

**City Council**

Mayor Neysa Hinton City Manager  
Vice Mayor Diana Rich  
Sandra Maurer  
Jill McLewis  
Stephen Zollman

**City Administration**

City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
Email: [lmclaughlin@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:lmclaughlin@cityofsebastopol.org)  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC, Mary Gourley  
Email: [mgourley@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:mgourley@cityofsebastopol.org)  
7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA 95472  
Phone: 707-823-1153



**CITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
MINUTES FOR Special City Council Meeting of June 27, 2023  
As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of July 18, 2023**

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

<https://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us/Meeting-Event.aspx>

Meeting was held in Person and Virtual /Remote Participation  
Zoom Link used for providing public comment/Live Stream is utilized for viewing only of Meeting

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.

**6:00 pm City Council Special Meeting**

**Call to Order:** Mayor Hinton called the Regular Meeting to Order at 6:06 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

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

**Absent:** None

**Staff:** City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley  
Administrative Services Director Ana Kwong  
GHD Toni Bertolero  
Interim Fire Chief Jack Piccinini  
Planning Director Kari Svanstrom  
Police Chief Ron Nelson  
Public Works Superintendent Dante Del Prete

STATEMENTS OF ABSTENTION BY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Emergency Circumstances – means a physical or family medical emergency that prevents a member from attending in person.

- a. The member requires the legislative body to allow them to participate in the meeting remotely due to the “emergency circumstances” and the legislative body takes action to approve the request.
- b. The legislative body requires a general description (generally not exceeding 20 words) of the circumstances relating to the member’s need to appear remotely at the given meeting, this shall not require a member to disclose any medical diagnosis or disability, or any personal medical information that is already exempt under existing law.

Limitations:

May not be used by a member to teleconference for a period of more than three (3) consecutive months or 20% of regular meetings (4 meetings for City Council) within a calendar year, or more than two (2) meetings per calendar year if the board meets less than ten (10) times per calendar year.

Members participating remotely must do so through both audio and visual technology and must publicly disclose whether any individual over the age of 18 is present at the remote location with the member and the general nature of the member’s relationship with the individual.

Required Procedures for Remote Participation under AB 2449

- 1. Notice and General Description. A member shall make a written request to participate remotely at a meeting as soon as possible. The request must state whether the member is claiming “just cause” or “emergency circumstances” and shall include a general description explaining their need to meet remotely. Members must make a separate request for each meeting in which they seek to participate remotely.

Councilmember Maurer requested “due to an injury, I am requesting per AB 2449 that I participate in tonight’s (June 27th, 2023) meeting virtually. I will use both audio and video capabilities throughout the meeting and am submitting this request in writing with this note to the clerk, and will additionally make a statement and request a vote at the beginning the tonight’s City Council meeting for a vote of the full Council when the meeting is in session following roll call.”

- 2. Action on the Request for Remote Participation due to “Emergency Circumstances”. The legislative body must take action on a request to participate remotely due to “emergency circumstances” at the earliest opportunity. If the request does not allow sufficient time to place proposed action on such a request on the posted agenda for the meeting for which the request is made, the legislative body may take action at the beginning of the meeting in accordance with the requirements of the Brown Act for taking action on items of business not appearing on the posted agenda.
- 3. Limitations on Frequency. A member cannot participate solely by teleconference based on emergency circumstances for more than three (3) consecutive months or more than twenty (20) percent of the agency’s regular meetings, or more than two meetings per year if the agency meets fewer than 10 times per year. A member participating remotely under the “just cause” provision is limited to two (2) remote meetings per calendar year.
- 4. Required Disclosures for Remote Participation. A member participating telephonically shall publicly disclose at the meeting before any action is taken, whether any other individuals 18 years of age or older are present in the room at the remote location with the member, and the general nature of the member’s relationship with any such individuals.
- 5. Audio and Visual Participation Required. A member of the legislative body participating from a remote location under the AB 2449 rules for teleconferencing must participate through both audio and visual technology during the entire meeting. A member’s notice and general description of need to appear remotely must include a

statement that the member will participate with both audio and video capabilities turned on throughout the meeting.

Mayor Hinton opened for questions. There were none.

Mayor Hinton opened for public comment. There was none.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Zollman moved and Vice Mayor Rich seconded the motion to approve the request from Councilmember Maurer Hinton for Remote Participation utilizing AB 2449 due to "Emergency Circumstances".

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

**VOTE:**

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

**City Council Action:** Approved the request from Councilmember Maurer Hinton for Remote Participation utilizing AB 2449 due to "Emergency Circumstances".

**Minute Order Number:** 2023-162

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

**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.

Mayor Hinton stated she had a conflict of interest for Item Number 1 for Discussion of City Manager budget proposal due to the fact that she may have a potential conflict as she may know someone who may apply for the position.

**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.

Kyle commented as follows: Tonight you will hear the City Council debate the budget for the next fiscal year but what I want the audience tonight to focus on is whether or not you believe that our City leadership and elected officials are meaningfully and actively considering the views and voice of the public in their decision-making. Currently, the budget subcommittee process did not itself meaningfully provide a full picture to the public therefore allowing the opportunity for informed public comment despite what the Mayor may have claimed defending the practice of choosing a method of public hearing on that budget. However, by the viewing of that process, I know for a fact that multiple public comments on these budgetary decisions were submitted. I asked for the members of the budget subcommittee to summarize those submitted comments as part of tonight's discussion and additionally between last week's meeting and tonight's, multiple public comments have been officially posted and provided. The public should review these comments and know quite clearly just how much of those public inputs make its way into the discussion. The City claims to make an effort to be transparent in its dealings, yet even at tonight's meeting page, they fail to include the very budget document being discussed this evening. Many insightful public comments in our budget are for public consumption but I call on our Councilmembers to make clear just how they have considered these comments throughout discussions, not just budget, but on all matters our Council takes up and the public should be clear that this is not happening.

## Agenda Item Number: 2

Linda commented as follows: Thank you, Kyle. You are very insightful and I appreciate it. I would just like to point out that these pulse radiation emitting water heaters are weapons. These are used against the public that paid for them and this is a catastrophe, a tragedy, a disaster that has led the way to these PG&E smart meters exposure with mimetic field which should be transformed into Auschwitz. This is radiation in Sebastopol. I would like to point out that in a closed session, Ariel Strauss's letter dated June 22nd talked about a reasonable compromise, with cancer-causing nonrecyclable plastic made in China water meters and a single vote by one of the leaders in City Council would save the City millions of dollars, not only in the initial \$2.2 and the \$1.2 million to the shysters, but millions spent in healthcare for pain and suffering. What happened to the no-cost, running in the red on the water meters which are going to have to be replaced time and time again.

**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. **NONE**

**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. **None**

Mayor Hinton stated she would recuse herself from Item Number 1 (City Manager Budget Discussion)

### **PUBLIC HEARING(s):**

1. Continuation: Public Hearing – To conduct a Public Hearing on Fiscal Year 2023-2024 City of Sebastopol Budget (Administrative Services Director).
  - a. Approval of Resolution Approving and Adopting Fiscal Year 2023-2024 City of Sebastopol Budget;
  - b. Approval and Adoption of Resolution establishing the appropriations limit for the City of Sebastopol for the 2023-2024 pursuant to Article XIII B of the California Constitution;
  - c. Adoption of Resolution Approving Supplemental Law Enforcement Funds (SLEF);
  - d. Approval and Adoption of Resolution Authorizing and Approving the City of Sebastopol Current Pay Rates and Ranges (Salary Schedule)

Mayor Hinton re-opened the public hearing for FY 23 24 City Budget for those that did not get an opportunity to speak.

Loretta commented as follows: I am a lifelong Sebastopol resident and taxpayer and business owner. I wanted to read this that I found on social media a few weeks ago and thought it was apropos. You are a firefighter. That's cool, I wanted to do that as a kid. What do I make? I can make five minutes seem like a lifetime when I go in a burning house to see the family. I make sirens seem like angels when you need them. I can make your children breathe when they stopped. I make myself get out of bed at 3:00 and risk my life to save people I've never met. I might make the ultimate sacrifice to save your life. I make a difference. What do you make? I want to address this to the City Council. I worked on school budgets for many years and on the school budgets, there are two items that we start with. Students and teachers. In a City, there are two items we should start with. Police and Fire. If you do anything at all, those should be your priorities. Those are the most important things to the citizens of this town, this City, and to do any cuts when we have the most educated person as our chief in the State of California, you should listen to him. We need our firefighters, we need, because of last City Council, years over lack of leadership that have not addressed issues that should have been addressed, we need to save our firefighters.

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Hinton closed the re-opened public hearing.

City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: So just listening to all the feedback over the last week and then comments and such, I have a little bit of a refined perspective with the whole budget, honestly. The must haves and the would be nice. When I am looking at this in this current section, my opinion is that with the grants, the community grants, rather than just giving a token \$500 to everybody, I am of the thought that we should perhaps suspend it for this year and re-evaluate, even mid-year. Also the bus shuttle. We have received a lot of communication about that and I am not comfortable with reducing it to where our seniors are concerned about whether or not they are actually going to have a ride to the grocery store. In this section, those are the things I am changing where I was at after listening to everybody. I don't know where everyone else is at, but, and I truly appreciate all the nonprofits. I am in the nonprofit world, and looking at their applications and what they ask for versus the token \$500, I am just wondering how much of a difference that makes.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: Referring to number eight, the situation with the shuttle, I too would like to have something to protect the seniors based upon the amount of letters that we received. Members of the public wanted to know if we had reading the public comment and some of us definitely have. There's been a lot of comments, and they are read. I recommend continuing the bus subsidy and questioned is it still 7500?

City staff stated that is what is proposed in the budget.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: I would join with Councilmember McLewis and try to figure out (community benefit grants) if we all don't agree on something, to address it later. Regarding STEP, I think what I understood was that she was not willing to do anything online and wanted to also have a binder and what I got from all of that was that she wanted at least the \$500 in order to do a final addition and I am okay with that.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I agree with Councilmember McLewis on that community grant and I think that maybe we don't need to wait until mid-year, but we can have a meeting in the next couple months on that program. My understanding is that the \$7500 shuttle, the reduction in the shuttle, if we paid \$2500 more or \$10,000, that it would be a free shuttle. I would agree with keeping the free shuttle. Regarding the STEP, if she would like to use the \$500 for a final farewell on paper I would support that. I would also support giving her the requested \$45 for a STEP binder to be placed in the library. I would like to thank her for her 23 years of loving service for the City of Sebastopol.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I'm willing to leave the \$7500 for the subsidy for the shuttle. I'm willing to go along with what I am hearing. It seems like a trend to do nothing on community grants and then put that back on the agenda for the future to look at community grants based on how this budget comes together. I am thankful for the years of service by Patricia Dines, however, we did, at the end, take it out of the budget and that's only \$500. I guess I would be okay with this in the library but I'm not okay with the \$500 for the last additional newsletter. This makes sense to me but I think that if we are not giving \$500 to others, I can't approve that. I would be okay with removing the entire conference line for the City Council. I think we all attended a conference this year and were lucky enough to do it. We just had one and I feel fine about completely eliminating conferences for the next year and thinking about it for the future.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I know that in the budget booklet what we are summarizing is the savings. What I would like to know is how much money was left in the proposed budget for the STEP newsletter? I don't think it was zeroed out, so that information would be useful. Similarly, I would like to know what amount was left for conferences. We are showing savings but not the summary of what is left.

City staff commented as follows: What is still left in the budget is the \$2000 for the conferences for the California cities and then, also the registration which is \$1250 and \$500 for the STEP newsletter which was not zeroed out.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: STEP Newsletter: I'm in support of the final \$500 amount for a final newsletter and I would be in support with a question to staff about whether it is workable regarding the binder.

Staff stated the City can provide the binder and can print out the newsletters.

**Agenda Item Number: 2**

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: Given the situation I would be in support of the content being made available through a binder. It doesn't sound like there's a need for budgetary allocation, so I would put in the budget the \$500 amount for the requested final newsletter subject to the content of that newsletter being approved by staff and to the content of the newsletter being focused on the summary of the needs for the present purpose. I would support \$500 for that line and approve in terms of content and in terms of conferences, I feel it's important for new City Council members to be attending the conference, so I would leave the conference amount in that would allow attendance by new City Council members and I as a continuing City Councilmember right now will say that I don't need to go. That's my position on that. In terms of the community benefit grants, I am in support of the general comment to zero them out. I do understand that we are in a budgetary situation. \$3000 will not help them much and will allow some leeway. Finally, on the shuttle fare, I support the \$7500 in the budget with a request that we address recognizing the total potential costs for next year and we will be able to get halfway to the midyear budget to reassess. A final comment on that, I don't know if enough people are aware, but Sonoma County Transit is not charging us for youth fares. It's a two year grant covering youth fares. Thank you to the grant maker for that and we have the benefit of that.

The Council had at least three thumbs up for:

\$500.00 for STEP

Zero out conferences (reduce 3250)

CBG Zero out

Bus Shuttle \$7500 – stay at current level

**COUNCIL BUDGET COMPLETED**

Mayor Hinton recused herself for City Manager Budget.

City Manager Budget:

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: We are now going to go to the City Manager/City Attorney budget. For purposes of the public, the discussion on the primary key items begins on page 38. We proposed various Councilmembers asking questions about this particular topic and there's a number of items, here, and I will just summarize them really quickly and we can go through and get comments from City Council members on each of these items. The first is an increase in base salary in order to provide 2\$85,000 for the new City Manager that would need to be hired. In addition, part of that item is an increase to \$100000 in benefits for that new City Manager. The second item is \$45,000 for an executive search firm. I will know what we already know from the last meeting which is that in fact, that line item is now \$30,000 because that is the contract we entered into, so that would be a \$15,000 savings, is that correct?

Staff stated that is correct.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: Item one is the increase in order to provide the appropriate level of salary and benefits for a new City Manager for this town.

City staff commented as follows: I just want to remind you that as part of the staff report in April, this was first provided to you and we did provide the salary ranges for Sonoma County. Our City Manager position is the lowest paid position. It does range anywhere from \$187,000 to \$300,000. We took an average on that report and that was about \$235K so you could theoretically reduce if the Council wanted to do that. With this recruitment, we do need to have whatever that base salary is as well as benefits.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: Could you help us if we were looking at a lower base salary? How would that affect benefits?

City staff commented it would depend of the person is a classic employee who's been in the system or a newer employee, so your benefits can range anywhere from \$90,000 to \$107,000.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I do not support the base salary of \$285,000 and \$107,000 in benefits. When I am looking at this chart of the different cities and what the City Managers are paid, if you look at the smaller cities,

**Agenda Item Number: 2**

Sonoma, Cloverdale, Sonoma is \$250,000, we have \$203,000, Windsor is \$200 thousand. Cloverdale is \$162,000. If you take an average, it comes out \$190,000, roughly. Just, this is a starting salary. I am really not comfortable with this \$285,000, base salary, and \$107,000. I realize there are arguments for getting someone who is better paid, I just can't support it. Considering our budget and considering that the starting salary and it's only going to go up from there.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: Would you be in support of a \$245,000 or \$250,000 salary or lower?

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I would not. At the most, I could support \$200,000.

City staff provided the most recent survey of salaries.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: I cannot get on board with this. I just can't. All of the research that we've done, the salaries we've looked at, I think that, being a small City and given where we are at, I think that we need to stick with in the average and in my opinion, this seems like the most logical place to be. I understand, I want to pay everyone as best we can, but \$285,000 is too high for such a small's to be in my opinion, looking at what we have to deal with.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: I am staying with what has been requested. I know what one person just had to pay and it was close to \$300 thousand. Discussed the comments being stated in the audience during the Council discussion and stated we can hear those comments and it is distracting, and we give you the benefit of the comments and I would appreciate the same. With Santa Rosa coming in and granted we do have fiscal constraints that we have now, we need someone with the skill and expertise to dig us out of the situation we just inherited so I am sticking with the \$285,000.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I don't think we should compare ourselves to Santa Rosa. That is a large City and we are small City with a small budget. I am sticking with \$200K or \$210K but no more.

The Council discussed the salary and had three straw votes for \$240,000 with \$107,000 in benefits.

The Council discussed the reduction in recruitment contract from \$45,000 to \$29,000.

The Council then discussed litigation costs.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I am going to propose that we subtract \$150,000 from that figure and then we reassess mid-year.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows: Under the current contract, whenever the new City Manager takes office, I would resume my position as City Attorney and that might be almost half a year.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: The idea would be that there is \$300,000 in the proposed budget to cover City Attorney services that would extend from July 1st of this year through June 30th of next year. We currently have a City Attorney who is sitting in the chair over there who is, I think, through at least December. The request would be that we only need half a year for this fiscal year.

The Council discussed the litigation fees. There was a straw vote of three to support retention of the \$325,000 and \$300,000.

**CITY MANAGER/CITY ATTORNEY BUDGET COMPLETED.**

Mayor Hinton returned to the dais.

Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Budget:

There were no additional comments on this budget.

**ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER/CITY CLERK BUDGET COMPLETED.**

Administrative Services Budget:

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: We did receive a letter from the public talking to us about the cost savings that had been projected for monthly water bills. I am not sure when monthly water bills was discussed. I don't recall it. But, it does make sense that we put in water meters that are more accurate, so maybe we would look at that item. But, with a member of the public bringing it up, it did dawn on me that if I was interested in my water savings, I might look online, and I don't necessarily still need a water bill sent to me every month. So, I would be open to opening that discussion if that is budgeted and going back to bimonthly printed water statements with an online element as we just launched our new website if that is possible. So, I wanted to bring that up. I don't know if anybody else read that letter from the member of the public, but can you give me some feedback on that and what the cost savings of that might be.

Director Kwong commented as follows: There isn't much cost savings as far as printing the monthly water bill to go from bimonthly to monthly. We don't have a schedule that we will do monthly at, but as soon as it is all been changed out, we will try to do all the transition in the back end to turn it into monthly. We will work with our printing service to see if we can contain the cost of printing monthly. We are also looking to promote for online. People should sign up for online bill pay instead of getting paper. So, all that is in the works. Whatever is budgeted right now for the printing of the bimonthly, I will keep it at that. It's in the water and sewer.

**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES BUDGET COMPLETED.**

Planning Department Budget:

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: There is a \$4000.00 reduction in outreach support, and if I recall, this is related to the outreach coordinator special projects.

Staff stated that is correct.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: I've just been looking at the different costs for these different communities, and I appreciate that we are reducing the costs, and I'm not sure if this would make a much of a difference, but like, the public art committee has it ever happened or been where we have actually had public art rather than having their own separate committee having them just be part of the parks commission. We have so many committees and we have so much money towards all these things, and I would like try to figure out if there is a better way for us to do this more efficiently so we do have less costs with these meetings and everything else. So, with the public art, and my understanding correctly that the total for that is \$1440, and that is for 12 meetings. I'm just asking, since we are looking at everything and we are rightsizing many things, public art is in our parks, and we do have parks as part of the planning commission. I am just wondering if there is a way to have them work together.

Director Svansson commented as follows: Our planning commission by the municipal code is the park commission. So, they review the parks budget and things like that. And the public art, yes. They are doing is certainly within the parks. They also do the public commission on the library. They are mainly working on the actual commissioned artwork and the structure garden. I don't know if having them be a part of the planning commission makes sense, because planning commission's mandate on all the land-use issues. But, I do appreciate how can we look at the synergies between those groups

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: My question is, if we were not to budget the \$1440.00 for the public arts committee how would this impact the recent Council direction of hybrid meetings.

Director Svansson commented as follows: The \$1440 budget is to hold them at the youth Annex, which is where you all are at tonight. There meetings this last year, due to scheduling post coming back to the hybrid format and in person have been on Wednesday, so it is a totally separate set up for the community center and breakdown. In the budget committee hearings, the budget community discussed meetings on Tuesdays as there is always a set up for either committees or



**Agenda Item Number: 2**

Council meetings. If you wanted to eliminate the \$1440, you need to authorize not having those meetings as hybrid, and then we are probably still need to find a different location, because the room setup is part of it. Those meetings pre-COVID were held at the City Hall conference room, which doesn't really exist any longer because of the office set up at City Hall. I am sure we can find other places like the art center or the library to host those, but frankly, this is to be able to do them as hybrid. I will say that the state is looking at, and I don't know where that legislation is, was looking at allowing advisory committees such as the public art committee, were they not actually doing decisions to be fully remote, and that would save that \$1440 cost if the state were to authorize it as well as the Council.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I support all of them without any changes in this department, and given our current policy regarding hybrid meetings in our appointment of citizens to these particular meetings, I don't see any other way to staff these to do a we are obligated to do in a cost-effective manner. So, I support all of those items in the planning department, including the allocation of those funds.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: I would support as request. We spent a lot of time trying to whittle this down, and we had tried to figure out ways to make sure that they were all held on one day so that we do not have to have an added expense of having the set up and take down for two different days. We can bring another agenda item to try to resize committees.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: We have infrequent public arts, with a very small budget, because it is not well-funded. I would be in support on another agenda item of maybe bringing it back to a six time meeting year. But, for now, I think which is on the since it is our obligation, and I can be a possibility for the future as we are talking about looking at everything. But, it sounds like we are all in agreement that this is all okay for now

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT BUDGET COMPLETED.**

Building Department Budget:

No additional comments.

**BUILDING DEPARTMENT BUDGET COMPLETED**

Engineering Department Budget:

No additional comments.

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT BUDGET COMPLETED**

Fire Department Budget:

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: I cannot support cutting \$80K from the retention pay. I just can't see us doing that. Not at all. We all know that we are in a bit of a conundrum basis. I personally would like to offer a compromise and that rather than doing stipend pay of \$145K, I know we are cutting that out, but I would like to propose that we consider having, actually, a full-time firefighter added in here. I'm doing that on the basis we have \$300K set aside for staffing. The top priorities that we should, as a City, that we should be providing is police and fire, I just, again, I am looking at the must haves, and as I watched the Gold Ridge respond to my neighbor this past weekend, it just got me thinking we need to have coverage here. In my mind, if we had another firefighter that was actually at the station, I think we need to ask Jack, he might have some comments about whether or not that would actually provide us with at least a firefighter at the station every day.

Interim Chief Piccinini commented as follows: My initial reaction is, to your point, any additional staffing will provide leverage for increasing reliability to ensure that the fire engine is able to respond to an incident and reduce our response times. Clearly, that would be an option were the of considering. I think my general reaction would be, giving the current 40 hour engineer position, if an additional one was budgeted for, then they could split the days of the week between the two of them, ensuring that a firefighter is in the fire station at least during the eight hour period of the day. Basically, you know, Monday through Sunday. So, every day of the week. That certainly does help in ensuring that, A, we do have a driver available, which will, again, ensure reliability getting the firetruck out, as well as reducing response times. So, anytime we can provide people in the fire station, it is clearly advantageous.

**Agenda Item Number: 2**

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: I know we are looking at cutting in many different ways, and we have already saved monies elsewhere. Just the idea of not having firefighters able to show up and response time impacting our homeowners insurance and everything else, I have just thought about this all weekend long just thinking what can we do? Some of the feedback we've received, the emails, the comments here, this is just, like, the very basic of what we should be providing as a City, and people should feel comfortable in knowing that somebody is going to show up, and show up in a timely manner. There are a lot of questions and still going on, and I know we still need to come back with the ad hoc committee report, but that is where I'm at right now.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: I cannot support any of this except for the \$80,000.00 reduction in retention. I want to be perfectly clear and address those that are sent a lot of emails that are shown up in public. I want us to feel comfortable that we can actually have the firehouse that we deserve, and response time. However, having said that, giving the time that I have spent on Council, and giving how this is actually worked out to the budget committee, have a lot of concerns about if we did even keep the \$80,000.00 retention if we are not going to come back hearing that that this was not sufficient to keep us having the number of people available to respond to fires. First, I will actually say, because we have gotten public comment on this stating that we might actually owe an apology to our Fire Chief. I do not think that that is appropriate because, we actually did send out a directive. We met countless times before we sent out the memo, and that memo was a directive to have all departments reduced. You, Chief, and correct me if I'm wrong, did come, and before they turned on the camera, stated I'm not doing that and I am not participating in this. They asked you before the camera came on, why? He just shrugged it off. I have never been part of any public or nonprofit where a department director is actually sent a directive, and they don't abide by. So, I understand that there is a lot that needs to be corrected with the new general manager and expectations of our department heads. I understand that, and I understand you just came into this position. But, that does not bode well for confidence and where we are currently positioned, and where the needs actually do need to be met. So, that is my comment there about the whole, to the public, and the person who asked if we read the comments. I did actually receive it, read them, and I'm not giving an apology. So, you were asked to reduce the particular part of the budgets, and you did not, nor did you actually participate in any of the budget hearings after the first one, even though you did know we invited back all the department heads. That does not bode well for having our department heads work together in order to solve the City's issues. So, moving on with that, the amount of stipends, and I will do say that two people in the public so that you can hear me, because one of you addressed me singularly at the last meeting, yes, I do understand about the fact that it is not a lot. I get it. As I've told you before, I applied for the position. Who knows why I did not even get it. The thing that just keeps getting this done all of this, which is referenced in the matrix report the fact it is not just the retention pay? What about pay for outside fire services. We all got the most recent final numbers for the years 2019 through 2023 for these out of outside fire services. What I want to know is, why, and you authorize these various things. I have also heard repeatedly that somehow, through the state, we ended up getting money because you decided to go outside, and provide outside fire services, right? But if that is going to be maintaining your position of the fact that you do this type of work, and it actually benefits the City, I can ask the director whether that is true or not, because it does not take into consideration the wear and tear on our commitment equipment, and the wear and tear on our vehicles, as well as the rest of these services. Why am I saying this? There are firefighters. Not disclosing names, but again, for those periods calendar years of 2019 through 2023, there has been a firefighter that actually has gotten \$235,000.00 during that time for these out of service areas \$233,000. The next one, \$194,520 and \$104,000. I am just saying that volunteer is more than just a \$15 reimbursement for showing up. Because, in my mind, that is a true mark of a volunteer. It's not accumulating all the excess money, and the coming in and saying well, now you should feel that for us, because we just barely getting by a \$15 each time we show up. So, those are my comments there. My last point is there is an itemization on page 91 for \$5000.00 for Fircrest Market. That, I am assuming, somebody abided by policy, and provided why there is a large amount of money. I asked this question, and they make the statements because I think we need to have full faith that those that are in leadership of this department is going to be straightforward with us, and actually get us the information we ask for. So, that is the reason why I cannot support any of the amounts that have been requested, and I am not in favor of returning the \$80,000.00 for retention.

Interim Chief Piccinini commented as follows: I have not been asked, but I'm going to make a couple of comments. First of all, with regard to the apology, I am not asking for one, I'm not looking for one, so I've no issue with that. With regard to the process in terms of the budget process, I think it made a very, very clear on my final comments. This is not the quorum for us to get into a disagreement or an argument over what level that I participated or as you put it, not

## **Agenda Item Number: 2**

participate. I made it really clear why I was not willing to reduce or meet your directive in terms of those budget requests, so we will fundamentally just agree to disagree on that. This is not the forum to go deep diving on that. With regard to the pay, and to continue to bring this out, and I will make it real clear, there are three general areas in which firefighters are compensated, the volunteer firefighters receive compensation. I will provide you with a detailed report on that, but I will ask that you invite me back to the Council to discuss that staff reports, because I will stand tall before this Council and stand tall before this community, and explain out how the volunteers are compensated in terms of their \$15.00 to get up in the morning and respond in an emergency, the \$15 for a drill, and when one of them attends 751 calls for service times \$15.00, that does in fact amount to a lot of money, but he is there 751 times to put into perspective. In regards to the out of county or out of area calls, just in short, and again, I want the opportunity, I want you to honor or ask me and allow me to bring forward the staff report that discusses this, and do it in a proper fashion, because again, I will stand tall before this Council, and I will stand tall before this community to explain the so. These volunteers are leaving their homes, their work, they're going up and down the state, they are doing hard and arduous and hazardous work, they do not get sleep, and if they are gone for 20 to 30 days in some cases, yes, they will make a fair amount of compensation for that, and that compensation was commensurate with the work that they are doing. It's arduous, it's hard, it is hazardous, and there simply being paid at a rate that the state has agreed upon. They are simply getting paid in an amount to what the firefighters making next to them. I don't want to spend a lot of time on a debate on this, but I would like the opportunity to come back and discuss this, because clearly, where there is a lack of information and a lack of understanding, we need to fill the gap on that.

Mayor Hinton called for a break at 7:40 pm and reconvened the meeting at 7:45 pm.

Interim Chief Piccinini commented as follows: I just sent you a very rough draft of the beginning of a report on this. I would appreciate you looking at it, and I would just like to remind the City in regards to the wear and tear of the engine, the City makes money on it. That is a discussion that I would love the opportunity to bring forward to the Council of the report item to provide the information, the background, and the education so that there is a clear understanding, so that's, again, in my humble opinion, there is a high level of misunderstanding regarding the whole compensation issue related to the firefighters, and then, I would like an opportunity to talk about the \$80,000.00, but I will wait for the invitation for that.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: Obviously, a really important discussion for all of us here and for the community. The first comment I have is that we have a lot of needs for essential services in this town. Public Works get lost in the discussion very often, and police have been mentioned. We have a budget that is really, really difficult, and we want to make sure we have everything covered as much as we can. In terms of the additional amounts I am not in support of any additional amounts. The firetruck is something that we are accepting needs to be funded, and we all know that that line item is there. But, in terms of the actual amounts in this list, I feel it is absolutely primitive to be talking today about adding any amount into the fire department budget. We all know any to respect we have an ad hoc committee that is working hard and includes your Chief of the fire department that is doing a deep dive into what is needed for the fire department. We are waiting to hear that report. I expect we'll be getting it fairly soon, but I personally am not going to support allocating any additional monies to the fire department in the absence of that that full report. Having said that though, when I look at where we are in terms of this budget, I am not convinced at the moment, but I would be open to discussing the \$80,000 retention amount being added back in, and my rationale would be that looking at maintaining the status quo, for the moment, and that is part of the status quo. I hesitate because \$80,000.00 is a lot of money, and this department needed to cut back money, just as all department were asking to cut back money. So, I am on the fence about that, but I am open to it. I am completely opposed to any additional amounts that are on this list, including the increase in stipends. But, I look forward to hearing the comments from my fellow City Council members. I do appreciate the comments in reference to the \$300,000.00 staffing reserve that we haven't yet discussed here, because for me, that is the safety net in terms of the outcomes of the ad hoc fire committee, and any other discussions about fire possible staffing needs. That is our fund. Where to depending on what comes out the various efforts are ongoing. We haven't even talked about the police department yet. There staffing needs. Management staffing needs. That is why the money is there, because we don't yet know. I personally, as one Councilmember, I do not yet know. I don't have the information that allows me to make a responsible decision about that staffing question.

## **Agenda Item Number: 2**

**City Council Meeting Packet of: July 18, 2023**

**Page 11 of 27**

## Agenda Item Number: 2

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I wrote some thoughts down, because those are pretty difficult comments to hear earlier, and I think that historically, there has been some feeling between firefighters regarding the Council that they have been shorted for many years, and I would love to see that turnaround. I love to see the firefighters honored and respected, and I am quite grateful to the fire department and the firefighters for their services. These are services that we depend on for our safety. A local fire department matters to our community. We, as a Council, have been elected to serve the residents. I believe that we are lucky to have the volunteer fire department that we have. If they can make some money helping fight fires and other areas, I support that. To me, that is a really good thing that they can apply their services, and be compensated elsewhere. Again, like I said, I want to see these firefighters feel good to feel respected, and feel honored. So, that said, I support keeping the \$80,000.00 in retention funding, and I am okay if he wanted to make that \$40000 into a midyear review. So, it would be \$40000 for half-year and the midyear review, another \$40000. But, I support those retention funds. I also think that the firetruck, I am not sure why that was in that fight department budgets, but I think that should be moved to the reserve fund called the equipment technology and vehicle reserve fund. As there is \$861,000.00 in there I don't see why that cannot be moved to that place. I and the public are quite eager to hear from the Interim Fire Chief, and looking for to the ad hoc committee's findings

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I like Councilmember Maurer's position of funding half the retention pay to get us through midyear. I think that I don't want to take away something that the fire department has had, and especially I did get a list of call responses for the first quarter, and we had seven members of our volunteer fire department respond in January through March of 100-284 calls. I also agree with Councilmember Maurer that I've never had a problem with the firemen lending their services to Cal Fire, and using our equipment. When I was Mayor last time, we evacuated the City because we were surrounded by fire. So, we all need to be responding, and I am proud of our fire department for responding to outside fires when they happen. So, if they make some money, and the City makes the money, and I do know how that breakdown happens, and we are good community neighbors, that is a plus. So, I will address why think the fire engine in this budget. I believe that is how we have always done it. We have a reserve fund for future needs, but if we know we have a need now, we always move the money into the department budget I believe. I could be corrected on that. But when we needed a police car, I do remember that we moved in when I was on the budget subcommittee, and I think we need to order a fire engine now, which is why it's in the budget. So, no reason to leave it over and reserves, because that is, like, for the future. We need a fire engine ordered now. It takes years to get one built. We seen it with our last order. I think we approved it two years ago. So, that is why that is in the budget. I'm also in favor of adding a fire employee now. I will say that our fire engineer that we are close to replacing who has been off for almost two months. We need a second firemen position. I believe that today, there is a reason to have a \$300,000.00 fund of applied money for the future and stated for a few of the other departments but I think we should fund another fire engineer now. So, that is where I am at. With the savings that we have in the \$300,000 we have set aside for future staffing, we can go ahead and have that. In the meantime while we are still getting our report done, which is likely coming out in September, we can't get any faster, we are moving forward instead of waiting.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: The question I have is just about the morale with the firefighters. I do think it is important for us to understand how the \$80,000 overall impacts the firefighters, and whether or not they respond. I am just concerned about that for those who are not supporting right now

Interim Chief Piccinini commented as follows: Three general points in a final commentary, first of all, it seems that there seems to be a relation or a discussion about all the departments need to sacrifice, but, no work it's done on a street, and no crime gets prevented unless it is done by a fully paid career benefited employee. Our workers get no compensation for many of the things they do. The optics of this is the motivator. It is not demonstrating the levels of respect, honor, and appreciation. It is also challenging as my employees can say no, I have to inspire, influence, I have to ask them to do things, and I have to motivate them. So, unlike the police chief and public works director that can order and direct their employees, I have to do it at a different level. Anything that we can do to stay ahead of the response challenges that we have, again, I cannot support removing the retention pay, and I recommend its reinstatement. I think that the \$40,000, while a good compromise, again, I will be making the same argument midyear, so I would argue, just leave it at the \$80,000, but I respect and appreciate at least coming forward with our compromise.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I am really feeling like what is happening here is we are being requested, the City Council, to make decisions that are premature. I cannot support funding a new position. I just can't support that this

## **Agenda Item Number: 2**

evening. I do not have the benefit of the report that is expected from the ad hoc committee. That report may, in fact, propose something completely different from funding this position that is been proposed by our City Councilmember. I am uncomfortable with that. I am comfortable with the status quo approach. I do really appreciate the \$40,000.00 idea. I'm hoping that we will be seeing an ad hoc report in September. I am hopeful, and it certainly seems to me that \$40,000 and retention pay is going to carry us through to September where we can fully consider all of the proposals from this ad hoc committee. So, I am status quo. We need the full benefit of that reports, and I would hope also that that report could discuss the whole stipend composition structure. Regarding firefighters, what an incredible group of people here that are serving our community. This budget is in crisis mode what we are trying to do is hold tight to make sure we make the right decisions.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I just want to clarify, because I don't want to be misunderstood, I said that I supported maintaining the \$80,000 retention funds, and then I suggested to the \$40,000 be a compromise to hopefully get some other Council members to agree, but that is in no way a reduction of the retention fund. It is a midyear review. It's not a cut at all. So, it is designed at \$40,000 would be \$20,000 a quarter, the same as it always has been, and then reviewed after the ad hoc is done, and reviewed at midyear. That is not a reduction of the offer, it is just a shorter-term. I just did not want to be misunderstood.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: To clarify my proposal, that would be \$40,000.00 to get us through to bid your budgets, and then, at that time, we were having the same debate about whether to continue it or not. So, I would leave my vote for the second \$40,000 to look at the midyear budget, and reanalyze at that point. That is my suggestion. In support of the second firemen, I sat on the fire ad hoc committee, I think, I believe three years ago, it was a recommendation at that time to put two firemen on. We could not afford it. It's in all the records. We discussed it, we added one with always the intent to add a second. That is why I propose that we add the second now. So, continuing the \$40,000, get the second on board.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I also suggested that we take the \$370,000, I think, vehicle out of the fire department budget, and take that straight from equipment technology and vehicle reserve funds. I just want to make sure that that suggestion was on the table as well.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I brought up in the past normally, we are about to make a purchase, we would put it, directly into the budget, for example, police cars in the past like we have this in the fire budget? Or should it really be in the vehicle budget.

Director Kwong commented it can be done either way. Staff stated this is just a deposit not the purchase of the fire engine itself as well as other equipment makes up the \$370,000.

The Council discussed which account the funding for the fire engine should come from and it was requested that it be funded from the equipment reserve fund and also that the purchase of the fire engine will return to the City Council with quotes. The Council also discussed how this impacts the Council reserve policy.

Director Kwong commented because it comes from a designated reserve, it is not part of the assessment Council policy goal of 15%. So, it would actually help our regular general fund budget by that amount of dollars because it is now coming from a reserve savings account, quote unquote, and not from the fire department budget.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: In the context of the fact that we get factored a lot of things none of this right now is bringing in revenues. At this particular point in time, I want to make sure our reserves stay at the highest point we possibly can. So, I am not in favor of reducing our vehicle reserve fund from \$860K to \$490K. I'm not in favor of that.

There was a straw vote of three for support of using the reserve fund for the deposit of the fire engine.

Council removed \$40,000 for additional contract staff. Not in support.

The Council discussed a new employee (firefighter/engineer) for the fire department.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: There are other departments that have staff needs too. Let's remember that our police department has two approved positions that are currently on hold. So, the staff in question is a big question. There are staffing needs in multiple departments.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: Why was the fire engineer position not asked for in the budget.

Interim Chief Piccinini commented as follows: I provided the budget ad hoc and the fire ad hoc committee a staffing report, and appreciating the budget situation, and appreciating the final report forthcoming. I proposed a different approach in terms of phasing, creating phases to achieve ultimately a full-time 24-hour staffing sometime down the road. I came in trying to ask for the expansion of the stipend program. Giving consideration to the forthcoming of the final reports, and again, my recommendations that were in the staffing report the both the budget ad hoc in the fire ad hoc committee has received technically in draft form at this point, but it recommends faced into get to full-time career.

Councilmember Mauer commented as follows: If we had the second position, and your opinion, as read in the newspaper that we did not get fire engines out in January and Fairbury, would we have fire and that on those calls

Interim Chief Piccinini commented as follows: I don't have a crystal ball. I can say unilaterally absolutely that having a person in the fire station, especially there happens to be a stipend firefighter on duty at the time as well, then that assures us getting the engine out the door, number one, to prevent what occurred in January and February free total of six times, and significantly reduces our response time. So, there clearly is leverage in the hiring of an additional 40 hour fire engineer.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I cannot support this because I feel like I don't have enough information, because we do not have the ad hoc fire committee report. They are doing their work. Do we expect to get a report out in September? Is that still a fair estimate?

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: That is the plan.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I'm wondering if there is a way to somehow delay this decision, somehow memorialize it in some manner, delay this decision until we have the benefit of that report

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows: If you decide to fund the firefighter in the middle of the fiscal year, you simply do a budget adjustment at that time to cover the cost of a new firefighter, and then, you have the budget, and you start the process. So, that can happen. It doesn't have to happen on the wintertime. I also wanted to make sure that if there is any confusion, it is perfectly appropriate to add new items during this budget discussion. That is actually the tradition in what occurs everything will budget your, your new items if you have a favorite, and bring it up now. It's perfectly appropriate to budget it if you have support from a majority of the Council. So, it is not an issue, for example, if it was not part of the page, the analysis of the fire department budget, for example, and it is to add a firefighter.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: If we set up a staffing reserve, whatever amount of money ends up in it and the ad hoc fire committee comes back with the report, could the City Council, at that point, make a decision to allocate a certain amount of that amount in the staffing reserve to a firefighter position? Is that something we could do?

City staff stated yes, as long as there is a three vote from the City Council.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: I am not really clear by what you mean. If the Council definitely doesn't approve a second position, if you've already extended an offer based on a decision today, then you're stuck with that offer, right? What happens at midyear?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows: What I understand is we will budget for an additional firefighter in this budget to assign a dollar figure towards that. It is not to initiate the process. However, staff will go

through the steps if three or more approve that idea. Staff will go through the steps to begin the recruitment of a firefighter.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I appreciate the budget subcommittee's idea to put \$300,000 in a staffing fund. However, my idea that I am proposing at full Council discussion is why wait? We need a fireman, let's budget for the fireman. That does not take the amount of the \$300,000. There are probably other needs, which we will discuss we get to another department. But, right now, I am okay with budgeting between \$122,000 - \$140,000 and assign in other position as part of this budget process.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I realized I am sort of the tiebreaker here tonight, and I know that Mayor Hinton and Councilmember McLewis are both on the fire ad hoc committee. So, I respect that they have been working on this issue, and I am guessing that they have more knowledge and information about why this position is important. So, I will agree to fund the fire engineer. I would agree with the \$40,000 additional, since we have moved \$300K out of the fire department budget, I will not take that out of the staffing reserve, but I would ask that that comes right out of the fire department budget.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: I am in favor of all the budget before the committee and Council. Now that we have actually taken some money out of the reserves, we actually have less designated for staffing, and I will agree with the Vice Mayor in the fact that the majority of the Council went ahead and did what they did despite not having final fire report.

There was a 3-2 straw vote for support of the additional firefighter /engineer.

#### **FIRE DEPARTMENT BUDGET COMPLETED.**

Police Department Budget:

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: We discussed this last week with the police chief, I would support unfreezing the position. I think he had someone he would be promoting into that position. I am not sure if there would be an increase in salary for that Sergeant position, but, he would be promoting it internally. I'm not sure of the extra cost. I'm open to discussing the unfreezing of the vacant officer position, which I believe the salary range for that is \$160K to \$230K and taking it from the reserve staffing fund that was set up.

Chief Nelson commented as follows: I do want to make a clarifying point. I spoke a little erroneously last week in regards, I believe I was asked if there is a recruitment that was going to have to take place, and for the sake of transparency, I want to correct that remark. We would do a very brief recruitment for a Sergeant position. Sometime has lagged since we actually conducted the testing process for recruitment, so, there would be some slight fees overall. It will be a tremendous amount. But, we have a brief recruitment period. I would anticipate the internal employee applying, and we did the recruitment last time, it was open for six weeks, and we had one applicant, and it was the internal campaign. So, for the sake of fairness, and to be transparent about my previous remarks, we would have to do a brief recruitment

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: How much do you estimate that?

Chief Nelson commented as follows: It's a matter of running an ad, and getting the word out and some of the trade publications. So probably a couple of thousand dollars.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: Is the real cost, \$264,000.00?

Staff commented it would depend on salary/benefits and whether it is a classic or PEPR employee.

The Council discussed recruitment costs.

The Council discussed budget changes as of this item.

City staff did a recap of the changed budget items.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I will go out on a limb here, and say I want to reduce the staffing reserve fund and apply it to the police position as well. Instead of having a reserve, I want to hire the officer.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: What is the point of spending all the time and all the resources on staffing assessment study that is independent and then we make our own decisions? Part of the budget committee was actually having us go through this staffing assessment to get a realistic update from the people who have been here for years and years and years about what was actually needed, and they were also part of the process of deciding the fact that we actually did need to set up the side for \$300,000. So, right now, I am feeling like this is just a way of, like, \$300,000.00 is just ridiculous, but will have consistent needs, because we do not have an idea where the revenue is going to be coming from. So, we are already going to vote on a budget that will leave us at \$1.4 in a deficit for next year. So, just keep all of that in mind in case we have lost track.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I just want to respond to that. Again, having been on the budget subcommittee for the previous five years, I realize it can be frustrating. You spent a lot of time, you have made your recommendations. But, the rest of us are fully able to also commit with limitations at this level. That is how the process works. We do not need to cut our officers back to 1980 something. I would, rather than saving money in the savings account reserve, I know that we need officers on the street, and that will help eliminate our overtime is afforded by the chief in our discussions last Tuesday night. So, I have to just respond to that. I am sorry, but this is the process now with the full Council where we get to that, and I have not had an opportunity to pitch my ideas, because I do not sit on the budget subcommittee.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: The piece that is missing here but I think the City Council should be aware of is that there were other staffing needs that were discussed at the budget committee level that arose out of the staffing report, and out of discussions with the staff members on the budget committee. Assistance for the City Manager, Assistant City Manager/City Clerk's office, there is a need for support within our Administrative Services department, and unfortunately, even though I agree that these are really legitimate needs that have been discussed so far already here, there are other needs that haven't had an opportunity to be fully heard here at the City Council. So, that was, honestly, the idea behind the \$300,000.00 staffing reserve. We felt that the full City Council needed the benefit of the opportunity to really get a sense of all of the various options, and make a decision, even with the limited funds, about what you could do with that.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: First of all, I appreciate all the time that you all spent on the budget committee. That being said, we all have an equal vote here, and we all have the ability to, you know, to pitch what we feel is important as well for the City. Being on the committee doesn't automatically mean that everybody feels the same way oral vote the same way. This is our time to pitch what we feel strongly about, and second of all, the staffing study, that is for commendations. At the end of the day, we have the consultants I watched on the videos that actually say the police and fire are the top priorities. I cannot support reducing staff with our police department back to the 1980s. I think we can all agree, we do not have the same society that we had in the 1980s. Some days I wish we did, but we don't. I support Mayor Hinton. I just can't imagine putting money in the savings account, and freezing positions. It just doesn't make sense to me. I do a lot of budgeting and staffing, and I just don't know. It just doesn't make any sense to me. So, I support Mayor Hinton in this, and, whether or not is the Sergeant, or the officer position, we can talk about the numbers, but in general, I do not support freezing any of these positions. As a community, we need to rely, again, on our fire and our police, and those of the top priorities, and that is what we owe our community.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I did want to just make one at on comment, and that is, we do know that we have put in this budget amounts to run ballot initiatives. So, again, we have to come up with solutions. It is not that I am just writing blank checks here but I do feel really strongly about this, and understand the two positions is over what the three hundred thousand recommended for the staffing reserve fund.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I would support the unfreezing of the Sergeant position based on the comments from the police chief, but I am also open to unfreezing the vacant officer position.



City staff did a recap of the budget figures as discussed to this point of the agenda item.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: I'm a bit confused about how we went from the staffing reserve fund and freezing positions to now proposing two positions questioned what is designed as safety.

Chief Nelson commented as follows: Responding to 911 calls, albeit not in the most efficient manner, and not having as much staffing to enable us to provide levels of service and lower response times, we will be safe as we can possibly be with that number of officers. However, for every position that you cut, there are impacts, and those impacts may be reduced response times. Not having enough officers on the street to potential breakaway from an ongoing emergency to handle lesser emergencies, or having to rely on outside resources should other emergencies, and when you were dealing with the current situation. It impacts our ability to do some committee-based policing, be more visible, being out on foot patrols, being in the schools, attending community events, things like that while on duty. With 13, it is a minimal level. Is it optimal? No.

The Council discussed unfreezing the Sergeant position.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I want to fully support police and fire, and want to make it clear that I can't support this position, because I feel it's on the back of our administrative staff, and hinders our ability of City Council to support that administrative staff. If not for that, I'd be all in favor.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: We spent 45 hours doing this. We can continue to just roll along, and continue to just borrow money out of our reserves. According to our analysis, we are not going to be able to do that for three years. We can just keep riding along and keep pushing them and pushing them and pushing them, but will be surprised when we can't relieve some of the work of our departments.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I would like to believe that all of our departments are necessary at this stage in the game, as I stated earlier, it will be discussed in future days for this Council. We are making these decisions for today, and for me, for today, is public safety first, and we will backfill as we get funding. I just want to publicly state, I'm not approving these on the backs of other positions, I do think that these are vital tonight, and we will hopefully find more money to fund other positions that are needed as allocated and indicated in that staff survey.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: We have many other departments to go through to see where we are at. We still have many other areas to look at and ask questions about. I support our staff as well. It's just, public safety, at the end of the day, is something that we have to provide. Again, functioning under the idea of the must haves it would be nice to have. I understand we don't want our staff to leave, and I hope it does not happen.

There was a straw vote for three to unfreeze the sergeant position.

## **POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET COMPLETED**

Public Works Budget:

Superintendent Del Prete discussed corrections to his budget.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: There was a letter to the Council talking about the cost of a new dump truck, and I don't see that in your budget. Is there a dump truck in the budget? And if so, can you tell me where it is?

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: Page 106. Public works reductions, streets, the last bullet, 3100. So, that 3100, originally, the vehicle was funded in three separate funds equally, 31,000 in the streets, 31,000 and water, and 31,000 and sewer. What I did is reduce the use of the vehicle, and I moved it half and half into the revenue funds, so notice located in the water and sewer fund. Half-and-half allocation

## **Agenda Item Number: 2**

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I am a little confused. So, you split the cost of a new truck into a couple different places. But, we are talking about reductions here. So, I see. Because he took 31 out and put it into an enterprise fund?

City staff stated it is similar to the fire truck.

The Council discussed past methods of locations in the budget for purchase of vehicles.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: Is this dump truck essential to your services right now this year?

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: I would say it is. It's one of the vehicles that we use for construction. It's a smaller vehicle that is easier to handle load and hand shovel agreement and materials into the side of the vehicle. Now, this is a replacement and vehicle. I sent the original flatbed truck that the vehicle were be replacing to auction this year, with several other vehicles. So, we did receive some compensation for the surplus vehicles that is going to general fund allocations.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: In terms of this, these budget reductions, the one item that I feel that I would like to put back in, or at least partially put back in is the trash contract with it becoming independent. Now, I wrote to them and asked if they would be willing to reduce their services to three days a week, which would be, say, they come five times a week. So, if they reduced it to Monday, Wednesday, Friday, they would be picking up trash three days a week, and that would be instead of \$30,000.00, roughly \$18,000. Or, if they came two days we, say on Monday and Friday and picked up trash, that would be reduced to about \$12,000.00 roughly.

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: Those are the numbers I have. He also discussed the parks fence around the pond and stated that I continue to reach out and work with local service organizations to help fund and possibly construct and provide labor to that fencing.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: Getting back to the parks thing, now I'm really confused. The first one, is it a \$4000.00 removal for the park.

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: The \$25,000 was already removed. It was a typo or a miscalculation of the value in the memo itself.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: On page 106, under parks, it says \$4000. Is that it still what is expected to be there? Is \$6000 still anticipated for the second bullet point instead of something of \$2250?

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: If I can ask you to refer to page 115 in the capital outlay you can see my original request was \$53,800. After I removed the \$47,000, we are left with \$6300. So, the budget calculation sheet is correct, the narrative numbers were wrong.

Councilmember Zollman commented as follows: That is the capital outlay, \$5100 is a budget number. Correct?

Superintendent Del Prete commented that is correct.

Councilmember Zollman commented the \$6300 really does not match the narrative at all.

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: The \$6300 is actually on 116, and an explanation in the capital that I left in their, because we need it, is a replacement mower trailer.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: Discussed Becoming Independent. Regarding trash, if they are not doing it, who will be doing it? Because the idea of having more litter especially downtown, as we are trying to, will be tasked with trying to bring in revenue.

## **Agenda Item Number: 2**

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: What I can say, what I mentioned last Tuesday is first, I want to say that Becoming Independent is a great organization. The employees that they have create a great relationship with our patrons downtown, and with my staff as well. So, it's a great relationship with the City, and it was difficult item to cut, but I look the cuts, it was contract the work related to the health and safety. So, that is where this difficult number came from. I believe I mentioned this last week as well, a lot of the trash the pickup, some of it, a lot of it will be picked up by the street sweeper, some of it will be picked up in the park by public works staff, but I think the downtown tree wells is what I mentioned last week. They do a lot of and removal, because their scope of work they use a lot of tongs and removing stuff by hand with gloves. That is not something machine work does pretty quickly. Downtown, which public works could do periodically, maybe quarterly per year, we will see reduction in service, and I did mention that last week. So, there will be some more trash in the tree wells. So, if there was some funding available, I did do the math for two times a week, which is about \$12,300.00 for two times a week and mentioned three times a week at \$18,000. Those are some options we could look into.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I hesitate to support funding for this very worthwhile organization, but we are doing is zeroing out our committee benefit grants, and not funding some fabulous organizations in town, including, for instance, Senior Center, Chamber, and Sea Serpents. What I'm hearing from you is that in fact, this is not just a charitable donation. The City is getting a benefit. Cleaner streets. So, the question, which to me, now we are talking about a service that is needed, as Councilmember McLewis was pointing out, my question to you would be, two times a week if you get them to focus on the tree wells, will this actually serve the City's needs?

Superintendent Del Prete commented: what I can say is two times a week is a lot better than none. From dealing with the great employees they have, and speaking with them, and touching base with them in whatever point possible, making them feel like they are part of our City team, when there is a lot of trash, they pick up a lot of trash. But, when there is a little bit, they are picking up little bits and pieces. So, I think if there is a couple of days worth of trash, they would pick up whatever they saw

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I might be in favor of a two day a week and this being yet another item that we could revisit at midyear budget if need be if the experience downtown is that it is insufficient. Otherwise, I am in support of all of that. That was the only item I had for discussion in this particular budget.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I am going to weigh in that I don't think I can support this item at this stage. I appreciate that they have been partnered with the City for a long time, and I'm willing to revisit it in the future, including midyear budget review. But, I would like to, I think, at this time, not support this item, and see what we can do in the next six months without it. So, I think that, as it was pointed out, we have zeroed out all of our local community grant organizations that do things that support the community, like Apple Blossom. I just can't support this tonight. I have advocated for positions, but I can't advocate for picking up trash when we have a street sweeper and public works employees, and I'm willing to just try it, and then maybe I am wrong, and then we bring it back. Tonight, I will be voting no on this one.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I believe that we had decided that we are going to be bringing the community grants back to Council to discuss. So, it is not like all of the committee grants are off the table. Now, we are voting on this issue. My understanding is that we are bringing back the committee grants. That is my understanding, and I want the public to hear that, and I'm hoping that the Council hears that we had decided to bring it back at another time. Secondly, if you take away this service, they can get work somewhere else and then, we will lose that possibility. So, this is certainly a reasonable cost for the services they provide, and I do think it is a win-win. I think if you wanted to do a midyear, then, if you want to do two days with a midyear review, you could do a \$6000.00 addition with a midyear review. If you do the full \$12,000, then that is a full year for their services. So, I just want to be clear about those two points.

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: We agreed to bring back committee grants. However, we also have not allocated money to them at this time.

**Agenda Item Number: 2**

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: I am really conflicted about this particular item, and I am looking for some direction. Is there anyone that can provide any additional information on whether this is a meritorious effort to fund this particular item

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: I want to say as a member the Downtown Association, I know that they assess themselves. If the focus is on downtown, this might be something they may consider. We have done it for a really long time, we have never changed it. I don't know the answer if it is going to make a difference or not.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows: I second what Dante was saying. I see that this is more helping a particular organization then getting some benefit from it. That is similar, I think, to how we view the community grants. So, I do think that those items should be seen together.

There was a 3 vote consensus to not fund this contract.

Councilmember McLewis discussed the water/sewer rate study. Mayor Hinton commented that would fall under the enterprise funds.

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT BUDGET COMPLETED:**

**Enterprise Funds:**

City staff commented as follows: All department allocations impact the water and sewer for the cost allocation piece of it. But, as far as the revenue is concerned, staff discussed deficits. Staff discussed allocations. If you are operating a water system is a private business, you have to have all the various staff members whose figures and salaries aren't considered when we allocate, because you would have to have a general manager in the water system. You have to have a finance director for the water system. You would have to have workers in the field who are presently public workers working on things at the water system. You have to pay all those people to be full-time staff members around the water system. So, we do a study to try and allocate the correct figures in terms of how much time is devoted. The softest time working on the water, it is time to run an entire department. You have to run personnel departments. You have to handle litigation. You have to buy supplies. All those various things that you have to do to run a water company, you have a whole infrastructure in place. So, we allocate what we hope is a fair share of that business that we are conducting. So, it basically covers some of the expenses of the staff members that are working, and also sewer.

Councilmember McLewis Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: Do all cities pretty much allocate similarly?

City staff commented as follows: We have studies to show what the appropriate figures are. Yes. All cities do that. So, they can get a lead worker because we are operating a water system. We need to account for that, and reduce what is being paid directly by taxpayers towards my salary. Some of that should be paid by ratepayers who are receiving water service.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: How often are the studies done? When was the last one?

City staff commented best practice, it should be done every five year and commented the last one was 2000. However, if the Council approves the budget tonight's, in the budgets, there is money allocated for a cost allocation study. It is time that we take a look at how we allocate a fraction of all of the departments from general funds to water and sewer, whether that is accurate, too low, too high, it depends. Based on this study. Currently, were trying to address the water conservation where we just had a routes component of the study. The usage went down, which is causing the revenue to be reduced. So, it is been five years since we did that rate study. There has to be justification. I mean, we have to provide them data on how much it costs, and they have to interview departments, and find out exactly what people do.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: Drilling down to what is essential for me on each of these, the water fund and the wastewater fund, is what is the plan? I think we can all see that there is a projected deficit that a substantial by the end of 2024, -5.9% for water, and -28.1% for wastewater. We these funds are in fact intended to support a lot of the budgetary

**Agenda Item Number: 2**

## Agenda Item Number: 2

items that we are looking at approving. So, how are we going to manage to navigate the situation over the course of this fiscal year?

City staff commented as follows: We manage what is necessary. As far as cost allocation between funds, in other words, money is not actually leaving the City until you pay salary and benefits and contractors or vendors. So, we are monitoring this as we go through the rate study. If it is not necessary to transfer out between funds, we will delay.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: The water rate study, I think you have answered this before. But, is it intended to increase rates in order to make us --but is in a healthier position financially these funds for the future, and also collect the funds that might be necessary to do with our deficits?

City staff commented as follows: That is what the rate study is intended to do.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: When do you the new water rates?

City staff commented as follows: We just had a kickoff meeting this morning with the consultant about the rate study. The proposed schedule, it's a bit delayed because we are going into the holiday season. I anticipate that we'll have a water rate increase but January 1st, but it looks like it may be February.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: It feels like the bottom line is that you feel like we will be okay to pay our bills and meet our financial obligations even though we have these deficits showing on these.

Staff stated that is correct.

Mayor Hinton opened for additional public comment.

Patricia commented as follows: I was just curious about the thing about doubling how often they send out the water bills and yes, that would increase the cost of sending out the water bills for copying and postage? It seems to me, there needs to be some analysis there. What percentage of the water bills are currently sent out by mail? It seems like online billing is a potential savings there, so I just wanted to encourage you to actually getting some numbers and data and calculation behind that idea.

Oliver commented as follows: It was copied on the email earlier on this afternoon, which I read pretty thoroughly. I don't understand why they're dancing around the edges of the budget, and talking about these tiny mounds of money we had this huge half million dollars zero deficit. Will be buying a \$19,000 trunk and all of this on talking about stripping together money to fund the best service in that kind of thing? I just wanted to comments while speaking appear, I just thought Councilmember Zollman. Earlier in his discussion of the fire service. I think maybe he should recuse himself from discussions of the fire department. It is seems very inappropriate. I don't know if there is some kind of conflict there, I don't know, but there is something strange going on there. That is my comment.

Linda commented as follows: By the way, I would like to let you know what I was trying to do was a legitimate point of order, which should not be taking up my time for public comment, by the way. Anyways, it just speaks to how well the Mayor listens. But what I was going to do is a point of order. You know that I am computer free, cell phone free, and TV free, and do not have the visual. I do not know who is doing this. I really appreciate it if you'd give me a little bit of clue so I know if I support on what issue. There's that. Additionally, is about the Mayor, I would like to remind you that all firefighters are not men. But, it speaks of her perception of the world, which refers to firemen without realizing is a whole other population that works in the fire department. Lastly, I want to address Councilmember Zollman's response with, it pains me to see him get his knickers in a wad over the fire department. I left my name and phone number, and then he acted like it just never happened. He did not get in touch with me. So, you know, is just amazing how everybody, with the exception of Sandi, you have an international audience from her safety network, and you will just act like it doesn't exist. We are under siege. We are being assaulted by wireless radiation.

## Agenda Item Number: 2

## **Agenda Item Number: 2**

Kate commented as follows: I just wanted to thank the Council tonight for supporting and funding our police and fire department. I have spoken on this numerous times, as you have heard me on previous evenings. So, I just really want to thank you for listening to the community, and for staffing our police and fire department. I think public safety is the number one priority in elected government, and all studies have shown that both departments are understaffed. So, I don't think there is any worry about over staffing them at this point. I am concerned about the relationship between the enterprise fund and the budget. It seems like, because so many staff salaries are being pulled from the enterprise fund, and it is running a huge deficit, that there is a danger of running out of money. The enterprise fund is funded by users, meaning that we don't vote on that. The Council sets water rates, and therefore our water expenses will seem like they are going to be going out quite significantly to bridge these deficits. In addition, it looks like we will have increased garbage rates, and then, I think, you know, given the study, the financial feasibility studies, we will also be looking at partial tax, perhaps, sales tax increase. So, basically, these are all really regressive taxes if you're trying to create a situation for people on fixed incomes, lower income people, increasing water rates, garbage rates, sales tax, those way heavily on people who are coming from lower fixed incomes. So, as you want to pursue an economic situation for people in the working class for utility and property taxes.

Mayor Hinton responded to public comment as follows: I try to watch my words carefully, and I do realize that women are in many of these positions. My only sister started at Sebastopol police, and was a police officer for over 25 years. So, policewoman. I just wanted to make a comment for people that don't know that about me.

### City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: I am curious about the proposed budget, the first line, the residential charges, that they are basically, it looks like, even less than they were in 2020 and 2021. So, my understanding is that one of the rationale for the purchase of the new meters is that they were going to be more accurate, and that the City would be making more money from these meters. So, I think that's a pretty conservative estimate in terms of the proposed budget. So, I'd like to know about that. Page 180. The operating revenue, the first line, operating revenue, uses charges, residential, which is less than 2020 and 2021 actual.

City staff commented it is conversation and a basis on an average of actuals and estimated that we are going to collect \$2M. The meter just came in. So, we don't have a history of usage, and we just came out of a pandemic, and we just started the whole collection recently of that process. I agree that this is conservative, but I don't want to be overly aggressive, and that it does not come in, and then we'll find ourselves short, so, that is the best estimate that I can provide. City staff also discussed the routes and conservation and no shut offs during the pandemic.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: In terms of the water rate study, I would just like to see the timing of that done once all of the meters were in, and you are getting the readings and the charges from that and not to base the water rate study on what is happening now, but for the actual readings on the new water meters. Because I think that they will be different

Mayor Hinton stated she would like to see the rate study done as soon as possible.

City staff commented as follows: We are in the middle of the study and providing data to the consultants. We will have some history. We are going to provide them with the data that they requested, and there will be some history of what the usage will be. The old meter is reading is in cubic feet. So, there's a lot of transition in the back end of the system. There is some of that are still reading in cubic feet. So, there is a lot going on with the water enterprise overall.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: If we are in the middle of it, and we are also in the middle of a switch that gives you disparate information, we then the request to wait until we actually have the water meters going, and we that history. I'm just concerned about confusion with all of those.

City staff commented a follows: What I'm trying to say is that the information, the data that we have is we have provided to the consultant, and they will use that to model the new rate study.

## **Agenda Item Number: 2**

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: I understand that. But what I'm saying is, based on everything I have heard as well, with the smart meters, that we will have more accurate readings. So, wouldn't it make sense to actually do the study on what we are going to have going forward in the future versus doing our study on old information that is not going to be around.

City staff commented as follows: The information you have now is in cubic feet. But, there is a conversion to see what that would look like in gallons.

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: I'm not worried about how it is being measured. I'm worried about whether or not we will have more accurate information about usage with the new meters, which mean that we would actually be making our decisions based on the current system that we are going to have from now until the future versus what we did in the past, which may not have been quite as accurate. If you're basing people's rates on information, it should be the most accurate information. Are the smart meters still being installed or are they finished.

City staff commented as follows: They should be finished soon. I think the last report a week or two ago, we had 800 left that was the figure. In the one hand, we need to do a rate study as soon as possible so we can start collecting for capital improvement projects that we know are going to take place, and we need to be proactive about that. I consider that with the new meters will do is be speculative. Rinsing our old meters are inaccurate, we are not saying we were charging the wrong amounts, just some of them were old, and getting worn, so they needed to be replaced for what could be the new meters. They could be little bit more accurate than the old meters. But we felt, we need to start the rate study as soon as possible, because we need the money, since our funds are in a deficit situation. So, you can juggle the two and come up with some perfect scenario. So, I started the rate study.

Vice Mayor Rich commented as follows: We need the revenue, we need to get the study done from my perspective. I see a real downside to delaying this.

City staff commented as follows: Discussed the requirement of monthly billing. The revenue is based on the financial data of how much we collect. The money, the revenue, the income coming into the water system, and the sewer system, you know, winter average base charges, and, you know, staff time expenditures, that is with the right model is based on. Is not based on how much it is reading. So, as far as weather is accurate or inaccurate, the smart meters, what I will say is that it will detach, now that we want to and would like to go from bimonthly to monthly, it will detect early leaks, as you know that we have old infrastructure in the City. So, rather than getting your bill every 60 days, you're getting your bill every month. It's early detection. Staff is doing billing monthly anyway, but we divided the City into two different cycles, and it is really time-consuming. Once a year, we do winter average, and it has this to keyless complexity of a span, because there is two different cycles. So, this a lot of manual process going into all of these calculations

Councilmember McLewis commented as follows: As a Councilmember and as a citizen here, I am frustrated that we have allowed ourselves to get into the situation with the infrastructure and everything else. I mean, it just seems like poor management to me.

Vice Mayor rich commented as follows: This is an opportunity for me to apply to a comment by the public. We all get passionate about these issues. We just saw Councilmember McLewis get passionate about an issue. So, the member of the public who criticized one of us were being overly passionate, we were elected here to speak on behalf of the citizens, and we do get passionate about our issues. Honestly, I think that most citizens appreciate that passion, which we hear from all of us. So, a cautionary note to the public, there is goodness behind the passion. It is centered on community service.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: Just to be clear, my understanding is that the justification for the new meters was increased funding. It would be to raise money. So, if there is more revenue being collected from the residence, and you're basing the rates model on old rates, then our residents could be getting double charged, or charged more, because you have a new rate study that is based on old information. I think what I was saying earlier, I think I was trying to say, I want to protect our residents water rates. So, if we will do a study, it seems important that the study is based on what the new meters are doing.

**Agenda Item Number: 2**

**City Council Meeting Packet of: July 18, 2023**

**Page 23 of 27**

Mayor Hinton commented as follows: The Council voted on the issue, as I was on Council, that is one of only a variety of things that I took into consideration when I place my vote. So, I will just say that, again, I stand by the position that the City has undertaken the water study rate study. We need to get it done sooner versus later, and I'm confident that we can figure calculations.

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: I wanted to touch on two points that I think will add some understanding to the issue. Yes, the meters that were replaced were over 10 years old. So, they will read more accurately. They are for generating revenue. That being said, we are collecting data now, and we have from these new meters, this rate study won't be completed for a few months, so you will have a few months of data from the new meters to utilize in order to calculate the rate study fees. So, yes on both accounts. I hope that clarifies the question.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: Will that rate study also include data from the old meters? Or is it 100% the new meters?

Superintendent Del Prete commented as follows: I will have to talk to the consultant about that. I don't know. I would be a good question for the consultant. But, we will have months of data from the new meters that should be entered into the system

Mayor Hinton discussed the opt out program.

Councilmember Maurer commented as follows: The opt out does not give the resident the old meter. Everyone is going to have a new meter. The opt out only takes away the antenna. Everybody gets a new meter.

**MOTION:**

Councilmember Maurer moved and Councilmember Zollman seconded the motion to approve the following:

- a. Approval of Resolution Approving and Adopting Fiscal Year 2023-2024 City of Sebastopol Budget with the following changes:

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| \$3250.00   | Reduction of Conferences in Council budget                        |
| \$3000.00   | Reduction of Community Benefit Grant Funding                      |
| \$15,000.00 | Recruitment firm for City Manager recruitment                     |
| \$45,000.00 | Salary reduced to \$240,000.00                                    |
| \$40,000    | Retention Pay for Fire Department                                 |
| \$140,000   | Fire Engineer Position to be Funded by 300K Staffing Reserve Fund |
| \$300,000   | Fire Truck funding to be taken from Vehicle Reserve Fund          |
| \$264,000   | Sergeant Position – to be funded by 300K Staffing Reserve Fund    |
| \$7500.00   | Recruitment for Fire  |
| \$7500.00   | Recruitment for Police  |
|             | Not fully funded from Staffing Reserve                            |

- b. Approval and Adoption of Resolution establishing the appropriations limit for the City of Sebastopol for the 2023-2024 pursuant to Article XIII B of the California Constitution;

c. Adoption of Resolution Approving Supplemental Law Enforcement Funds (SLEF);

d. Approval and Adoption of Resolution Authorizing and Approving the City of Sebastopol Current Pay Rates and Ranges (Salary Schedule)

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

**VOTE:**



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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved the Following:

a. Approval of Resolution Approving and Adopting Fiscal Year 2023-2024 City of Sebastopol Budget with the following changes:

- \$3250.00 Reduction of Conferences in Council budget
- \$3000.00 Reduction of Community Benefit Grant Funding
- \$15,000.00 Recruitment firm for City Manager recruitment
- \$45,000.00 Salary reduced to \$240,000.00

- \$40,000 Retention Pay for Fire Department
- \$140,000 Fire Engineer Position to be Funded by 300K Staffing Reserve Fund
- \$300,000 Fire Truck funding to be taken from Vehicle Reserve Fund
- \$264,000 Sergeant Position – to be funded by 300K Staffing Reserve Fund
- \$7500.00 Recruitment for Fire
- \$7500.00 Recruitment for Police
- Not fully funded from Staffing Reserve

b. Approval and Adoption of Resolution establishing the appropriations limit for the City of Sebastopol for the 2023-2024 pursuant to Article XIII B of the California Constitution;

c. Adoption of Resolution Approving Supplemental Law Enforcement Funds (SLEF);

d. Approval and Adoption of Resolution Authorizing and Approving the City of Sebastopol Current Pay Rates and Ranges (Salary Schedule)

Minute Order Number: 2023-163

Resolution Numbers: 6544-2023; 6545-2023; 6546-2023; 6547-2023

2. Continuation: Public Hearing – To conduct a Public Hearing on Capital Improvement Program Budget for FY 2023-2024 and Approval of Resolution Approving a Capital Improvement Program Budget for FY 2023-2024 (Responsible Department: Engineering Director)

Toni Bertolero, GHD, presented the agenda item recommending the City Council Receive the agenda item and presentation, ask questions of Budget Committee, City Staff or City Department Directors; open the public hearing; discuss and consider approval and adoption of the FY 23 24 Capital Improvement Program Budget.

Mayor Hinton opened for questions of staff.

The Council discussed the following:

- Ned Kahn art project
- Housing linkage fund
- Parklets Costs/Insurance
- Concept design for parklets costs
- Discussed sponsorship/funding from downtown businesses for parklets
- Discussed Caltrans requirements and costs
- Parklets will return as a separate agenda item
- Discussion of general funds versus other funds for funding of projects (listed in the CIP report)

Mayor Hinton opened the public for public comment. FY 23 24 Capital Improvement Program Budget

**Agenda Item Number: 2**

Linda commented as follows: I object to this, but the point is, your project and so forth, it is ironic about the A.D.A. that you are making pads and stuff for people in wheelchairs and totally ignoring a lot of the rest of us, a growing number of people like myself and everybody, who is being adversely affected by the microwave radiation, which this wonderful City Council and this wonderful mayor has ushered into this town, and at the cost of two point \$2 million and in opposition to our general plan, which calls for the reduction of exposure to electromagnetic fields. The whole thing is ludicrous. You are telling the City, you're making a lot more business for the fire departments and that EMTs who are responding to a lot more calls for heart attacks because the heart is an electrical organ. All of this all of its microwave radiation and electrifying of this town is just adding to it. Plus, not to mention the cancer. So you are all contributing, not everybody, Sandi is the exception. Mayor you are maintaining your ignorance and keeping your hand in the sand. Anyway, you need to, look on Sandi's safety network, there are thousands of papers on this. It just speaks to the success of the telecoms who have kept you clueless about how wireless networks have consequences. You need to speak up and fight back and not go along with their programs because it was designed for their profit at our expense.

City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:

There was no further discussion.

**MOTION:**

Mayor Hinton moved and Councilmember Maurer seconded the motion to approve FY 23 24 Capital Improvement Program Budget as discussed with changes corrections as noted by staff.

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

**VOTE:**

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

**City Council Action:** Approved the FY 23 24 Capital Improvement Program Budget as discussed with corrections as noted by staff.

**Minute Order Number:** 2023-164

**Resolution Number:** 6548-2023

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** Three 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.

There was no additional public comment.

The items below were not discussed

**ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

June 27, 2023 Meeting will be adjourned to the Regular Meeting of July 18, 2023 at 6:00 pm (In Person and Remote/Zoom Virtual Meeting Format).

Please note: The City Council Meeting of Tuesday, July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2023 has been cancelled.

Mayor Hinton adjourned the City Council Meeting of June 27, 2023 at 11:22 pm to the Meeting of July 18, 2023 at 6:00 pm (In Person and Remote/Zoom Virtual Meeting Format).

Please note: The City Council Meeting of Tuesday, July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2023 has been cancelled.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary C. Gourley

