER IS A SELF-SUSTAINING, VERSUS THE OTHERS THAT ARE COMING UP THAT ARE STILL NOT SELF-SUSTAINING, THOSE ARE MY COMMENTS ON THAT.

THANK YOU AND THANK YOU VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN, YOU'RE MY DID MANY TO TURN TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE FOR COMMENTS ON THE SIDE. I SUPPORT ALL OF THESE.

AND I DO NOT. THE COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER, GIVEN WHAT I JUST SAID, IT IS NOW EQUITY BECAUSE I WILL STATE THIS PUBLICLY AND I'VE STATED A NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE BUDGET COMMITTEE, THE FACT THAT THERE IS A RUMOR FLOATING AROUND IN THE COMMUNITY THAT SOMEHOW THIS NONPROFIT IS SUPPOSED TO BE GIVEN MORE DEFERENCE BECAUSE IT USED TO BE PART OF PARKS AND REC AND FOR YEARS WE HAVE GIVEN THEM UPWARDS OF \$350,000 A YEAR TO MAKE IT SELF-SUSTAINING AND IT JUST SEEMS TO BE GOING ON AND ON AND ON AND IT WAS NOT UNTIL RECENTLY, WHERE IT WAS MORE OF A DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS ITEM THAT ALL OF A SUDDEN NOW THEY HAVE INCREASED THEIR PROGRAM AND I'M DEFINITELY NOT IN FAVOR OF GIVING THEM MORE SIX MONTHS WORTH OF FUNDING IN

ORDER TO BECOME SUSTAINABLE WHEN ALL OF HER OTHER NONPROFITS ARE EXPECTED TO BE SELF-SUSTAINING, INCLUDING THE POOL, ET CETERA. I KNOW THIS RUBS MY FELLOW COLLEAGUES DIFFERENTLY BECAUSE THEY BE THERE BEEN ATTACHED TO THAT PARTICULAR ENTITY IN ONE WAY, SHAPE OR ANOTHER BUT FOR ME, PARITY MEANS PARITY.

THANK YOU, VICE MAYOR. COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR McLEWIS?

OKAY. SO, I GUESS I'VE BEEN AROUND A LITTLE LONGER AND I REMEMBER WHEN THE SENIOR CENTER CAME TO US AND THEY WERE DESPERATE AND THEY WERE IN NOT A GREAT FINANCIAL SITUATION AND WE GAVE THEM TIME TO GET BACK ON THEIR FEET. THEY GET A LOT OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECAUSE OF MEALS ON WHEELS AND THEIR LEGACY STORE IN KITCHEN, THEY BUILT THOSE THINGS UP. IVES POOL HAS BEEN SELF-SUSTAINING PRETTY MUCH FOR YEARS AND THEY HAVE A LOT OF THINGS. AS POINTED OUT WE HAVE GIVEN COMMUNITY CENTER, WHICH I HAVE NEVER WORKED FOR OR BEEN AFFILIATED WITH REALLY EXCEPT TO USE SERVICES, QUITE A BIT OF MONEY OVER THE HISTORY IF YOU LOOK AT THE YEAR-TO-YEAR AMOUNTS, WITH SUPPORT. IT DOES TAKE TIME TO MAKE A BIG CHANGE AND WE SAW THIS WHEN WE VOTED TO NO LONGER HAVE FIREWORKS THAT THE NONPROFITS MADE A LOT OF MONEY OFF OF IN THE CITY AND WE EXTENDED SOME PEOPLE BECAUSE THAT WAS A HUGE PART OF THEIR BUDGET. SO, I AM IN SUPPORT OF THE RECOMMENDATION TONIGHT BUT WITH THE OPTION TO CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THEM PAST THE FIRST SIX MONTHS AND LOOK AT IT FOR THE MIDYEAR BUDGET REVIEW AS WE ARE WITH OTHER OPTIONS. I AM NOT WILLING TO PULL THE LEGS OUT FROM UNDER THE COMMUNITY CENTER WHEN WE HAVE SUPPORTED THEM FOR VARIOUS REASONS AND THEY SERVE A LOT OF PEOPLE IN OUR COMMUNITY. THAT IS WHERE I FALL TONIGHT AND I FIND APPROVING IN SIX MONTHS WITH AN OPTION TO LOOK AT AND HEAR FROM THE BOARD IF THEY NEED ANOTHER SIX MONTHS. IT IS A DIFFICULT POSITION TO BE IN FOR ALL OF US. THAT IS WHERE I WEIGH IN TONIGHT.

THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS.

SO, HAVING SPENT FIVE YEARS OF MY LIFE SERVING ON THE COMMUNITY CENTER BOARD, MOSTLY AS THE CHAIR, ALL DURING COVID, AS THE CHAIR, I HAD MANY TOUGH DECISIONS TO MAKE WITH THE BOARD AND WE FOUGHT LIKE HECK TO KEEP THE FUNDING AS TIGHT AS WE COULD SO THAT IT COULD SURVIVE. IT IS PERSONAL, I HAVE SPENT SO MANY HOURS, HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS OF HOURS WITH THAT ORGANIZATION AND I KNOW THE BOARD, THEIR FAMILY TO ME. I AGREE WITH REDUCING THE FUNDING, I REMEMBER WHEN WE RECEIVED THE FUNDING AND THE CHANGE WAS MADE TO HELP SUPPORT OPERATIONALLY. I HAVE SPOKEN WITH THEM DIRECTLY. THEY ARE COMMITTED TO BECOMING SELF-SUSTAINING, THEY ARE ABSOLUTELY COMMITTED. THEY UNDERSTAND THE RAMIFICATIONS IF THEY DO NOT, THEY ARE FULLY AWARE OF THAT, SOME OF THESE PEOPLE OWN A VERY LARGE BUSINESSES IN THIS COMMUNITY AND THEY KNOW HOW TO RUN BUSINESSES, THEY JUST NEED TIME AND I TOO REMEMBER A TIME NOT THAT LONG AGO THAT THE SENIOR CENTER WAS IN DIRE STRAITS AND CAME TO THE COMMUNITY CENTER TO ASK THEM TO HELP RUN BECAUSE THEY WERE IN TROUBLE. I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD CUT THEM OFF AT THE KNEES. IT DOES TAKE TIME AND I ALSO RUN A NONPROFIT, YOU KNOW? SO, I AM IN SUPPORT OF THE REDUCTION BUT

KEEPING THE FUNDING THAT WE HAVE RIGHT NOW AND RE-ASSESSING IN SIX MONTHS. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE WHERE THEY ARE AT. I AM NOT SAYING I WANT TO DO THIS IN PERPETUITY BUT I DO NOT THINK WE SHOULD CUT OUR COMMITTEE MEMBERS OFF AT THE KNEES BECAUSE THEY HAVE FALLEN ON HARD TIMES. COVID WAS VERY HARD, WHEN YOU ARE AN EVENT CENTER AND YOU CANNOT BE OPEN FOR A YEAR BUT THEY HAVE SERVED A LOT OF PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY, I HAVE TAUGHT CLASSES THERE AND MANY PEOPLE DO. I KNOW WE ARE SHORT ON TIME BUT I CANNOT SAY ENOUGH OF WHAT THEY HAVE DONE FOR THE COMMUNITY IN MY OPINION. SO, I SUPPORT WHAT WE HAVE HERE BUT I ALSO THINK THAT WE SHOULD REASSESS AND SEE WHERE WE ARE AT AT THE MIDYEAR. I HAVE A LOT OF FAITH THEY WILL FIGURE THIS OUT BECAUSE I TALKED TO THEM WEEKLY AND THEIR INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SHE IS WORKING SUPER HARD AND I REALLY APPRECIATE THE EFFORT SHE'S MAKING.

THANK YOU. I WILL WEIGH IN ON THESE ITEMS. IT DISTRESSES ME TERRIBLY TO CS REDUCING OUR SUPPORT FOR THESE AMAZING NONPROFITS, ESPECIALLY AT THE SAME TIME WE ARE REDUCING THE PIECES THAT WILL HELP MAKE THEIR SPACES ATTRACTED TO THE COMMUNITY THROUGH OUR REDUCTION AND LANDSCAPING AND MAINTENANCE SUPPORT. AND I KNOW DANTE AND HIS TEAM WILL DO EVERYTHING THEY CAN BUT IT IS DISTRESSING TO SEE THIS HAPPEN AND IT DISTRESSES ME TO SEE US ELIMINATE THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE SENIOR CENTER, EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE DOING WELL AND I AGREE THAT HAVING HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH THEM THAT THEY ARE IN A GOOD PLACE RIGHT NOW, THEY ARE IN A VERY GOOD PLACE. THE COMMUNITY CENTER, I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL HERE. I DO THINK THAT WE NEED TO GIVE THEM SIX MONTHS OF \$58,300 AND I WOULD JOIN MY COLLEAGUES AND AT THE MID-YEAR TO BE VERY OPEN TO CONTINUE TO SUPPORT IF THEY HAVE MADE SUBSTANTIAL STRIDES BUT ARE NOT AT THE POINT WHERE THEY CAN ACTUALLY GO AT IT ALONE AND I WOULD TRUST STAFF TO HELP US INFORM, TO INFORM US ABOUT THE STATUS AND THE PROGRESS THAT THEY HAVE MADE. SO, THAT IS MY PIECE ON THAT, IVES POOL, NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE. WE ALL KNOW THERE WILL BE EXPENSES THERE LATER ON BUT, I SUPPORT ALL OF THESE ITEMS ON THIS LIST, UNLESS THERE'S ADDITIONAL INPUT BY STAFF OR OTHER COMMENTS, YES? DEFINITELY. I'M GOING TO WALK THROUGH THEM AS WE HAVE WITH OTHERS. SENIOR CENTER, \$38,250 REDUCTION WITH ELIMINATION OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT, SADLY, COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER, 76,600 REDUCTION IN SUPPORT FOR GENERAL OPERATION, REMAINING 58,300 TO PROVIDE EXTENSIVE SUPPORT DURING TRANSITION WITH THE CAVEAT, I WOULD ADD, THAT WE HAVE HEARD FROM THE THREE HERE THAT AT THE MID-YEAR WE WILL SERIOUSLY CONSIDER CONTINUE FUNDING IF WE JUDGE THAT IT IS NEEDED. OKAY. I THINK THAT WAS FOUR THUMBS UP, YES, FOUR THUMBS UP. IVES POOL, NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE, OKAY. DOES THAT PROVIDE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO THE STAFF? OKAY. NOW WE ARE AT NON-DEPARTMENTAL. THERE ARE ONLY TWO ITEMS HERE. ONE IS THE SHIFT OF COSTS OF THE CONTRACTS AND ONE IS INCREASING THE TECHNOLOGY FOR REPLACEMENT BUDGET. GOOD WITH BOTH OF THESE.

YES, THIS IS WHERE HE WENT AROUND AND AROUND WHETHER IT SHOULD BE WITHIN THE ACTUAL BUDGET OF EACH DEPARTMENT OR NON-DEPARTMENTAL AND THIS IS WHAT HE DECIDED ON AND I AM DONE WITH IT. ANY COMMENTS FROM COUNCILMEMBER HINTON OR McLEWIS?

I MEAN I HAVE TO TRUST THAT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE HAS VETTED THIS AND IF THEY ARE RECOMMENDING THAT WE NEED TECHNOLOGY AND INCREASED CYBERSECURITY, I KNOW THAT WE DO NEED TO KEEP UP ON THOSE THINGS, I WILL BE IN FAVOR OF FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF TONIGHT AND THE BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

IN THE INTEREST OF TIME, DITTO.

OKAY. I WILL WEIGH IN, I AM IN SUPPORT OF THESE TWO ITEMS, I AM TRUSTING THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO HAVE MADE SURE THESE SHIFTS IN COSTS MADE SENSE AND THE COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY ITEM, WE ARE SUPPORTING. \$134,000 SHIFT OF COSTS FOR CONTRACTS TO DEPARTMENTS, GOT IT. THUMBS UP FROM YOU, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS ON THAT ONE AND \$160,000 525 INCREASE TO ADDRESS NEEDS FOR TECHNOLOGY REPLACEMENT, THUMBS UP FROM EVERYONE AND TO INCREASED CYBERSECURITY. OKAY. WE HAVE GONE THROUGH EACH OF THESE. I KNOW THAT ONE ITEM THAT IS REMAINING IS A REQUEST FOR AN AD HOC, AN ADDITIONAL AD HOC AND IT WAS FOR WHAT PURPOSE? MARY GURLEY CAN YOU HELP ME?

THAT WAS FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING ASSESSMENT.

OKAY. I THINK THAT IS ONE ITEM, LET ME GO TO THE BUDGET OVERALL. WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE WHOLE BUDGET PROCESS WITH OUR THUMBS UP AND THUMBS DOWN, IS ANYBODY FEELING COMPARED TO RE-VISIT ANY ITEMS? I HESITATE TO ASK THAT QUESTION. OKAY, GOOD. GLAD TO HEAR IT. IN TERMS OF OUR PROCESS, MARY GURLEY, WOULD YOU LIKE US TO A FORMAL VOTE ON THE BUDGET? AND THEN GO ON TO THE AD HOC QUESTIONS?

YES, THERE WILL BE THREE SEPARATE MOTIONS.

I AM LOOKING , SO, THERE HAVE BEEN CHANGES HERE. HOW WOULD STAFF PROPOSE WE CAPTURE THESE CHANGES FOR PURPOSES OF MOTION?

SHALL GO THROUGH ALL THE CHANGES?

OH, BOY. NO.

SO, YOU CAN JUST DIRECT STAFF TO BRING BACK THE FINAL BUDGET BASED UPON THE CHANGES DISCUSSED TONIGHT.

SO MOVED.

SECOND.

OKAY, ROLLCALL VOTE, PLEASE.

SO MOVED BY COUNCILMEMBER MAURER AND SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS, TO DIRECT STAFF TO CHANGE THE FY '24 '25 BUDGET AS DISCUSSED AT TONIGHT'S MEETING AND THIS ITEM WILL BE RETURNED AT THE AUGUST 12 SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON? . COUNSELOR NUMBER MAURER. VICE AD HOC ZOLLMAN, MAYOR RICH? MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

THE CREATION OF AN AD HOC TO EXPLORE SAFE , I THINK, EFFECTIVELY WE HAVE LEFT THAT AS, DO NOT SEE SUPPORT TONIGHT FOR AN AD HOC AND I THINK WE'RE LEAVING THAT ALONE, HOW DO WE HANDLE THAT PROCEDURALLY? MARY GURLEY ? DO WE WITHDRAW IT? WHAT DO WE DO?

I AM NOT PLANNING ON WITHDRAWING IT.

YOU NEED TO MAKE A MOTION AND HAVE A SECOND AND VOTE ON IT OR IF THERE IS NO SECOND THE MOTION GOES.

I MOVED TO CREATE AN AD HOC TO WORK ON THE SAFE AND THE FUNDING ISSUES.

AND I WOULD MODIFY THAT BY SAYING WITH THE OBLIGATION OF THE AD HOC OF BEING THE INITIAL OBLIGATION TO COME BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE DEFINITION AND PROPOSAL OF SCOPE AND TIMING FOR THE AD HOC. AND I SECOND THE MOTION. I THINK NOW WE GO FOR A VOTE. SO MOVED.

CAN I CLARIFY, YOU ARE SAYING THAT YOU WILL BE ON THAT?

YES. I WILL BE ON THAT AD HOC AND THE MOTION IS TO CREATE AN AD HOC WITH COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN AND ME APPOINTED TO THE AD HOC AND IS OBLIGATED TO COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL WITH THE DESCRIPTION OF THE SCOPE THAT I WILL LAY OUT FOR THE COUNCIL, THE ONE OPTION WOULD BE TO BOTH US DOWN AND THEN COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN AND I COULD COME BACK AND MAKE A MORE FORMAL PROPOSAL, THAT IS ONE OPTION. JUST SAYING, IF YOU ARE NOT READY TO SUPPORT THE CREATION OF THE AD HOC, THAT IS AN OPEN QUESTION. I DON'T THINK PEOPLE SHOULD HESITATE.

MY CONCERN IS TIME, HOW MUCH TIME? WE HAVE TO BE OUT OF HERE IN 40 MINUTES AND I'M WONDERING IF YOU'RE GOING TO CREATE AN AD HOC COMMITTEE, SHOULD PUBLIC COMMENTS BE TAKEN?

IS THAT TRUE, MARY GURLEY?

NO, WE TAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE ENTIRE ITEM AND IS A PART OF THE ENTIRE ITEM.

WE ARE HAVING A MOTION, THE THREE OF YOU CAN VOTE NO AND COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN AND I CAN DO WHAT WE CHOOSE TO DO. THAT IS THE MOTION WHICH HAS BEEN SECONDED AND A ROLL CALL VOTE, PLEASE, MARY GURLEY.

SO MOVED BY VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN AND SECONDED BY RICH TO CREATE AN AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE SPECIALIZED ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF SAFE WITH COMING BACK FOR THE ADDITION OF THE SCOPE AND TIMING TO A FUTURE CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND TO APPOINT VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN AND MAYOR RICH AS MEMBERS? COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

AT THIS TIME, NO.

COUNCIL MEMBER MAURER?

NOT AT THIS TIME.

COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS?

NOT AT THIS TIME.

VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN ?

YES. MAYOR RICH?

YES.

THE MOTION DOES NOT PASS WITH THREE COUNCIL MEMBER'S IN OPPOSITION, THE MOTION FAILS.

THANK YOU, WE WILL GO ON TO THE OTHER AD HOC, WHICH IS CREATION OF AN AD HOC FOR, TO FOCUS ON THE SEBASTOPOL COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN. WHICH WAS A PROJECT THAT WAS APPROVED IN OUR CIP. MY QUESTION TO STAFF IS, DOES THIS NEED TO HAPPEN TONIGHT? CAN WE BUMP THIS ITEM TO ANOTHER MEETING?

YOU CAN CONTINUE INTO ANOTHER MEETING IT WAS JUST DIRECTION FROM THE CIP TO CREATE AN AD HOC COMMITTEE.

OKAY. I'M SORRY. I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE THAT THIS ITEM BE LEFT FOR ANOTHER AGENDA. DOES ANYBODY OPPOSED TO THAT?

I AGREE.

OKAY. WHAT FORMAL ACTION DO YOU NEED US TO TAKE, MARY GURLEY? IS THERE CONSENSUS?

YES.

NO FORMAL ACTION, WE WILL CONTINUE THIS IN A FUTURE MEETING.

THANK YOU.

I AM SORRY, I DON'T WANT TO DELAY THIS BUT THERE IS A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE GOALS.

THE GOALSETTING. ON THE GOALSETTING ITEM, IS THAT SOMETHING WE CAN BRING BACK FOR A LATER DECISION?

YES. IF THERE IS COUNCIL CONSENSUS TO RETURN US TO THE FUTURE CITY COUNCIL MEETING.

THE OTHER OPTION THAT I WOULD SUGGEST IS WE CONSIDER MAKING A DECISION TO HAVE A MINI-GOALSETTING AND DIRECTING MARY GURLEY TO COMMUNICATE WITH COUNCILMEMBERS FOR PURPOSES OF SETTING A DATE, IS ANYBODY OPPOSED TO DOING THAT?

IT SEEMS THAT WE ALREADY AGREED BECAUSE HE PUT IN THE BUDGET THAT WE WOULD HAVE A MINI-GOALSETTING SESSION.

NO, THE 10,000 FOR THE GOALSETTING IS FOR LATER ON, IS THAT CORRECT? THE 10,000 IN THE BUDGET IS FOR GOALSETTING THAT WOULD BE MORE FORMAL, LATER ON?

YES. WE WERE GOING TO DO MANY HEAVEN GOALSETTING BETWEEN NOW AND SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER BUT WE PUT FUNDING INTO THE BUDGET TO A FACILITATOR FOR THE JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MAJOR GOAL SESSION.

THIS IS A MEETING THAT IS NOT FACILITATED WHERE WE WOULD HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT OUR PRIMARY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. AFTER HAVING SET THE BUDGET. I THINK WHAT I WILL DO WITH THIS ONE IS TRY TO SEE IF WE HAVE A THUMBS-UP, GENERAL CONSENSUS ABOUT HAVING A MINI-GOALSETTING IN THE NEAR FUTURE, IN ORDER TO SET BASIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES AND THAT WE THEN DIRECT MARY GURLEY TO COORDINATE WITH US TO SET A DATE, IS THERE GENERAL CONSENSUS FOR THAT? OKAY. FOR, 4-1, THAT PASSES. YOU NEED A FORMAL MOTION ON THAT, MARY GURLEY?

I WOULD PREFER A FORMAL MOTION TO HAVE A GOALSETTING AND TO HAVE STAFF DO A DATE.

OKAY. I WILL MOVE THAT WE DIRECT THAT A MINI-GOALSETTING, WITH NO ADDITIONAL COST FOR A FACILITATOR OR OTHER EXPENSES BE SET IN THE NEAR FUTURE AND THAT MARY GURLEY COORDINATE WITH EACH OF US IN ORDER TO SET AN APPROPRIATE DATE, IDENTIFYING THAT THIS IS QUITE DIFFERENT FROM THE GOALSETTING THAT HAS BEEN FUNDED BY THE \$10,000 ITEM IN THE BUDGET.

I'LL SECOND THAT.

SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER MAURER.

SO MOVED TO HAVE STAFF SEND OUT MEETING DATES FOR A SPECIAL GOALSETTING, WITHIN THE NEXT COUPLE OF MONTHS, HOW'S THAT? COUNCILMEMBER MAURER ?

YES.

COUNCIL NUMBER McLEWIS?

YES.

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON?

NO.

ZOLLMAN?

YES.

THIS PASSES 4-1 WITH COUNCIL OF HER HINTON IN OPPOSITION.

OKAY, THANK YOU, THANK YOU AND WE ARE DONE WITH THE BUDGET ITEM, HESITATE TO DO THIS BUT IS ANYBODY NEED A REALLY QUICK LIKE BIO BREAK? OKAY, THAT IS LIKE TWO MINUTES, I AM NOT LEAVING MY TABLE. I WILL SEE EVERYBODY IN TWO MINUTES.

ALL RIGHT, EVERYONE, WE ARE BACK FROM A BRIEF BREAK AND WE ARE NOT GOING TO MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ITEM ON OUR AGENDA. I REALLY APPRECIATE STAFF AND THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILMEMBERS FOR HANGING IN HERE AS WE MOVE TO THE SECOND, VERY IMPORTANT ITEM. THIS IS ITEM NUMBER EIGHT ON OUR REGULAR CALENDAR AGENDA, DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF PLACEMENT OF VALID MEASURE ONTO THE NOVEMBER 2024 ELECTION, PULLING RESULTS ARE INCLUDED THERE AND THE RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT IS THE CITY MANAGER CONSULTANT OUTSIDE LEGAL COUNCIL, I AM TURNING TO OUR CITY MANAGER TO START DISCUSSION OF THIS ITEM.

THANK YOU. I GOT A PRESENTATION WHICH I WILL GO THROUGH RAPIDLY, UNLESS SOMEBODY ASKS ME TO SLOW DOWN. I WILL LEAVE THAT UP TO YOU.

I THINK WE WILL SUPPORT YOUR RAPID RUN THROUGH.

HERE WE GO. YOU HAVE SEEN THIS BEFORE TALKING ABOUT A STRATEGIC APPROACH WITH MULTIPLE WAYS OF ADDRESSING OUR FISCAL CHALLENGES. SALES TAX INCREASE BEING ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT BECAUSE THE SUSTAINABLE, LONG-TERM FUNDING SOURCE AND YOU HAVE WILL BE SEEN THIS BEFORE, THIS IS THE NO-CHANGE WHAT WE ARE DOING AND ARE SALES TAX, NO MAJOR CUTS AND WE RUN OUT OF MONEY IN LESS THAN THREE YEARS AND THIS IS A SERIOUS FINANCIAL PROBLEM. QUARTER SENT OF SALES TAX GENERATES ABOUT \$706,000 A YEAR AND WITH THIS WE WOULD HAVE \$800,000 IN FUTURE SERVICE CUTS OR FORGO FUNDING FOR PRESERVING OUR ASSETS, WHICH ESTIMATE AT ABOUT 900,000 A YEAR IS NEEDED OR SOME KIND OF MIX OF THE TWO. AND HALF A CENT SALES TAX GENERATES ABOUT 1.5 MILLION PER YEAR AND THAT ALLOWS US TO PRESERVE OUR SERVICES AND OUR ASSETS, ALTHOUGH WE WOULD BE COMPETING WITH OUR KIDS OUR FUTURE TAX, POTENTIALLY ON THE NOVEMBER BALLOT. IN TERMS OF THE SURVEY RESULTS, I THINK YOU HAVE ALL SEEN THESE, PEOPLE GENERALLY LIKE THE JOB WE ARE DOING, THERE IS SUPPORT FOR SALES TAX OVER THE QUARTER AND HALF SENT MEASURES, BOTH NUMBERS AND A WHOLE LOT DIFFERENT, LESS THAN 2%.

CITY MANAGER, I AM SORRY, BUT THESE POLL RESULTS?

THE POLL RESULTS.

THANK YOU. EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE USES ARE NOTED HERE TO THINK YOU'VE SEEN THE MATERIALS, I WOULD JUST RUN THROUGH THEM. COMPARISONS TO OTHER CITIES I GUESS WE ARE TIED FOR THIRD FOR THE HIGHEST DEPENDING HOW YOU LOOK AT IT. THIS IS PRE-MEASURE LATER

AGE GOING TO AFFECT THIS FALL. WE ARE NOT TERRIBLY OUT OF WHACK ONE WAY OR THE OTHER AND THEN MY RECOMMENDATION IS TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION REPLACING THE SALES TAX MEASURE ON THE BALLOT DETERMINE IF IT IS A QUARTER OR HALF CENT AND THEN APPOINT TO COUNCILMEMBERS WITH ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF A MEASURE AND REBUTTAL ANY ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE MEASURE. THAT CONCLUDES THE PRESENTATION.

GREAT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS? ANYBODY HAVE QUESTIONS AT THE MOMENT?

COUNCILMEMBER HINTON, GO AHEAD.

IT LOOKS LIKE IN THE STAFF REPORT WE HAVE PROPOSED LANGUAGE AND ONE OF THE THINGS IT TALKS ABOUT IS OUR LIBRARY, ONE EXAMPLE, THAT DID NOT PULL WELL AND I'M WONDERING, SHOULD THIS MEASURE BE ADJUSTED BASED ON THEM STRENGTH OF THE POLLING? DO YOU THINK? TO GIVE US THE BEST ODDS OF PASSING. I HAVE NOT GONE THROUGH IT WORD BY WORD BUT I DID GLANCE AT WHAT PULLED HEINLEIN DID NOT PULL HIS HIGH AND THEN IT ALSO TALKS ABOUT FIRE BUT WE KNOW THAT FIRE WILL PROBABLY BE FUNDED IN A DIFFERENT WAY, I AM CURIOUS, WAS THIS THE SUGGESTED POLL QUESTION OR ARE WE STILL WORKING ON IT?

AND THAT IS PAGE THREE OF 88 THE STAFF REPORT.

I'M LOOKING AT THREE OF 88.

QUESTION FOR STAFF OR CONSULTANT IF THEY ARE AVAILABLE, DOES THIS PHRASING REFLECT THE RESULTS OF THE POLL?

IF I CAN I'M GOING TO STOP SHARING , ADAM IS STILL HERE WITH US, HE HAS BEEN WITH US ALL EVENING, I'M GOING TO LET HIM RESPOND TO THAT IF I MAY.

GREAT, MAY YOU SHARE AN ANSWER WITH US, PLEASE?

SURE, MAYOR AND COUNCIL. MY PERSPECTIVE IS THIS, THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENT REASONS TO INCLUDE LANGUAGE IN THE BALLOT QUESTION, THE LABEL ITSELF, WHICH IS WHAT PEOPLE SEE WHEN THEY FILL OUT THEIR BALLOT AT THEIR KITCHEN TABLE. SOMETIMES LANGUAGE SPECIFICALLY GEARED TOWARDS THINGS THAT PEOPLE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT SHOULD BE INCLUDED AND FOR GREATEST EFFECT. SOMETIMES THE THINGS THAT THEY ARE REALLY HAPPY WITH IS, HAS UTILITY BECAUSE IT SHOWS YOU'RE REINFORCING SOMETHING THAT YOU ARE ALREADY DOING WELL. THERE ARE SOME OTHER CONSULTANTS INVOLVED THAT ARE VERY INVOLVED IN THE OUTREACH COMPONENT OF THIS PROCESS AND I WOULD DEFER TO THEM ON THE FINAL LANGUAGE OR THE LANGUAGE THAT WAS DEVELOPED BUT OUR RESEARCH INFORMED THAT AND FOR INSTANCE, THE LIBRARY COMPONENT WOULD BE PART OF THAT SCENARIO WHERE PEOPLE ARE MAYBE NOT AS CONCERNED ABOUT IT BUT ARE QUITE HAPPY WITH HOW YOU MANAGE IT.

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS ? IF NOT WE CAN -- GO AHEAD COUNCILMEMBER HINTON.

I DO SEE IS A PART OF THE STAFF REPORT THAT AN AD HOC WOULD BE CREATED ., IT SOUNDS LIKE FOR THE BALLOT QUESTION I SAW THAT BUT MAYBE WE CAN GET THAT CLARIFIED. IT LOOKS LIKE COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS HAS A QUESTION AS WELL.

I THINK THE QUESTION, GO AHEAD COUNCIL NUMBER McLEWIS, PROBABLY RELEVANT. GO AHEAD.

I HAVE A QUESTION I DON'T KNOW WHEN IS THE APPROPRIATE TIME TO BRING IT UP SO I'M JUST GOING TO ASK IT NOW OF MY COLLEAGUES. EVERYBODY KNOWS THAT I HAVE VOTED NO ON TAX MEASURES IN THE PAST AND I HAVE BEEN TRYING TO WORK THROUGH THIS TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO GET TO YES AND, ALL DIFFERENT WAYS, FINALLY HAD A CONVERSATION WITH OUR ATTORNEY BECAUSE THE CONCERN I HAVE IS THAT WITH THE COMMUNITY, THEY HAVE GIVEN US OUR PRIORITIES, GOTTEN A LOT OF MIXED INFORMATION BACK AND THIS IS MY QUESTION, WOULD THE COUNCIL BE WILLING TO PUT TOGETHER AND COME BACK IN EARNEST, NOT THE NEXT MEETING BUT THE MEETING AFTER THAT OR EVEN BEGINNING OF SEPTEMBER AND DO A COUNCIL POLICY THAT IS BASICALLY A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A COUNCIL POLICY ON PRIORITIES OF EXPENDITURES FROM THE SALES TAX AND I TALKED TO OUR ATTORNEYS ABOUT THAT AND THEY SAID THIS WAS DONE IN A VARIETY OF PLACES AND IT WAS SIMPLY BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, THEY WERE WORRIED ABOUT NOT GETTING PEOPLE ON BOARD BUT IF THEY PUT TOGETHER A POLICY AND ACTUALLY PUT THEIR INTENTIONS FORTH AND I KNOW WE ALREADY TALKED ABOUT GOALSETTING BUT THIS IS SEPARATE AND JUST RELATED TO THAT. AND SOME EXAMPLES THAT HAVE GONE ON IS THEY HAVE PUT IN A PERCENTAGE FOR ROADS, PERCENTAGE FOR PUBLIC SAFETY, PERCENTAGE FOR PARKS AND PUT CAVEATS IN THERE THAT IF YOU DON'T SPEND 20% PARKS AND WE WILL SPEND IT ON THAT AND I'M JUST WONDERING IF HER COUNCIL WOULD BE WILLING TO DO THAT ? I AM TRYING TO GET TO A YES HERE, I TRULY AM BUT I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT HOW WE SPEND MONEY IN THE HISTORY IN MY OPINION OF HOW YOU HAVE SPENT MONEY IS NOT ALWAYS, YOU KNOW, HAS BEEN ON BEHALF OF OUR INFRASTRUCTURE AND THINGS THAT WE TRULY SHOULD BE DOING FOR THE CITY. WE CANNOT PUT IT IN THE LANGUAGE BECAUSE IT BECOMES A SPECIAL TAX AND IT IS HARD TO PASS, SO IN TALKING WITH THE ATTORNEYS THIS IS WHAT THEY SAID IS A COMPROMISE AND I'M JUST WONDERING IF MY COLLEAGUES ARE IN EARNEST WILLING TO COME BACK AND VOTE ON A COUNCIL POLICY TO SHOW OUR COMMUNITY , YOU KNOW, THAT WE ARE PRIORITIZING WHAT THEY TOLD US THEIR PRIORITIES ARE. THAT IS MY QUESTION.

INTERESTING QUESTION, RELEVANT , IS THIS SOMETHING, SHOULD THIS BE IN COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION AFTERWARDS? I THINK THE QUESTION THAT COULD BE, THE QUESTION THAT COULD BE PRESENTED TO STAFF IS THAT AND I THINK YOU ANSWERED IT, BUT TO CONFIRM FROM STAFF, IF WE PURSUE THIS AS A GENERAL TAX AS PRESENTED HERE AND APPROVE IT TONIGHT, COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS SAID SHE CONSULTED COUNCIL AND HAS BEEN TOLD IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE FOR THE COUNCIL TO THEN HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT ALLOCATION OF THOSE FUNDS, IS THERE ANY INFORMATION THAT STAFF WOULD HAVE THAT WOULD COUNTER THAT, TO THAT STATEMENT?

I DON'T HAVE INFORMATION COUNTER TO THAT ONLY THAT I WOULD BE CAUTIOUS ABOUT WHAT WE PUT INTO THE POLICY, THAT IT DOES NOT TRIGGER ANYTHING TO MAKE IT A SPECIAL ELECTION. ALEX IS ON THE CALL AND I THINK THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING AS WELL, ALEX.

THANKS, MARY, THAT KIND OF POLICY IS ALLOWED, IT WILL NOT MAKE IT A SPECIAL TAX AND IT IS JUST A COUNCIL POLICY, NOT PART OF THE MEASURE. IT IS POSSIBLE FUTURE COUNCIL WOULD HAVE AN AUTHORITY TO CHANGE

THAT POLICY BUT THAT IS SOMETHING THAT THE COUNCIL COULD ESTABLISH WITHOUT MAKING IT A SPECIAL TAX.

GREAT, THAT WOULD BE LEGAL AND IT WOULD PUT OUR TAX IN JEOPARDY AND IT COULD BE A STATEMENT OF INTENTION. SO, THE QUESTION HAS BEEN PRESENTED BY OUR COLLEAGUE AND IT HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO US. WE DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY AND THINK IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR US TO RESPOND TO THE QUESTION FROM OUR COLLEAGUE, ANY CONCERN FROM STAFF IN DOING THAT?

THERE IS NO CONCERN ABOUT RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION , IT IS JUST DO NOT MAKE A DECISION UNTIL AFTER --

YES. BUT COUNCILMEMBER MAURER?

I SUPPORT THAT IDEA. I ALSO HAVE A QUESTION, CAN WE ADD A SUNSET DATE?

COULD A SUNSET DATE BE, A QUESTION FOR ALEX, I BELIEVE, COULD A SUNSET DATE BE ADDED TO THIS TAX MEASURE?

YES, IF THE COUNCIL WANTS, IT IS PROBABLY NOT SOMETHING WE CAN DO ON THE FLY TONIGHT BUT THAT IS SOMETHING TO COME BACK WITH THAT ADDED INTO THE ORDINANCE AND TO THE BALLOT QUESTION. THE MEASURE ALSO GIVES THE COUNCIL THE POWER TO END THE TAX AT ANY POINT IN THE FUTURE AS WELL, THE COUNCIL ALWAYS RETAINS THAT AUTHORITY TO END IT.

YOU HAVE ANY ADVICE ABOUT THE WAY IT IS PHRASED NOW VERSUS ADDING A SUNSET DATE?

WE ARE PRETTY CLOSE, RIGHT AROUND 71 WORDS AND YOU CAN ONLY PUT 75 IN THE BALLOT QUESTION, WE MAY HAVE TO ADJUST A LITTLE BIT TO PUT IN THAT. IF YOU SAY FOR 10 YEARS OR SOMETHING, THAT IS 10 YEARS AND WE COULD MAKE IT WORK, IT IS JUST HARD TO COUNT ON THE FLY.

I UNDERSTAND . WHAT IS YOUR ADVICE? WHAT WOULD BE GAINED BY PUTTING IN A SUNSET CLAUSE?

I WOULD DEFER TO THE POLL CONSULTANT WHO MAYBE KNOWS HOW THOSE CHANGES HELP OR HURT OR DO NOT MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

I CAN SHARE SOME PERSPECTIVE THERE. WE OFTEN ASK THAT QUESTION IN AN A.B. TEST, WHERE WE ASK HALF THE VOTERS, WE PUT SOME SUNSET INTERVAL ON, WE DON'T TEND TO SEE A BIG DIFFERENCE BETWEEN US TWO AND IN THIS CASE WE DID NOT ASK THAT BUT YOU HAVE CLEAR SUPPORT FROM THE VOTERS COMPONENT.

THANK YOU. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS? I WILL WEIGH IN AND ANSWER TO COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS ' QUESTION, I'M OPEN TO A DISCUSSION BY THIS COUNCIL ABOUT THE ALLOCATION OF THE FUNDS IN A STATEMENT OF INTENTION AS TO THE ALLOCATION OF THE FUNDS RECEIVED FROM THE SALES TAX. I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THAT AT ALL, TO HAVING THAT DISCUSSION AND I WOULD SUPPORT THAT, ESPECIALLY IF IT WOULD HELP BRING COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS .

CREATING A POLICY AND NOT JUST DISCUSSION.

I HAVE NO OBJECTIONS ABOUT DOING THAT. I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE PUBLIC. THAT WOULD BE MY ANSWER TO THE QUESTION.

I'M INTRIGUED BY THE SUNSET DATE.

ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM THE COUNCIL? I DO WANT TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE TIME TO GO OUT TO THE PUBLIC. NO. OKAY. LET'S GO TO THE PUBLIC, MARY GURLEY, IF WE COULD ALMOST HAVE A.

THIS IS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SALES TAX MEASURE, IF YOU LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT I WILL GO TO IN CHAMBERS FIRST. AARON?

GOOD EVENING, WILL MAKE IT QUICK. AS MOST OF YOU KNOW I AM THE UNION REP FOR SEIU AND WE REPRESENT THE PUBLIC WORKS STAFF AND WHAT IS PRETTY CLEAR THAT WITHOUT ADDITIONAL REVENUE, COST SERVICES THAT ARE PUBLIC DEPENDS ON WOULD BE THREATENED AND THE CITY ALSO RISKS LOSING INSTITUTIONAL KNOWLEDGE DUE TO THE CITY'S INABILITY TO RETAIN AND RECRUIT QUALIFIED STAFF. AND AS A GENERAL RULE, THIS ONLY PROLONGS ECONOMIC RECOVERY, SEIU URGES THE COUNCIL TO PLEASE ALLOW THE CITY RESIDENTS TO DECIDE ON A HALF OF THE TWO SALES TAX, THANK YOU.

YOU, AARON. NEXT I WILL GO TO ZOOM. ROBERT, CAN YOU MEET YOURSELF?

YES.

I WILL LET YOU KNOW YOU HAVE 30 SECONDS LEFT, GO AHEAD.

OKAY, REALLY QUICK. I SUBMITTED A PUBLIC COMMENT ABOUT THE DISINGENUOUS NATURE ABOUT THE WORDING IT IS SUGGESTING WE WILL SPEND MONEY ON POLICE AND THEN ON FIRE. WHEN IN FACT WE ARE PROBABLY NEVER GOING TO SPEND ANYMORE MONEY ON POLICE AND FIRE IS GOING TO GO BY THE WAYSIDE IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. I THINK THAT COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS'S SUGGESTION OF A POLICY HOWEVER IS AN EXCELLENT WAY TO MANEUVER AROUND THE SPECIAL TAX ISSUES AND I FULLY SUPPORT THAT. I THINK YOU SHOULD ALSO TAKE A LOOK AT MAYBE TAKING OUT FIRE AND MAYBE A COUPLE OF OTHER THINGS THAT YOU ARE REALLY NEVER GOING TO SPEND ANY MONEY ON AND IT SHOULD NOT BE IN THERE, THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM. LINDA, CAN YOU AND MEET YOURSELF, PLEASE? LINDA, GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE.

I WANT TO SAY HI TO RICHARD, THANK YOU FOR SPEAKING UP BUT ANYWAY, I ALWAYS FIND IT INTRIGUING THAT YOU KNOW YOU PUT THE BURDEN OF THE DYSFUNCTION OF THE PREVIOUS, RELATIVELY RECENT CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS AND ALL OF THEIR FAILURES, YOU KNOW, ON US, THE TAXPAYERS HERE IN THIS TOWN, YOU KNOW? I HATE TO GO BACK A LITTLE BIT BUT TO LOOK AT WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR GETTING US INTO DEBT IN THE SITUATION AND IT IS MAYOR HERE ALONG WITH SLATER AND NEYSA WHO PREVIOUSLY WENT AHEAD AND SIGNED A FIVE POINT MILLION-DOLLAR LOAN, NOT KNOWING THAT IT WAS ALONE AT ALL AND THEY WERE HURTING FOR TIME AT THE END OF THE YEAR AND DANTE HAD PRESENTED THIS, ALONG WITH THE WIRELESS WATER METERS AND THAT WAS IT NO COST, NO COST.

LINDA, YOU GOT 30 SECONDS.

IN ADDITION TO THAT IT IS NONE OTHER THAN THE MAYOR OR SELF WAS RESPONSIBLE, SHE IS THE LIAISON FOR THIS RV VILLAGE THAT HAS TURNED OUT TO BE A COMPLETE DISASTER AND SHE IS LEADING US INTO MORE DISASTER WITH THE CRIMINALS AND THE FELONS, AND THE CRIMINAL ELEMENTS THAT SHE HAS ATTRACTED AND IS GOING TO KEEP IN OUR

COMMUNITY AND THAT IS JUST DEVASTATING FINANCIALLY AND IT HAS CHANGED THE ENTIRE CHARACTER OF MY NEIGHBORHOOD.

LINDA, THAT IS TWO MINUTES.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT, NEXT I WILL COME BACK TO CHAMBERS, SEEING NONE EVER GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, KYLE, YOU CAN MEET YOURSELF, PLEASE.

WOW. HERE WE ARE.] A SALES TAX. JUST THINKING ABOUT HOW MUCH TIME WE HAVE SPENT ON AGGRESSIVE SALES TAX MEASURE, THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR QUITE SOME TIME. THIS IS NOT JUST SOME, NEW, LET'S GO AHEAD AND FIND A REVENUE SOURCE AND LET'S GO AHEAD AND ASK THE PUBLIC TO INCREASE SALES TAX TO DO THIS. WE SPENT PROBABLY, NEAR \$100,000 IN TOTAL AND JUST CONSULTING FEES ALONE AND IMAGINE THE AMOUNT OF STAFF TIME THAT HAS BEEN GOING THROUGH THE PROCESS OF TRYING TO DEVELOP A SALES TAX MEASURE AND HOW WE CAN PITCH THIS THING TO THE PUBLIC. RIGHT? HERE WE ARE, RIGHT BACK AT A SPOT WHERE WE SEE SALES TAX MEASURE THAT IS LEANING HEAVILY INTO POLICE, FIRE, SAFETY, RIGHT? USING THIS CERTAIN LANGUAGE TO PITCH A SALES TAX TO THE PUBLIC WHEN WE ALL WELL KNOW THIS IS JUST GOING TO THE GENERAL FUND AND ARE GOING TO MAKE DECISIONS INTO GOING TO SPEND HOURS AND HOURS DEBATING ON \$4000 FOR SOME PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CITY COUNCIL OR YOU GOING TO DEBATE \$40,000 FOR CITY MANAGER BUDGET SIX MONTHS DOWN THE LINE. SO, BY ALL MEANS, GET YOUR REVENUE THAT YOU NEED BUT CONSIDER, IN THE FUTURE, JUST BE HONEST ABOUT THE APPROACH THAT YOU TAKE IN ASKING THE PUBLIC FOR ADDITIONAL REVENUE IN SOMETHING LIKE A SALES TAX. IT IS FOR THE GENERAL FUND, COLLEGE FOR THE GENERAL FUND AND IF IT'S GOING TO BE FOR SUMMING SPECIFIC, DO NOT GO FOR A GENERAL FUND TAX MEASURE.

KYLE, YOU HAVE ABOUT 20 SECONDS.

GO AHEAD AND ACTUALLY PITCH IT SPECIFICALLY FOR THE BUDGETARY ITEMS THAT YOU'RE GOING TO USE IT FOR. BECAUSE WE ALL WELL KNOW THIS IS GOING TO A GENERAL FUND, A GIANT SLUSH FUND AND ARE GOING TO FIGHT AND THROW-IN THINGS AT THE 11th HOUR TRYING TO GET STAFF HIRES IN THE 11th HOUR WITHOUT ACTUAL PUBLIC INPUT ON THE PROCESS. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, KYLE FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NEXT I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE, OLIVER, CAN YOU MEET YOURSELF, PLEASE? I AM IN YOU DID.

GO AHEAD WITH YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT.

QUICKLY, IT IS LATE. I DID ACTUALLY SAY AT THE LIVE TOWN HALL, IF IT IS A QUARTER CENT SALES TAX WE ARE ONLY TALKING ABOUT \$700,000 AND THERE IS A HUGE SHOPPING LIST ON THAT SLIDE WAS MAILED OUT TO EVERYBODY OTHER THINGS IN THEORY THE MONEY COULD BE SPENT ON. I WOULD AGREE TO SOME EXTENT WITH KYLE BUT IN A MORE POSITIVE WAY, WE REALLY NEED TO SHOW THE COUNCIL TO SHOW VERY CLEAR INTENTIONS OF THEIR PRIORITIES, SELL DISCRETE, SPECIFIC TOPICS TO HAVE A CHANCE PEOPLE VOTING ON THE SALES TAX BECAUSE AS I HAVE SAID PREVIOUSLY THERE HAS BEEN SO MANY PAST INSTANCES WHERE MONEY HAS BEEN ALLOCATED TO BE SPENT ON THINGS AND IT JUST DISAPPEARED

INTO THE GENERAL FUND. SO, THE MARKETING OF THIS HAS TO BE VERY CLOSELY TIED TO A VERY CLEAR PRIORITY. THANK YOU.

FIGURE, OLIVER FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. I BECOME ONE LAST TIME TO CHAMBERS. SEEING NONE , MARY, CAN YOU MEET YOURSELF, THERE YOU GO.

I DID. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW, WHAT DOES UNTIL ENDED BY VOTERS MEAN? HOW DO VOTERS END THE TAX? OR IS THIS LIKE OUR HOSPITAL TAX, WE JUST KEEP PAYING AND PAYING AND PAYING. THANKS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. AGAIN I WILL COME BACK INTO CHAMBERS, SEEING NONE I WILL GO BACK OUT TO ZOOM, IF THERE IS ANYBODY THEY WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE SALES TAX MEASURE, PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY, DOROTHY, CAN YOU MEET YOURSELF, PLEASE?

OKAY, CAN YOU HEAR ME OKAY?

I CAN HEAR YOU AND I WILL JUMP IN AND YOU HAVE ABOUT 30 SECONDS LEFT.

OKAY, WE NEED MONEY TO PAY INFRASTRUCTURE, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR THAT HAS NOT BEEN DONE FOR WHAT? FIVE, SIX YEARS. IF YOU TIE THE TAX TO THE SEWER AND THE WATER, BECAUSE WE ALL KNOW OR JUST LET THEM ALL FAIL AND THEN PEOPLE UNDERSTAND WHY THEY SHOULD'VE SIGNED AND BROUGHT ON TO THE TAX BUT TIE IT TO THOSE TWO THINGS, THOSE THE TWO BIG THINGS WE HAVE NOT BEEN FIXING OVER THE YEARS. WATER AND SEWER, PLEASE, THANKS A LOT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. AGAIN, I WILL GO OUT AND CALL, ONE LAST CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE SALES TAX MEASURE, IF YOU'D LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND VIRTUALLY, SENIOR NONE, THE PUBLIC COMMENT IS CLOSED.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MARY GURLEY. I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND EVERYONE THAT FIRE SERVICES, THERE WILL BE MONEY THAT IS OBLIGATED FROM HER GENERAL FUND INTO THE FUTURE AS NEGOTIATED WITH GOLD RIDGE, SO, IT IS NOT AS IF NO MONEY WILL GO FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO FIRE SERVICES WITH CONSOLIDATION. SO, THAT IS AN INTEREST WE NEED TO SUPPORT. WE ARE FULLY AWARE, THIS COUNCIL WAS FULLY AWARE OF ALL THE IMPRECATIONS OF THE WIRELESS WATER METERS WHEN A DECISION WAS MADE REGARDING THE SUPPORT OF THAT FUNDING EFFORT. I HAVE TO COMMENT THAT EACH EXPENSE IS WORTH PAYING CLOSE ATTENTION TO, \$4000 MAY NOT BE MEANINGFUL TO OUR SPEAKER FROM THE PUBLIC BUT IT IS VERY MEANINGFUL TO TAXPAYERS WHO TOOK THE MONEY OUT OF THEIR POCKETS, SO, WE PAY ATTENTION TO ALL OF THOSE AMOUNTS. WE ARE HONEST AND TRANSPARENT ABOUT OUR EXPENDITURES AND OUR INTENTIONS AND I POINTED TO COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS ' SUGGESTION A FEW MOMENT AGO AND WE DO NOT TREAT THE GENERAL FUND AS A SLUSH FUND, EVER. EDUCATION TO THE PUBLIC IS VERY IMPORTANT ON THE SALES TAX MEASURE AND I CERTAINLY WOULD AGREE AND TO THE EXTENT THAT THIS COUNCIL SUPPORTS A SALES TAX MEASURE, I AM SURE I CAN SPEAK FOR THEM AND SAYING THAT INFORMATION EDUCATION WILL BE ESSENTIAL. I WOULD LIKE TO GET AN ANSWER TO THAT VARIANCE IN QUESTION, WHAT DOES UNTIL ENDED BY THE VOTERS MEAN? HOW WOULD THE VOTERS END THIS TAX MEASURE? THIS IS A QUESTION FOR ALEX, IF HE IS STILL ON?

I AM HERE, YES, MAYOR. THE VOTERS CAN END IT THROUGH THE INITIATIVE PROCESS. YOU KNOW, GATHERING SIGNATURES AND PUTTING A MEASURE ON THE BALLOT TO END IT OR OF COURSE ALSO THE COUNCIL COULD END IT AT ANY TIME. THOSE TWO METHODS.

GREAT. THANK YOU, VERY MUCH AND THANK YOU TO THE MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC FOR ASKING THAT QUESTION. WE ARE NOW BACK AT THE COUNCIL TABLE. I AM LOOKING AT STAFF, ANYTHING TO OFFER FOR US BEFORE WE START DISCUSSION?

JUST A REMINDER THAT THERE WAS A REVISED RESOLUTION AND I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE ARE WORKING OFF THE SAME PAGE, IT WAS POSTED AND WAS SENT OUT LAST WEEK.

OKAY. I THINK THAT IS THE RESOLUTION VERSION WE HAD REDLINED, IT SHOWED THE CHANGES. CORRECT? OKAY. JUST MAKING SURE THAT ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS ARE AWARE OF THAT IF THEY HAD THE REDLINE VERSION IN FRONT OF THEM, THAT IS THE UP DATED RESOLUTION, IS THAT CORRECT? OR AM I MISSTATING?

I CAN SHOW IT IF YOU WOULD LIKE, TO MAKE SURE.

I WOULD SHARE THE SCREEN.

OR PERHAPS, MARY GURLEY, YOU COULD JUST EMAIL IT TO ALL OF US, RIGHT NOW. BUT YES, IF YOU COULD SHARE IT.

I THINK IT WOULD JUST BE EASIER TO SHARE THE SCREEN.

SURE. IT IS LENGTHY, I'M HOPING WE ARE NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH IT.

JUST PUTTING THE ONLY CHANGE HERE ON THE MEASURE ITSELF, CHANGING FIRE PROTECTION TO WILDFIRES RESPONSE AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND ONE MINOR CHANGE AT THE END TO TAKE OUT AND.

WAIT A SECOND, FOR SOME REASON I PRINTED THE OLD ONE.

IT APPEARS IN THE THIRD LINE THE WORD FIRE PROTECTION HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE WORD WILD -- WILDFIRES. AND AT THE END DISCLOSURE,, ALL FUNDS USE LOCALLY, BE ADOPTED. OKAY, THANK YOU. THAT IS VERY HELPFUL, I THINK.

SO, I PUBLICLY STATED I WOULD SUPPORT A QUARTER CENT SALES TAX MEASURE AND WE HAD THE SURVEY AND THE TOWN HALLS AND PEOPLE APPROACHED ME ASKING FOR ME TO SUPPORT HALF SENT TAX, AND I THOUGHT ABOUT OUR ENTIRE FINANCIAL PICTURE AND THE ONE PIECE FOR ME THAT IS NOT ADDRESSED IN ANY OF OUR FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS OR ANYTHING IS THE NEED FOR ROADS. TO HAVE THE ROADS TAKEN CARE OF. I WAS THINKING THAT IF I CAN SUPPORT A QUARTER CENT, IF I SUPPORTED THE OTHER QUARTER CENT FOR ROADS, THAT WOULD WORK FOR ME. I WOULD SUPPORT A HALF CENT BUT I ALSO WANT THE ASSURANCE THAT AT LEAST THREE OF US ON COUNCIL HERE , YOU KNOW, SUPPORT THE IDEA OF PUTTING MONEY TOWARD REPAIRING THE ROADS. I AM NOT SAYING USE ALL OF IT FOR ROADS BUT YOU KNOW, ROUGHLY A BIG CHUNK OF IT, 50% OF IT. I ALSO WOULD SUPPORT STAFFING FOR ALL OF OUR DEPARTMENTS BUT I THINK THAT WOULD ADDRESS THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL, POLICE AND FIRE TO SUPPORT FULL STAFFING AND THEN MAINTENANCE OF STREETS AND ROADS AND PARKS. PARKS ARE ALSO IMPORTANT TO ME. I WOULD SUPPORT JILL'S IDEA AND HAVE THE RESOLUTION AND I WOULD ALSO, I THINK I WOULD LIKE TO ADD THE IDEA OF A 12 YEAR SUNSET DATE THAT COINCIDES WITH THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION AND THAT WAS RECOMMENDED, 12 YEARS.

THAT SEEMS A REALLY LONG TIME , I AM IN SUPPORT OF A SUNSET CLAUSE TOO, I DON'T KNOW. YOU CORRELATED THAT WITH -- PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS. I AM NOT TREAT YEARS IS ENOUGH. YOU KNOW? THINGS GO SLOWER THAN WE THINK.

OKAY, COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, THANK YOU. COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS, DO YOU HAVE SOMETHING?

I'M CURIOUS ON YOUR THOUGHTS BECAUSE I WAS THINKING LIKE EIGHT YEARS, FIVE YEARS, BECAUSE PEOPLE ARE SO UPSET, THEY ARE COMPARING THIS TO THE HOSPITAL TAX.

THE ONE THING I WOULD SAY ABOUT , AND I DON'T, EIGHT YEARS AT END ABOUT THE TIME WE PEAK ON HER FIRST PAYMENT OBLIGATIONS AND THE FACT THAT WE HAVE ALMOST 3 MILLION SET-ASIDES REALLY HELPS MITIGATE THE PAIN BUT IT STARTS DECLINING, AT LEAST THE LATEST PROJECTIONS AFTER THAT. I WILL TELL YOU, EIGHT YEARS, 12 YEARS, THAT GETS US IN A LOT BETTER SHAPE THAN WE ARE TODAY.

I CAN SUPPORT EIGHT. PERSONALLY.

I'M GOING TO LOOK TO COUNCILMEMBER HINTON FOR HER COMMENTS AND THEN VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN .

I'M GLAD YOU GUYS POINTED OUT BECAUSE I WAS GOING TO SUGGEST THAT FIRE PROTECTION BE PULLED OUT AND I AM GLAD, I FORGOT IT WAS ALREADY REDLINED. I'M GOING TO SUPPORT HALF CENT SALES TAX TONIGHT AND I WILL SUPPORT THE SUNSET OF 12 YEARS. I ORIGINALLY WAS NOT SUPPORTING A SUNSET, I THINK THIS IS A COMPROMISE BUT I HAVE BEEN ON THE COUNCIL EIGHT YEARS AND WE THOUGHT THE HOTEL WAS GOING TO BE BUILT AND LOOK WHERE WE ARE TODAY. I HAVE TO SAY THAT EIGHT YEARS GOES BY LIKE NOBODY'S BUSINESS AND IF WE ARE GOING TO GO THROUGH ALL OF THIS TROUBLE THAN WE NEED A STOPGAP AND WE CAN ALWAYS END IT EARLIER. THAT IS ON THE TABLE BUT I WOULD AGREE THAT IT SHOULD COINCIDE WITH THE PRESIDENTIAL AND I WOULD SUPPORT 12 YEARS. THAT IS WHERE I AM SITTING TONIGHT.

SINCE IT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED BY TWO COUNCILMEMBERS, WHAT IS YOUR PERSPECTIVE ON THE IDEA OF A RESOLUTION OR POLICY?

I AM 100% FOR THAT. I AGREE AND I AM FINE WITH TRANSPARENCY. I MEAN, OBVIOUS YOU HAVE BEEN IN FAVOR OF ATTACKS FOR A WHILE NOW, IT IS NO SECRET. IF THIS IS WHAT IT TAKES TO GET US OVER THE FINISH LINE, I AM TOTALLY FINE WITH THE POLICY IN PLACE THAT WOULD TELL THE PUBLIC HOW WE PLAN TO ALLOCATE THESE FUNDS AND IN FACT I THINK IT WILL HELP US GET THE MEASURE PASSED BECAUSE EVERYBODY WILL HAVE A LOT MORE CONFIDENCE.

OKAY. I WILL TURN TO COUNCILMEMBER ZOLLMAN AND I'M ALSO LOOKING AT THE CLOCK, IS IT REALLY ALMOST 11:30 ? OH, MY GOSH.

I SUPPORT HALF CENT SALES TAX AND YES, I AM FINE WITH HAVING THE POLICY THAT WE CAN PASS TO INFORM THE VOTERS AND IT CAN ALWAYS BE CHANGED, DEPENDING UPON HOW THINGS EVOLVE BUT I WOULD PREFER TO JUST HAVE IT THE OPEN-ENDED UNTIL THE VOTERS DECIDE TO DO DIFFERENTLY.

OKAY. WEIGHING IN, I WOULD LOVE TO HAVE IT BE A HALF PERCENT WITH NO SUNSET CLAUSE BUT I AM LISTENING TO OUR COUNCILMEMBERS AND I FEEL THAT A UNIFIED FRONT IS THE BEST WAY TO GET THE SALES TAX APPROVED IN OUR COMMUNITY. SO, I RECOGNIZE THE COPPER MY

STATEMENT MADE BY COUNCILMEMBER HINTON. I WOULD SUPPORT THE SALES TAX AS PROPOSED BUT WITH A 12 YEAR SUNSET CLAUSE. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. AND I WOULD ALSO SUPPORT A COMMITMENT TO BRINGING A DISCUSSION BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO DETERMINE THE PARTICULAR ALLOCATION OF SALES TAXES, IN A FORMAL FASHION, IN TERMS OF HOW THAT WOULD BE ALLOCATED, I WOULD SAY TO COUNCILMEMBER MAURER THAT UNTIL WE HAVE THE FULL DISCUSSION , I WOULD SAY YES TO ROADS AND STREETS BUT I CANNOT COMMIT TO A PERCENTAGE TONIGHT OR ANY SORT OF SPECIFIC ALLOCATION UNTIL I HEAR FROM MY FELLOW COUNCILMEMBERS. SO, THAT IS HOW I SIT ON THAT. COUNCILMEMBER McLEWIS, YES?

I WANT TO BE CLEAR THAT I HAVE NOT BEEN WILLING TO APPROVE THIS AND I STILL HAVE RESERVATIONS AND THAT THE ONLY REASON I AM WILLING TO CONSIDER THIS AND WHY HAVE BEEN TRYING TO GET TO A YES IS BECAUSE I HAVE LISTENED TO THE COMMUNITY AND ALL OF THE FEEDBACK AND WE HAVE HEARD, WE HAVE RECEIVED SO MUCH FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE ARE OKAY WITH THIS AND I ALWAYS SAY THAT I WANT TO LISTEN TO THE COMMUNITY, SO, SETTING MY OWN RESERVATIONS ASIDE I FEEL LIKE AT THIS POINT IT MAKE SENSE TO BRING IT TO THE VOTERS AND THAT IS WHY I SPENT THIS TIME TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO GET TO A YES AND OVER THIS. SO, HALF CENT, I WILL GET ON BOARD WITH A 12 YEAR SUNSET AND I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE IS IN EARNEST IN BRINGING THE POLICY BACK BECAUSE THAT IS LIKE THE DEALBREAKER FOR ME AND IF THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN I WILL COME OUT HARD AGAINST THE SALES TAX, I WILL. TO ME WE OWE THE VOTERS THAT, IN MY OPINION. THAT IS WHERE I AM AT AND I DO HAVE RESERVATIONS WITH THIS BUT I AM LISTENING TO THE COMMUNITY AND SO, THAT IS WHERE I AM AT.

OKAY . I THINK WE MAY BE PREPARED FOR EMOTION. ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS? I'M HAPPY TO MAKE A MOTION. OKAY.

MADAME MAYOR, SORRY TO INTERRUPT BUT I WANT TO POINT OUT WHERE THE CHANGES WOULD BE BECAUSE I'M HEARING A CONSENSUS FOR THE 12 YEARS.

IS THERE A THUMBS UP ON THE CONSENSUS FOR 12 YEARS, YES. THERE IS. AND ABOUT QUESTION ITSELF WHERE IT CURRENTLY SAYS UNTIL ENDED BY VOTERS, THAT WILL BE CHANGED TO SAY, FOR 12 YEARS AND IN THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE, THE ACTUAL TEXT OF THE MEASURE, THE VERY LAST SECTION, 3.7 0.160 IT CURRENTLY SAYS UNTIL ENDED BY VOTERS AND INSTEAD IT WILL SAY, SHALL TERMINATE 12 YEARS, EXCUSE ME, THE 12th ANNIVERSARY OF THE OPERATIVE DATE. I JUST WANTED TO PUT THAT ON THE RECORD.

THANK YOU. COUNCIL FOR MAURER?

MAY I ASK THE OUTSIDE COUNCIL QUESTION , ALEX, THIS IS MARY, CAN A SUNSET DATE BE DECEMBER 31st, 2036? INSTEAD OF 12 YEARS ON THE ANNIVERSARY DATE?

IT CAN, BUT THE THING TO KEEP IN MIND AS WE WILL NOT START COLLECTING THE TAX UNTIL APRIL 1st, 2025, IF YOU WANT 12 YEARS OF COLLECTING IT IT WOULD REALLY BE 12 YEARS FROM 2025.

OKAY. I WANTED TO MAKE SURE.

THANK YOU. CAN YOU ARTICULATE A MOTION FOR US, MARY? OR SHALL I TAKE A SHOT AT IT?

JUST A SECOND.

YES. A MOTION TO APPROVE A SALES TAX MEASURE FOR A HALF PERCENT WITH A 12 YEAR SUNSET DATE AND WITH THE COMMITMENT BY ALL CITY COUNCILMEMBERS TO RETURN FOR A DISCUSSION BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL, TO DECIDE UPON A POLICY TO DIRECT ALLOCATION OF SALES TAX FUNDS, THE RESOLUTION OR POLICY? I'M NOT SURE.

IT IS A COUNCIL POLICY.

OKAY.

IS NOT SUFFICIENT, MARY ? AND I'M SORRY, COUNCILMEMBERS, DO YOU THINK I CAPTURED WHAT OUR INTENT WAS? OKAY. MARY GIRLIE?

SORRY, I WANT TO MAKE SURE I HAVE THE WORDING CORRECTLY .

PLEASE DO. ALEX, CAN YOU RE-STATE HOW YOU STATED THE EXPIRATION OF THE 12 YEARS?

YES. IN THE FINAL SECTION IT WILL BE, WILL TERMINATE 12 YEARS FROM THE OPERATIVE DATE.

FROM WHEN WE COLLECT.

THE QUESTION IS, 12 YEARS FROM THE OPERATIVE DATE , WHICH WOULD MEAN WHAT?

THAT WOULD BE APRIL 1st, 2037.

12 YEARS FROM APRIL 1st OF 2025.

CORRECT.

OKAY, THAT ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT WAS BEING ASKED? SO, WE ARE WAITING FOR MARY TO STRUCTURE OUR MOTION CORRECTLY, WHICH GIVEN THAT IT IS A SALES TAX MEASURE, AND I APOLOGIZE TO HER ACTING FIRE CHIEF, WE WILL NOT BE GETTING TO THE FIRE AD HOC ITEMS. YEAH.

I'M GOING TO TRY THIS. WHOEVER WILL MOVE THE SECOND, SHALL BE THE MOTION. TO DROP THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE PLACEMENT OF A GENERAL TAX MEASURE ON THE BALLOT FOR NOVEMBER 5th, 2024 GENERAL MUSICAL ELECTION, FOR THE SUBMISSION TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF AN ORDINANCE TO ENACT A GENERAL TRANSACTION IN SALES TAX AT THE RATE OF HALF CENT IN REQUESTING THAT THE SONOMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSENTS THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE ELECTION WITH THE STATEWIDE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON THE SAME DATE AND MODIFY THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION AN ORDINANCE TO REFER TO A HALF CENT TAX AND TO ADOPT BY MOTION UP TWO MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL TO PREPARE THE ARGUMENT TO BE SUBMITTED IN FAVOR OF THE MEASURE AND A REBUTTAL AGAINST ANY ARGUMENT SUBMITTED AGAINST THE MEASURE, DIRECTING STAFF TO RETURN TO THE CITY COUNCIL POLICY ON THE ALLOCATION OF THE SALES TAX FUNDS AT THE MEASURE IS APPROVED AND I WOULD LIKE TO STATE THE BALLOT MEASURE QUESTION. SO, THE SEBASTOPOL PUBLIC SAFETY ROAD CITY'S SAFETY MEASURE TO MAINTAIN SEBASTOPOL CITY SERVICES SUCH AS 911, EMERGENCY, MEDICAL, POLICE, FIRE RESPONSE, WILDFIRE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, MAINTENANCE AND STREETS OF RHODES, LIBRARIES, YOUTH AND SENIOR SERVICES, RETAINING, ATTRACTING LOCAL BUSINESSES AND FOR GENERAL GOVERNMENT USE, SHALL THE MEASURE ESTABLISHING A HALF CENT SALES TAX GENERATING APPROXIMATELY 1.5, THINK IT IS MORE THAN THAT, ISN'T IT? 1.65 SORRY, I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE THE CORRECT, OKAY, 1 MILLION -- SORRY. AND GENERATING 1,000,520, 1.5 MILLION ANNUALLY TERMINATING 12 YEARS IN THE OPERATIVE

DATE REQUIRING AUDITS IN PUBLIC SPENDING DISCLOSURE, ALL FUNDS LOCALLY BE ADOPTED. DID I CAPTURE EVERYTHING?

SO MOVED, ALTHOUGH I HAVE A QUESTION, DO WE HAVE TO APPOINT TWO COUNCILMEMBERS TONIGHT? CAN I BE DONE AT THE NEXT MEETING?

SECOND ON THE MOTION. TO WRITE THE ARGUMENT YOU'D WANT TO APPOINT TONIGHT. IT'S THE ONE WE WANT TO APPOINT TWO COUNCILMEMBERS ESPECIALLY SINCE TWO OF THE COUNCIL MEMBERS ARE GONE FOR THE NEXT MEETING. CAN YOU DO THE MOTION AND THEN APPOINT? OR DO WE NEED TO GET THAT INTO THE MOTION, MARY? DO THAT NOW.

WHO WANTS TO VOLUNTEER , I SEE VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN, ANYBODY ELSE WANT TO VOLUNTEER TO BE ON THAT? OKAY, I WILL VOLUNTEER, FINE. I AM VOLUNTEERING. OKAY. THE COUNCILMEMBERS THUMBS UP, OKAY WITH APPOINTING ME AND VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN TO THE COMMITTEE? OKAY. SO, MODIFYING IS NEEDED, MARY GURLEY ?

THERE IS NO MOTION YET , I WILL NEED SOMEONE TO MAKE A MOTION. I WILL MAKE THE MOTION.

I WILL DO THE SECOND.

SO MOVED BY MAYOR RICH AND SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER HINTON TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE GENERAL ELECTION, POINTING VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN AND MAYOR RICH TO PREPARE AN ARGUMENT TO BE SUBMITTED IN FAVOR OF A MEASUREMENT IN THE REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OR ANY ARGUMENT AGAINST THE MEASURE AND THEN TO DIRECT STAFF TO RETURN WITH THE CITY COUNCIL POLICY FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THE SALES TAX MEASURE OF THEM MOTION IF THE MEASURE PASSES AND THEN THE QUESTION IS READ, AMENDED TO STATE TERMINATING 12 YEARS UPON THE OPERATIVE DATE. COUNCILMEMBER HINTON. COUNCILMEMBER MAURER, COUNCIL FOR McLEWIS. VICE MAYOR ZOLLMAN, MAYOR RICH, THE MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

THANK YOU, VERY MUCH. THE MEETING HAS CONCLUDED AT 11:35, APOLOGIES FOR THOSE ITEMS THAT WE DID NOT GET TO, ESPECIALLY THE FIRE AD HOC BUT AGENDA SETTING IS MEETING TOMORROW MORNING. OKAY, THANK YOU, VERY MUCH, EVERYONE. WE GOT THROUGH IT. [Event Concluded]