

Minutes
AMENDED SPECIAL
CITY COUNCIL/SUCCESSOR
AGENCY/PUBLIC FINANCE AUTHORITY
MEETING AGENDA
July 10, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Garcia called the meeting of July 10, 2013 to order.

Council Members Present: Lander, Oxborrow, Ramsey, Keough, Garcia

Others Present: City Manager Rene Ramirez, City Attorney Avedisian-Favini, Assistant to the City Manager Shannon Jensen, Police Chief Cal Minor, Fire Chief Steve Henry, Finance Director Mari Jimenez, Assistant Community Development Director Sean Brewer, Senior Administrative Analyst Mercedes Garcia, Police Detective Bolles, City Treasurer Olga Keough, City Clerk Wanda Earls

1. Changes to the Agenda

City Manager Ramirez indicated that Closed Session Item 4 is pulled.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Garcia lead the Council and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. AWARDS, PRESENTATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND PROCLAMATIONS

1. CM Construction - Palmer Reservoir Project Update, Jerry Lemus

CM Construction Services, Inc.:

A PowerPoint presentation was given showing reservoir progress:

Progress:

- *Reservoir has been completed and tank is online.

- *All bacteria and leak tests passed successfully.

- *Piping cut over's from the old tank to the new tank were successfully completed.

- *New fence enclosure for both tanks has been installed.

- *Final grading is complete at all project earthwork locations.

- *Contractor is currently finalizing all closeout documentation and as-built drawings to run over to the City.

- *Utilities - New electrical service pedestal and electrical equipment shed was installed and power to the new tank and existing equipment is complete.

Project Financials:

- * Original Contract Sum: \$2,650,000

- * Change Orders:

- * Change Order #1 - \$31,793.66

This change order consisted of the addition of two butterfly valves to avoid 3 or more days without water supply during the cut-over process, and for future water district maintenance benefits. Four weeks were added to the project for material procurement.

Schedules:

- * Overall Project was substantially completed on May 28, 2014, with exception to a couple punch list items that were finalized on June 13, 2014.

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Mr. Glenn Adams, 420 Joaquin Street, Former Council Member:

Does the City need to be spending \$15K on a chance for gratuities? The City needs to keep open minded on jobs, impact fees and building. Coalinga used to go out and try to bring in businesses. There are companies who have not decided on a place to do business. We are in the center of California and an ideal place. Look at the CCF, Industrial Park, etc. Lets look at them and invite them to look at us. Go after business!

Mr. John Cicerone, Warthan Place Apartments:

He indicated he is one of those out-of-town business owners. He is here to update you on the Warthan Place Apartments and share with you a little good news. He is one of those business people who will be pulling permits and spending money. A few years ago the Council, in 2009 or 2010, was one of the cities which responded to us and, ultimately, this opened up a piece of property which is now Warthan Place Apartments on Sacramento Street.

Last summer we worked to finalize our approval of entitlements and the Council was gracious enough to have the foresight to grant us a portion of your housing bond proceeds. After the City had worked for quite a longtime for this approval, we were successful in June in securing our Tax Credit allocations toward the Warthan Place Apartments. That was a major hurdle for us though not the last hurdle. His expectations is that they will be pulling permits toward the end of this year with construction to begin the first part of next year when we will begin pulling the permits. Construction should take about one year and should be up sometime in 2016. When he receives his permits at the end of the year, he will be back before you and for that, he wants to thank you!

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Introduce and Waive First Reading of Ordinance No. 776 (Amending Article 9 of the Coalinga Municipal Code related to Planning and Zoning)

Sean Brewer, Assistant Community Development Director

Assistant Community Development Director Sean Brewer:

I. RECOMMENDATION:

Introduce and waive the first reading of Ordinance No. 776 related to the comprehensive update to Article 9 of the Coalinga Municipal Code which deals with all planning and zoning related regulations. This ordinance will replace Article 9 in its entirety.

II. BACKGROUND:

In July 2009 the Coalinga City Council adopted the General Plan Update. The updated plan established several policies and implementation measures to meet the intended goals of the City to ensure clear and orderly growth within and adjacent to the City over the next several years. The General Plan establishes long-term goals, policies, and implementation measures for the City's future, and the Zoning Ordinance implements those parts of the plan related to development.

State law requires that the each city's Zoning Ordinance be consistent with its General Plan. The Coalinga Zoning Ordinance pre-dates the newly adopted General Plan, having not been updated for over 20 years except for piecemeal amendments. The Zoning Ordinance must be updated so that it is consistent with the General Plan, and so that new development reflects the goals and objectives of the new General Plan.

Over the course of the last two years the Community Development Department for the City of Coalinga has been working on a comprehensive zoning code update in order to ensure consistency with the recently adopted 2025 General Plan. The Zoning Ordinance Update implements the sustainable and smart growth vision of the City's 2025 General Plan, including new Zoning Districts to implement the Land Use Element. The Zoning Ordinance Update also presents an opportunity for the City to update its Ordinance language, align with State laws, and reorganize the document for easier comprehension. Modifications to implement Housing Element programs to comply with State Law have been included, to allow the City to qualify for a Streamlined Housing Element Update process in the 2014-2022 update cycle. As part of the Sustainable Communities Grant, the City of Coalinga collaborated with Fresno COG and their circuit planners provided an audit of the draft zoning ordinance of the City of Coalinga to determine the draft ordinance's consistency with the 12 smart-growth principles of the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint. Comments have been provided from the Circuit Planners and their recommendations have been included within the appropriate sections of the draft.

During the course of the development of the draft document, staff has worked closely with the Planning

Commission and stakeholders by holding bi-weekly Planning Commission meetings in order to discuss each chapter of the draft in depth and obtain feedback for changes. In addition, staff has conducted multiple Council workshops to discuss the working document to ensure a well and informed collaborative process during its development. The (30) day public review began on March 24, 2014 and to this date we have not received any comments related to the draft document. The document was available at the Chamber of Commerce, Public Library, City Hall and on the City of Coalinga's website.

On April 22, 2014 the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the draft zoning ordinance update and adopted Resolution No. 014P-002 recommending adoption by the City Council.

Blaze is here from Metropolitan Planning and he will provide you a brief overview of each chapter and how it is going to be structured.

Blaze, Metropolitan Planning:

A PowerPoint presentation is given detailing the following:

The main highlights of the Draft Zoning Ordinance are organized by Chapter headings below. All Chapters are attached for your review and comment. The summaries below will help in your facilitation of the content provided in the attachments.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This section lays out the goals and objectives of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as the 12 Smart Growth Principles of the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint that the Zoning Ordinance implements. The Definitions section now includes Use Classifications (i.e. definition of land uses allowed in a specific Zoning District) for ease of reference.

Chapter 2: Zoning Districts and Allowable Land Uses

The Zoning Districts implement the Land Uses laid out in the General Plan Update, for example, the new Mixed Use Zoning District, which implements the Mixed Use Land Use designation in the General Plan. Tables showing permitted uses and general development standards help readers to know at a glance which uses are allowed, and what the development standards are. In particular, transitional setbacks between Residential and Commercial or Manufacturing Districts have been described and illustrated. Please note that height limits are based on the height limits of existing Zoning, but are not a direct match to existing heights due to the inclusion of new Zoning Districts. The height limit for Residential High Density (RHD) is now at 50 feet to support the density range prescribed in the General Plan, while allowing flexibility in building design.

Chapter 3: Special Districts and Overlays

This chapter implements the Special and Overlay Districts in the General Plan, including the Downtown District Overlay, Flood Hazard Overlay, Gateway Overlay, Master Plan Overlay, Planned Development District, and Resource Extraction Overlay. The Downtown District and Gateway Overlays are tools to focus on building and streetscape design of specific areas in the City. The Flood Hazard Overlay addresses environmental constraints, and the Resource Extraction Overlay acknowledges and protects existing resource extraction activities.

The Master Plan Overlay and Planned Development District are important tools that guide the development of larger land areas and properties according to smart growth principles. Key features of these tools include the push to preserve or create open space, cluster rather than spread out development, provide connections to the rest of the City, and require fiscal impact analyses to identify long-term costs and benefits to the City. These tools are also tied to the requirements of base districts in the Zoning Ordinance to avoid creating mini-zoning-codes out of every new Planned Development or Master Plan application.

Chapter 4: Development Standards and Signage

Measurement standards have been described and illustrated to assist applicants and property owners to determine measurements such as building height and lot coverage. This Chapter also takes the City requirements for various aspects of a development project, such as landscaping, lighting, and screening, and groups them into a single go-to section under Development Standards. These standards are currently described in separate sections of the existing Zoning Ordinance. Included in this section are development standards for applicants and owners related to signage and the regulations that are placed on the location, size and shape of signs throughout the City.

Chapter 5: Specific Uses

This section details such requirements for specific uses, including findings for approval and standards for operations. The text has been updated to include Golf Courses and Country Clubs, Solar Power Generating Facilities, Housing Element requirements for Emergency Shelters and Single Room Occupancy facilities. The Telecommunication facilities section is consistent with the 2012 Job Creation Act to streamline approvals for qualifying modifications to telecommunication facilities.

“NEW MATERIAL” TEMPORARY FARMING: During the course of the development of the draft document, the City received an application for a zoning text amendment related to approving temporary farming activities on primarily residentially zoned land with a minimum land size of 20 acres. After discussion with the applicant, staff is in support of such a regulation and has attached the recommended draft language as part of this process. There are a few locations in the City where farming has historically occurred and development has since been planned however, nothing has moved forward in terms of physical development and land owners have wanted to farm until development occurs in an effort to utilize the land and/or maintain dust and weed control.

Chapter 6: Code Administration

Chapter 6 provides guidance to public administrators as well as interested applicants on the required process and City’s expectations for various planning applications. A chart clearly shows the approving authorities for different types of projects. Criteria, findings, and potential conditions of approval are included for development certainty and the predictability of outcomes. The environmental review process is also explained in this section.

Chapter 7: Subdivisions

This chapter was updated to be consistent with the latest Subdivision Map Act, and provides guidance on the subdivision process. Smart growth principles and basic design standards have been included in this chapter.

Chapter 8: Floodplain Management Ordinance

This chapter was reorganized based on the existing Floodplain Management Ordinance. The purpose is to provide review standards for proposed development within flood zones.

We received a grant for \$100K (cannot understand words) Planning Commission Meetings to adopt the draft document (cannot understand words) On March 24 the review draft went out (cannot understand words) Upon its adoption it would go into effect on September 7th (30 days). In August will start working with the City to draft commercial/residential design guideline which we aim to complete in January of next year. This concludes his presentation.

Mr. Brewer:

This project has been fully funded through the Sustainable Community's Grant the City received. The fiscal impact to the adoption of this ordinance is undetermined at this time as the implementation of the ordinance will not be evident until it has been in place for a period of time.

Staff would like to entertain any questions or comments from the Council. The document before you and attached to the staff report is very similar to the document we discussed at a workshop. He tried to overview the item within the document.

Mayor Garcia indicated it appears to be a very thorough document. Thank you and the Planning Commission for all the hard work.

Council Member Lander said he would like to compliment staff and the Planning Commission for all the hard work. It is very tedious to go through all of this document. He very much appreciates all the hard work that has been done. It is nice to see this coming to completion.

Mayor Garcia said this is a public hearing and he asked for any comments in reference to this Ordinance. There was no one wishing to speak.

*Motion made to Introduce and Waive First Reading of Ordinance No. 776 (Amending Article 9 of the Coalinga Municipal Code related to Planning and Zoning) Made by Council Member Lander, Seconded by Mayor Pro-tem Keough. Motion **Approved** by a 5/0 Roll-call Vote: Lander, Keough, Oxborrow, Ramsey, Garcia.*

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

Council Member Keough pulled Item 2 Check Register:

He notices two things where he would like clarification. There was a check no. 475802 to NTU Technology

WP Protec for \$35,948. He is curious as to what that is?

City Manager Ramirez said that was at the Water Treatment Plant and it is part of the treatment process. We put this material into the water to settle out materials that are floating in there.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough asked about check No. 47600 to Winter Chevrolet for \$66,747.01. It stands out. Finance Director Mari Jimenez said the actual check amount was for \$30,501. It is a sum total because it was the last check.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough wants to ask the Treasurer what he is reading. He would like to hear from the Treasurer what the debt part is on this report.

Treasurer Keough said the Treasurer's Report list all the City funds. About 1/3 down it shows beginning balance as of July 1st and for the period from July 1 and ending on the 31st.

Mayor Pro-Tem Keough said when he sees \$411,370 in the red. What is that saying to him?

Treasurer Keough said it is the ending balance as of May 31st. However, a couple days ago we received the Audit Report and the beginning balance for July 1st has been changed. On her report she says it shows \$730,000 according to the Audit Report, if she reads it correctly, it is negative \$1.9M dollars. Income for the General Fund \$5.6M in income through May 31 with expenses of \$6.7M. So expenses exceeded revenue by \$1M.

The debit actually belongs to the State so basically (cannot understand wording)

Finance Director Jimenez said the General Fund reported in the financial statement is, overall, the funds presented as general funds. It is not specific to the General Fund debt. The Treasurer's Report is only part of it. The General Fund encompasses the General Fund, Habitat Fund, Police Dept Fund and the Claremont Fund. It is not specific to the General Fund. We still have to update the ending balance but we did not have the audited number completed. The audit statements show this as a long-term obligation from the Successor Agency that it is entrusted with. It is the States obligation. Every six months we have to report loss obligations. Every six months they will send us approval of that loss.

City Treasurer Keough said she has a question. Are you going to adjust it and combine it with Claremont Custody?

Finance Director Jimenez said it is not going to be combined.

Mayor Garcia said he pulled item 6 Notice of Completion for the Plaza. He really has no complaints. His only issue is with the benches, a couple of them are damaged. He is wondering about any warranty and guarantee?

Mr. Brewer said we were disappointed in the quality of the metal provided for the benches. We worked with the manufacturer represented and we actually have all new benches setting in the Public Works yard. All were replaced at no cost to the City. They will be a steel cable style and they are practically indestructible. They will be a little different color. They also said to basically keep the ones we have. We are working out a way to get those installed.

Council Member Ramsey said he only brought up Item 5.9 to advise the public that the City will be accepting credit cards for payment at the City Hall and/or on the City Website.

*Motion to Approve Consent Calendar Items 1.,2.,3.,4. 5.,6.,7.,8.,9.,10., and 11 Made by Mayor Pro-tem Keough, Seconded by Council Member Ramsey. Motion **Approved** by a Roll-call (5/0) Vote: Keough, Ramsey, Oxborrow, Lander, Garcia.*

1. Minutes - June 9, 2014 (Special)
2. Check Register: 05/01/2014 - 05/31/2014
3. Monthly Treasurer's Report - May 2014
4. Water Use Through June 2014
5. Adoption of the City of Coalinga Bid Protest Procedures
6. Notice of Completion for the Plaza Beautification Project
7. Notice of Completion for the Proposition 1B ADA Accessible Ramps Project

8. Approval For Fire Dept. to enroll and participate in CAL-Card
9. Adoption of Resolution No. 3647 – Convenience Fee to Enable Paymentus Corporation to Provide the Service of Credit Card Payments for Utility Billing Customers
10. Adoption of Resolution No. 3648, Requesting the Board of Supervisors Of the County of Fresno to Consolidate and Canvass the Election and Permit the County Clerk of Fresno County to Render Specified Services to the City of Coalinga Relating to the Conduct of the Municipal Election to be Held in the City of Coalinga, November 4, 2014 and Appropriating Funds to Pay for Said Services
11. Adoption of Resolution No. 3649, Approving the Provisions of Elections Code Section 10229 Relating Appointments to the City Council in the Event of a Lack of or Insufficient Nominees

6. ORDINANCE PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

1. Presentation of the FY13 Financial Statements by the City Auditor

Bryant Jolley, CPA Auditor

Mr. Bryant Jolley, Auditor:

He is here this evening to present for your review the Audited Financial Statements for the City of Coalinga for the year ending June 30, 2013. As usual he would like to point out a number of highlights and please feel free to ask questions.

On the first page of the Financial Statements is our audit opinion. It is still an unqualified opinion which is the highest opinion we can give which indicates we are in agreement with the correctness of the presentation of the Financial Statements contained in the General Ledger of the City.

On Page 7 is the Statement of Changes and Fund Balances Revenues and Expenditures commonly referred in business as the Profit and Loss. On this is reported the major funds which fall within certain definitional terms. The General Fund is always there. The second major fund is the Coalinga Public Finance Authority and the other governmental funds are combined on Page 34, 35.

Of most interest is usually the General Fund. As you see there are revenues of \$6M plus, expenditures of \$7.7M leaving a net deficient of \$1.570M.

He would like to point out (the Treasurer commented a little on this) at the second to the bottom line, you will see the retained earnings were restated. That was due to a change in accounting principles. Claremont is no longer operating and has no special restrictions. It is a good idea because there is no way that deficient would ever be covered by anything other than the General Fund. Even if Claremont did kick back up, it is truly a General Fund enterprise. That presented a substantial hit to the beginning rate fund balance combined with the current year deficient, takes us through the \$2M General Fund deficient.

On Page 10 are the operating statements for the Enterprise Funds which are counted as any form of business would, on the accrual basis. The definition of enterprise fund is that operating expenses are to be offset via user charges. These numbers are fairly comparable to the prior year. They are holding their own when you back out depreciation which is a non-cash item. On the other hand, depreciation needs to be offset at some point because it is an indication of wear and tear of fixed assets. At some point, you will have to have funds available to replace equipment and property.

The Natural Gas had some slippery over the prior year and ended the year with a deficient of \$255K. Over a ten year period the Natural Gas Fund as performed quite nicely. The overall fund balance is still over \$2.8M which is quite substantial. The water and sewer rates are always items plaguing any government because your operating costs go up on a monthly or annual basis. Cities don't react quickly because of Prop. 218.

You will have to address this at some time and perhaps you are in the process of addressing it now.

The other item is the whole RDA issue is you are hired by the State to manager this fund. The reason you show all the debt and not the revenue is because we have to report all the debt. The revenue is actual the tax increments that are going to come over the next fifteen - twenty years. We can't really accrual the property taxes because that is not a known number. We have the right to that income. That is why that fund will

always be a negative until the final date of termination when the last property tax comes in to pay off that debt. That is a common thing to see a \$6-7M deficient in that account. Even less reason to worry about it, is it is not yours.

The other funds are all operating at a profit as he anticipates. He has no comments. The remaining special revenue capital funds and a couple of small very immaterial deficient and are all in the positive and operating as intended.

Council Member Oxborrow asked about the Coalinga Public Financing Authority showing \$107K to the good and a balance at the end of the year of \$1.8M.

Mr. Jolley said the Public Finance Authority was set-up to try to a common scales on selling bonds. You took in West Hills College but City of Selma and all of these water and RDA bonds and thereby you were able to sell one big bond as opposed to six small bonds. The PFA when doing that is set up to make a little bit of profit but more important, as time went along, the PFA refinanced their bonds to get a better return where existing RDA bonds stayed where they were. Because of that, overtime, you are building up somewhat of a surplus in there and at some future time that surplus might be available. As you are aware when the State took the RDAs back, the three bonds and the RDA bonds belonging to the Police Department totally about \$400K. The State stated because of various things, leases not being paid and vice versa, that those bonds wouldn't be funded by the tax increments that we talked about earlier. A trust payment for the RDA (the money is coming from the property taxes) in essence the State turns around and pays the money back to a PFA to pay these other underlining bonds. There are three smaller bonds of about \$400K which will have to be absorbed by the PFA. That may be a major point of concern. As you know it has been a difficult road with the RDA dissolution.

Council Member Oxborrow asked if those monies are in the General Fund Account.

Mr. Jolley indicated those monies are not in the General Fund but in a PFA account. In reality, if all the bonds got paid off, there would be a certain amount left over that would transfer back to the General Fund. You cannot spend that money today.

Treasurer Keough said she has a couple of questions. (Cannot understand wording).

Mr. Jolley said that is a good question. Are you asking how the excess expenditures throughout the year affect the General Fund. Although we have in essence twenty different companies, we don't have twenty bank accounts. All the funds are comingled together. That is why the General Fund might have a deficient. The City is not out of money. What happens is, at the end of the year, we are required to show that as an inter-fund transfer back and forth. If you look on the Balance Sheet on Page 5, you see "due to other funds" under liabilities the General Fund has a \$2.5 liability. Our cash is zero when in fact the cash should be a negative figure. The reason the \$2.5M doesn't tally out to the \$1.9M is because you have other assets and liabilities that work together. By looking at this right now, the General Fund cash is in the hole \$2.5M. We used to show the \$2.5M negative and he feels that is much more beneficial, but powers over his head changed that and said we had to report it as a inter-fund loan.

Treasurer Keough asked the City about the liabilities, in the next couple of years, if no major change happens.

Mr. Jolley said if the City continues with current spending, of a negative of \$1.5M, the answer is "no". If he doesn't bring the Enterprise Funds in and not counting fiscal agent cash, there was only \$4M. In theory within three years, the City would be out of money. You have the Enterprise Funds which are somewhat cash-rich. The City cannot continue the way they are going. The only way to fix this is an increase in revenues or decrease in expenditures. The problem with increasing expenditures you would have to go back for a vote of the citizens which you could do as a special tax or general tax, etc. You are not the State, you can't do things unilaterally; you cannot pass it on to anyone else. The buck stops with the City and the City would have to reduce expenditures. He knows the City administration is aggressively already doing that with the department heads. Claremont will potentially get us out of this. Who could have foretold that after two or three years, Claremont is still setting vacant. You have to plan on the worse and hope for the best. You can always build things back up but right now you have to cut, cut, cut.

Treasurer Keough asked if the City has a fiscal emergency.

City Attorney Avedisian-Favini said there are findings the City Council could make, it is actually a legislative decision to declare a fiscal emergency. It has not been done; it is a decision of the Council.

Mr. Jolley said he would like to thank Mari and Rene for all the help extended to us. Staff has been cut in

the finance department and Mari continues to do a very good job helping us. With Rene on board, in dealing with them and the attitudes they have towards reducing these expenditures (cannot understand words) things should get better for the finances of the City.

2. Future Agenda Item - Council Meeting Start Time

Rene A. Ramirez, City Manager

City Manager Ramirez said this was brought up by Mayor Pro-tem Keough so he would like to turn it over to him for explanation.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said he wanted to bring this up because he wasn't sure why we start at 7:00. He is the last guy hired here so there might have been a really good reason from the past. He sees special meetings starting 5:30 and 6:00 PM and he thinks we could start earlier so we can get home earlier and not have as hard a time waking up the next morning to our regular lives. He is sure staff would appreciate that as well. He would like to ask the Council what they would think about starting the meetings at 6:00 PM?

Council Member Lander said he would have no problem.

Council Member Oxborrow said he would have no problem but, obviously, Mayor Garcia would have a problem getting back here by that time.

Mayor Garcia said he is on the job until 5:30 PM.

Council Member Oxborrow said as long as they have been here it has been starting at 7:00 PM.

Mr. Glenn Adams said most people get off work at 5:00 and starting at 7:00 allows you to get home shower and eat dinner. Ninety percent of the people would want the 7:00 meeting time. The majority of people expect a 7:00 PM meeting.

Council Member Lander said he asked several mayors at COG and generally they said they had it at 7:00 PM. One of the reasons was to accommodate the general public should they choose to attend a Council Meeting.

City Manager Ramirez said the idea of the future agenda process is so if a council member brings something up, the Council discusses and then gives direction to the City Manager. The time the Council meets is set by you. If your desire to change the meeting start time, he would prepare a Resolution and come back at the next meeting so you can vote on the time.

Consensus of the Council is to continue to meet at 7:00 PM.

3. Approve Design Engineering Task Order and Preliminary Budget for Phase 3 of the Elm Ave Beautification Project (Elm/SR 198 from 7th Street to Polk Street)

Sean Brewer, Assistant Community Development Director

Assistant Community Development Director Sean Brewer:

Staff is requesting approval of the Task Order to work with our City Engineer to begin preparing preliminary design for Stage 3 of our Elm Street Beautification project. There is probably more improvements on this site than we had on previously segments. We are going to employ an arborist to analysis all the trees within the block(s) of Seventh to Polk and the big ADA issue right there in front of the Fire Department; we have sidewalks that are up 6" - 8".

He can't promise you that all of these trees are going to stay because if we cut the roots, the trees are going to fall over. He did walk the site with the arborist and they talked about getting a proposal. He will provide us a report as soon as staff receives authorization to move forward with this project. He is aware these are mature trees but they may not be the best trees for that location.

Since we are talking about street project, Forest Street Stage 2 will begin construction on Monday. From 5th to 3rd it will be completely shut down with detour signs everywhere. Property owners should be notified today or tomorrow. They are expecting an expedited schedule.

The proposal will be less than what will be put into the budget. It will probably be less than half that amount. We actually have received the proposal.

Tonight we are talking about new curb, gutters and sidewalks; decorative ornamental street lights; benches. There will be a similar look to what we have done previously on this project.

He is willing to answer any questions, if not he would like to request approval for the Task Order as well as provide you a budget on the numbers we are looking at for the project cost.

Mayor Garcia confirmed it would be on both sides of the street. Are you going to get input from the business owners like McDonalds and Ice Bucket? They might have some concerns, etc.

Mr. Brewer said in most cases access from the back is available. When we get closer to that and have a Conceptual Plan, he will walk around and talk to the business owners.

Mayor Garcia said he has talked to Gerald (Ice Bucket) and he would definitely like to see this project go forward. He thinks it would be a courtesy to give him a call.

It is all Measure "C:" plus street dollar funding.

City Manager Ramirez said there are some ADA issues out there. That ADA Transition Plan we have been talking about where we recently made repairs in a five or six block area, well, this project will continue that. Here is a different pot of money; it is not General Fund dollars which is real critical right now but it is another pot of money specific for these types of projects. We are not taking away from Police/Fire or Public Works, etc. It is money that is earmarked for transportation improvement.

Mr. Brewer said he would like to update the Council on Forest Street Stage 2 which will begin construction on Monday. Forest will be shut down from 5th to 3rd with detour signs everywhere. The property owners should be notified today or tomorrow. They are expecting an expedited schedule as they want to be done in less time than what the contract gives. They are motivated to get this project completed.

He will talk to the newspaper and let them know about the detours, etc. We are going to try to encourage trucks to come down Elm Avenue which will increase traffic there. The project should be completed by September and October.

Council Member Lander said this is long overdue. He has had a lot of conversations regarding this project especially about the sidewalk in front of the Fire Department. You are going to make a lot of people very happy with this project.

Mr. Brewer said it took a little while to work within the Caltrans right-of-way.

Motion to Approve Design Engineering Task Order and Budget for Phase 3 of the Elm Avenue

*Beautification Project Made by Council Member Oxborrow, Seconded by Council Member Lander. Motion **Approved** by a Roll-call 5/0 Vote: Oxborrow, Lander, Ramsey, Keough, Garcia.*

4. Consideration of Fresno County Request for Construction Water for Final Cover Requirements at the Closed Coalinga Disposal Site

Rene A. Ramirez, City Manager

City Manager Rene Ramirez said the County approached us saying they awarded a contract to a contractor to bring closure and/or end operations at the old Coalinga Landfill. They are asking for water. He explain that now is not the time to be asking for water. They kept pushing the issue so he is bringing it before you for direction.

They need probably 53 acre feet of water. We just shut water off to outside construction a little over one month ago. He heard from Mr. Oxborrow; perhaps he wants to say something.

Council Member Oxborrow said they need to postpone their job. This water crisis is something that effects everybody and he does not see giving any special rights to the County especially now. They really dispositioned the City five or six years ago with no input from us. They are mandated by the State to have it covered by a certain date. The State has created this problem by not building any infrastructure or dams the last forty years. He sees no reason to honor this request.

Council Member Ramsey replied to the negative.

Council Member Lander agrees with Mr. Oxborrow. If it had not been for Fresno County, we would still have a dump.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said he would like to mention that we are going over our water allocation. We are going to have to justify that. Just to throw it out there, it might be good to have the Board of Supervisors on our side when we are trying to justify why we went over our water allocation. We might have a little political clout with them by doing this.

Council Member Lander said in light of what you just said, we did not have the Board of Supervisors supporting us when we had to close down our City Dump. Therefore, it has cost the City of Coalinga substantially more money. His answer still remain no. If we get to the point where we are over the allocation of water, he does not believe Fresno County would step up to the plate.

Mayor Garcia said he votes no on this request.

Consensus of the Council is to refuse the request from Fresno County for water to closed the Coalinga Landfill.

5. Direction Regarding Public Safety Funding from Natural Gas Enterprise Fund

Laurie Avedisian-Favini

City Attorney Laurie Avedisian-Favini:

At the last Council meeting, you ask me to come back with some analysis regarding Chief Minor's suggestion that the Natural Gas Enterprise Fund be used to pay for part of the Police Department budgets. The Police Department protects and monitors the Natural Gas Meters in the alleys.

As Council is well aware, any Enterprise Fund fees including Natural Gas fees, water fees, sewer fees are subject to Prop.218. The fees that the City charges for those services cannot exceed the cost to provide the service. Security and monitoring can be included in that as long as we can show the nexus that we talked about last time, and show tracking of officer time. We have to demonstrate they are actually monitoring those resources and the fund allocated to the Police Department as a result are reasonable and match up to what they are actually doing.

There are a couple of cases cited in the memorandum; both set forth the rule that she just explained, but she will point out in both cases the City lost because the court said the nexus wasn't there for charging those fees to the enterprise fund.

She would just caution the Council to make sure that we are reasonable in the amount that we allocate but we can use enterprise funds to fund part of the Police Department.

City Manager Ramirez said you will notice that Chief Minor prepared a memo trying to outline a rational/mythology/reasonable cost for the Police Department to be allocated a certain dollar figure from the Enterprise Fund. If you take a look at the memo, what we are trying to show to the Council to make the case is, on a regular basis, when a police officer is out and about on his/her beat part of the time is spent inside or outside writing reports, etc. In talking to the Chief and in talking to his officers, he figures there is probably about 60% of their time they are out and about within the community patrolling on streets and alleys, dirt roads, etc.

If we say that an officer is patrolling about 60% of the time in the community, how much of that time would you say they are driving up and down alleys? They said a lot of the time, they are dealing with people who have been accused of (cannot understand word) the utilities. We go down alleys more often than you think. He sees them where he lives going up and down the alleys because of his particular neighborhood. The officers, in talking amongst themselves, thought that about 25% of their time, when out on patrol, they are driving up/down an alley. They could be looking at a gas meter or reacting to a call from someone in the community regarding some suspicious activity in the alley. While patrolling the alley they may go into a specify home and after that the officer is looking at water meter he thinks it is reasonable.

That is the approach we took. He approached the Finance Office/HR Department to find out what is the fully burdened cost. You will see that at the bottom of the first page the fully burdened cost for a police officer is about \$34.21. They appear to be spending about 60 percent of their time out in the field driving around the community and 25% of that time going up and down alleys. We took those two factions and multiplied that by that \$34.21 per hour and we came up with a typical officer as spending about 329 of his or her patrol hours going up and down the community alleys. That works up to about \$11,200 per officer and then you multiple it by the number of officers out in the community and (approximately 10 officers) that is a little over \$112,000. He took the same rational with the sergeants (watch commanders) and that translated to an additional \$75,000. So between the two, there is roughly about \$188,000 that we feel is a reasonable number without trying to grab some.

If you remember from a couple of weeks ago, the Chief was thinking close to \$200,000. He would like as much as \$300,000. He does not think they can get to \$300,000 but we can make a reasonable case to a reasonable person that the Police Department spends roughly \$188,000 per year out and about patrolling the community. That translate into surveillance, patrol, investigation of utility theft., etc. Those could be passed on at cost to the enterprise funds.

Council Member Oxborrow asked are you talking about spreading it between all Enterprise Funds, are just the gas fund.

City Manager Ramirez said we talked about that and you can make a pretty good case for the gas and water

because we measure both of those. With the sewer system there is not anything we are measuring. Council Member Oxborrow said by the description here, if they are to monitor abuses of water then that would not be just the time driving through the alleys but the time driving on the streets. At a time like this when we are in a severe drought and don't have any water, there is quite a bit of abuse going on out there he thinks it would be justified.

Chief Minor said that was an idea we talked about at the last meeting. The rational could be easily fixed to include other enterprise funds. He does not think other than water and gas could we reasonable charge for protecting or preventing lost, etc. Gas and water are the two major enterprise funds; in reference to water, we do have a lot of water theft.

We are now instituting a new policy on (he talked to Mr. Ramirez yesterday) being more activity involved in our water conservation efforts.

Council Member Oxborrow asked if that would increase the percentages.

Chief Minor said it would. The problem, in talking to our City Attorney, is quantifying the exact amounts because when an officer is on patrol, they are looking at the total situation. When you hire a security guard, you hire him for the whole time. You cannot breakdown that time. In his thinking and what he has read is that you have to be reasonable on the application. That is how we came up with 25% of the 60%. We could spread it out over these two Enterprise Funds. There are some other costs (he just ran out of time) in working on this because we have dispatch time when we have Public Works people on call 24 hours per day. If someone has a gas, sewer or water problem they call us and we dispatch to a public works employee. All can be factored in and he thinks they are reasonable charges.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough asked if there were some monies coming out of the Enterprise Funds for public safety.

City Manager Ramirez said not per say but there are some charges from the Enterprise Funds that go into the General Fund; they are basically overhead charges. For the water and sewer fund he thinks it is about \$235,000 and the gas fund it is about \$144,000. Those pay for some of the costs of processing of utility bills and those types of things.

Finance Director Mari Jimenez said money that comes into the General Fund from the Enterprise Funds is strictly for admin overhead. This is for the administration of the Enterprise Funds. The utility billings is separate, we actually re-bill those out. This is to cover protection. We collect about \$635,000 throughout the water, gas, sewer, etc. None of this goes directly to the Police Department.

City Manager Ramirez said it could be used for Police, Fire, Community Development, City Manager's office, etc.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said if it is reasonable to give \$200,000 to the Police Department then that is great. But then you begin breaking it down because we already are pulling fund from there, then we don't have just \$200,000 or we are not being reasonable anymore. We are raising our water price because we are trying to break even to pay the bills, He was unaware we have excess funds in Enterprize Zones to pay to Police, etc.

City Manager Ramirez said we will have to take a look at that to determine if the water fund can absorb the cost. We have not done that thorough of an analysis.

Mayor Garcia asked the Chief if we are ever audited or called on it, how are we going to be able to capture that time to justify those funds.

Police Chief Minor said the only way to do it would be to do a time and motion study which is very time intensive and expensive. The City Attorney may correct him but, again, his research says reasonable. When you read the definition of what is reasonable, there is no set definition stating that you have to prove what exactly (item by item) that you are using for your factors. It talks about reasonable, reasonable, reasonable. Mayor Garcia said you have 60% discretionary hours and you are only going to use 25%. Of that 25% are you going to be doing anything internally like capturing it on each or are they going out to do specific (end of sentence).

Chief Minor said we could if we had to but how often to we drive through an alley for a minute. Are we going to log that and how many times that happens? Its gets back to what is reasonable? That is almost an unreasonable expectation to expect that, in his opinion.

Council Member Oxborrow asked what agency would call you on that. Would it be a citizen law suite, etc.? City Attorney Laurie Avedisian-Favini advised it could be a taxpayer law suite. Both cases identified in the

memo were brought by Howard Garvis Taxpayer Association. It could be citizen complaint.

Mayor Garcia said it seems we should try and recapture some of that. Would it be direct patrols where the officer would go out and patrol and safeguard the infrastructure?

Chief Minor said that would defeat the purpose. It is the randomness for the current effect. He actually tried to contact some public and private utilities and due to the nature of our country, I spoke to the Chief of Security at PG&E and he would not disclose how much they spend on security. It is such that they are afraid of some group using that in some manner. San Diego Water and Power (public utility) won't disclose. The only thing he could come up with is L. A. Department of Water and Power spends \$2.5M on helicopters. All they way say is half the time is spent on security. It is hard to find specific information as to what they are spending as to a percentage of "x" amount of dollars spent out of their operating costs. He could not gather any other information because of the times we are living in no one wants to disclose what they are spending in those areas.

Council Member Oxborrow asked what does the Council wish to do. We are going to try to balance the budget, right?

Council Member Ramsey said to try and pursue it.

Council Member Lander said he totally agrees that we need to pursue, if there is a way to legally do it.

City Manager Ramirez said Mr. Keough mentioned to make sure in the water fund that it can absorb or handle an additional charge to it.

Mayor Garcia said the consensus of the Council is to move forward on this possibility.

Council Member Ramsey asked to please look at the Fire Department to determine if it is possible to charge some of their stuff to enterprise funds.

6. Decision on a Tax for Public Safety; Type of Tax; and Tax Rate in Order for an Urgency Ordinance to be Prepared so an Initiative can be Placed on November 2014 Ballot.

Rene A. Ramirez, City Manager

City Manager Ramirez said we are back asking for some direction from the Council as to if they want to pursue some sort of tax measure to assist public safety because of our budget situation.

Back in June we brought forward a memo from the City Attorney's office that outlined that there are three types of taxes; a property tax, utility user tax and a sales tax that could be implemented should the voters approve. Of the three types of taxes there are two ways those taxes can be effected; one is under a parcel tax measure which means it requires a simple majority of the voters to approve and a special tax that requires a 2/3 super majority vote.

He put in the agenda packages a matrix or summary trying to capture some of the points to let you know whether one of those particular tax measures could be considered and what would be required. In most cases there is not a limit on the duration of the tax. What are the types of tax rates that could be applied if you were to consider one of those special types of taxes? With the parcel tax, the tax would be applied proportionate to the use. You just can't pull a number out of the sky and say that is what it is going to be. There has to be some rationality to it. On the utility users tax, according to what he read, it could be anywhere from (1) one percent to (11) eleven percent. Statewide average is about (5.5) five and one half percent. This is a tax on the city's water, sewer, gas, garbage, power bill, phone bill, cable TV, etc. The sales tax is capped at (2) two percent.

Under the parcel tax the County implements the tax. It is collected by the assessor's office. They would start issuing the property tax bills, if a property tax were the Council's choice and it were approved. It would be on the August tax bills that people would start seeing a parcel tax for public safety.

Under the UUT implementation it is actually by the utility. If it were on your power bill, PG&E would be collecting that UUT from anyone who had a City of Coalinga address and then they would be submitting that revenue to the City.

If it were a sales tax, it is the State Board of Equalization and if a sales tax were approved in November, beginning on April 1, 2015 the State Board of Equalization would begin taking that money and remitting it on a quarterly bases to the City.

When would a revenue stream begin coming into the City for these types of taxes? If a parcel tax, not until late 2015 or early 2016. The assessor's office gives us money at the end of the year and in April. If a UUT, probably within (60) sixty days (according to what he read) you would begin to see UUT money come into

the City. After that we would get the money on a monthly basis but it would always be in arrears. If a sales tax were passed in November, we would probably see it in July or October 2015.

He read that parcel tax is something that is typically requested by school districts, park districts or special districts like an irrigation district, cemetery district, etc. Cities and counties typically have UUT's. Of the four hundred plus cities in California, about one hundred fifty plus have a UUT. There were four counties that have UUT's. Cities and counties typically have sales taxes.

Going forward he thinks we have talked about an opportunity for the community to let you know whether they support a public safety tax and at the level of public safety they are presently receiving. It is obvious that in our General Fund our public safety departments are the ones using the largest percentage of our tax revenues. We are overspending and we do not have enough revenue right now. We have lost that million dollars that used to come in from Claremont and it has made a big hole in our General Fund budget. We need to do something. His recommendation to Council would be to move forward with one of these taxes and let the voters tell you they either support the level of public safety they have or they don't. If they don't support it, then you have the mandate from the community that there will be a difference in the level of service provided.

Council Member Oxborrow said it is your opinion that we would do a definite public safety tax where it takes 2/3's majority vote.

City Manager Ramirez said a general tax requires only 50% majority.

Council Member Oxborrow asked how do you justify that to the community. You have just told them that it is public safety using 70% of our General Fund budget.

City Manager Ramirez said you are going to say that basically it is a general tax to the community but (interrupted).

Council Member Oxborrow said you are basically going to sale it to the public that it is a public safety tax but then you are going to fudge and place it as a general tax. To him it is a matter of just being upfront with the public and say it is for public safety (which we all know it is) and you should have to met the threshold of two thirds.

Council Member Ramsey said it is 2/3 of the people who vote in that election.

Council Member Oxborrow said to be fair, if we are going to admit it is for public safety, he is not opposed in having the community decide. We need to be upfront because, to him, that is one of the things that we are fudging on right off the bat by saying it is easier to get passed this way and we all know it is public safety.

Council Member Lander said that is why is failed last time when the tried to do it because they did not specific it was strictly for public safety. The voters voted against it because it was to go into the General Fund and not specific for public safety.

Council Member Ramsey asked if we know what a 5.5 UUT tax would bring us.

City Manager Ramirez said he has some rough estimates. A 5.5 UUT would generate about \$1.1M to \$1.5M based on the typical utility bill that people pay in town and by the number of customers we have.

Council Member Lander said according to this, the typical residential utility customer increase would be \$23.00 per month.

City Manager Ramirez said it depends on the amount of their utility bills. When he was looking at this he was thinking about his own house and it is probably about \$350 per month for all utilities including power. There are other people who might have a larger house and there are those having smaller houses.

Council Member Lander said he tried to talk to the mayor of Selma because they did a UUT increase. He was going to get back to him and then he received an email that he had resigned.

City Manager Ramirez said he thinks he was the city manager.

Council Member Ramsey said the councilman who took that over, he resigned. The mayor resigned.

City Manager Ramirez said you might be talking to the city manager.

Council Member Oxborrow said his concerns are the same as last week. When you are dealing with something like this and the election is in November the quickest you are going to get it is sixty days after that. We are almost done with the whole fiscal year. In listening to our auditor, you can raise revenue or cut expenditures. Even if we are fortunate enough to get a 2/3 majority and the citizens want to have a public safety tax, it is not going to help us this year. He really has to go back to that unless you are willing to spend in the deficient of \$1.5M from of the General Fund again. He is not willing to do.

We can use the Enterprise Funds to supplement a couple hundred thousand here and some of the other

options but we need to be fiscally responsible this year. He does not see 2/3's of the voters going out on a utility tax if it is going to mean a \$25 per month increase in their budgets. A lot of people paying utilities don't have a lot of money. Most people have cut off their land lines and have cellphones. They have a \$100 cellphone bill. These are the people who might make an effort to go out and vote. He just thinks it is going to be a long, long process and a tough sale. He does not envision it passing maybe not even if it were at 50%. When they find out it is a public utility tax and everything, their water, sewer and everything is going to be taxed at 5.5%, there is going to be a lot of people vote against it than ones voting for it. He could be wrong. He gets a feeling that is going to be a tough sale.

Council Member Ramsey said he thinks it will be a tough sale but we should fund some from the Enterprise Funds plus do the UUT, too.

Council Member Oxborrow said you are not effecting anything this year. What if we get a contract for Claremont two or three months from now, what are we going to do?

Council Member Ramsey said we can always lower the tax but cannot raise it. If we actually get the tax, we could lower it if we had Claremont going again. We can't raise it again unless we have a 218 hearing.

Council Member Oxborrow said it is not going to effect the opening of Claremont if we are blessed to get it opened this year. Essentially, you are not going to need the tax but you are still going to have it on a ballot measure. We thought we had Claremont going a couple of times. We don't have Claremont; this is another way to do it.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said the last time we came to Council, he was one person against this. He has done some thinking about it and how much money we really need to raise per year to payoff our debt so we don't get into a negative position in two or three years? We won't have any cash to pay people. How much do we really need? He thought making a tax on people was a bailout. However, with what the two chiefs came and told us about making cuts, it seems we need to do a tax and cut the budget. Don't we need \$1.5M more per year? Realistically, we need to know a number before we start talking about all of these things. We need to know what our goal is.

City Manager Ramirez said the revenue we can count on, right now is about \$6.8M into the General Fund. Right now, our expenditures are budgeted at \$7.7M so we need to cut..

Mayor Pro-tem Keough indicated as much as he is against it, we have to explain to the City and say we are going to cut the Police and Fire Departments and in making all these cuts we will not have many services. Guess what, we still need a tax to cover whatever the number is. He thinks if we just present it as factually as we can and if the people say forget you guys, we are not going to pay an extra \$25. per month then we can tell them we are not going to have the public safety services as we now have.

It is not this Council's fault that Claremont closed. People can say you should have started bleeding the services three years ago. Here we are today and he agrees with Ramsey on this one, we had better start thinking ahead and he hates the idea of putting a tax on people. He is always saying no about this kind of stuff.

Council Member Oxborrow said you spend the money to get it on the ballot. The City Attorney does all the work and it fails and we still have to balance the budget this year. To him it is pretty simple.

Council Member Ramsey said someone is going to call 911 and no one is going to respond.

Council Member Oxborrow said well what are we going to do. We have to have fewer police officers and/or firefighters. If the people pass the tax, you are going to staff up again next year. We are still going to be without service this year.

Mayor Garcia said we are trying to be proactive in trying to produce some additional revenue. We have a \$1.5M gap. We know services have to be cut even if for three, four or five months. It is going to happen. It depends on the community as to whether they want to have that long term or to bring back the services. We have done everything we can do here. We are going to balance the budget and not spend anymore than we are taking in. We need to spring forward and hopefully bring back those services in six months.

Council Member Lander said he is a strong advocate of balancing the budget just like everyone else. But he is a stronger advocate for public safety. Public safety is the primary focus of this community. If we don't have public safety, we are in deep trouble. The thing is we can do this; it could pass or fail, the community has the right to vote for a decision. Let them decide, we have seen in budget cuts over the past five or six years of cities cutting fire and police. Then you have an increase in crime. Have we had an increase in crime over the past few years? Yes, we have, but we are going to see an even larger increase if we have to cut our

police department. If we have to cut our fire department, you might call the ambulance and it might take 20 minutes for them to respond to the call because of limited staff.

We are responsible for public safety. It should be our primary focus. Put it on the ballot and let the community decide what they want.

Council Member Oxborrow asked if we have any estimations on the sale tax.

City Manager Ramirez said the sales tax we collect on a fiscal year basis is about \$650K. If you want to generate a million dollars, you would need to have a sales tax increase of about 1.50%.

Council Member Oxborrow said his thought is if you go with the public utility thing, you are going to get a lot of animosity against because it is across the board on all utilities. Maybe augment the Enterprise Funds for \$200-\$250K and maybe you could generate a 1% sales tax, etc. That way anyone coming through the community and shopping at the stores, is going to pay for the public safety. He thinks you might have a better chance of getting the public to go for that. He is the only car dealership in town; it might effect him and it might not.

Mayor Garcia said the UUT tax effects a lot more people and people who are not homeowners.

Council Member Oxborrow said the homeowners are paying all the bills. When you are talking about your Verizon bill, etc., people might be getting phones out of town to avoid the tax. Seems to him when you are across the board and every utility is going to be taxed, you are going to get a lot more opposition. Some families could be effected \$25.00 per month, some families \$200 per month.

He can tell you that Mr. Mahfood is not going to be happy with a UUT tax. He is going to be out there telling everybody.

Mayor Garcia said he is not going to be happy when the police are not responding to his 911 call.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said whatever we do, we are still going to be short and we need to tell the people this is the number we are short and if you don't want this tax, you may not get your services you need. We have to be really blunt this time.

City Manager Ramirez said we need to know what kind of tax you want to do. We talked about we wanted to meet next week on July 17th to keep working on our budget. There is going to be a special meeting and at that time, bring back an urgency ordinance for the Council to adopt so we can work to get this on the ballot. We have until August 8th, if the Council wants to get something on the ballot. If we miss that date, we will be waiting until 2016 when we have another general election.

Mayor Garcia said Mr. Keough said to be honest with the community and the only way to do that would be a special tax specifically for public safety. It is going to require a 2/3 vote but we have to be honest.

Council Member Oxborrow said you could pay an extra 1% or 1.5% sales tax, etc. When you are talking about a utility tax, he thinks that will scare a lot of people away. If you don't want to go with the one giving you the best odds, then why do any of this. For him, personally, he could pay an increased sale tax but when you are talking about a utility tax that is going to scare a lot of people. He would think they would want to go with the one with the best odds; 2/3 threshold is a lot. There are a lot of bonds which do not pass because of them having to meet that 2/3 threshold.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough asked if we had examples in the State. He heard you say so many cities had UUT's. How many are raising their sales tax and what was the success rate out there for other cities who tried this?

City Manager Ramirez asked Mr. Brewer if he remember that. Sean found an article on the primary election in June and there were some tax measures there and, actually, some cities that had just general taxes all passed. The ones that were the special taxes struggled a little more. Most of them passed. Recently, there have been a number of communities putting tax measures on the ballot and most of them found success.

The ones that had less success, were the special taxes requiring 2/3 majority. Again, even if you wanted to do a sales tax, you don't have to do the special tax. If you do a general tax, you can use it for anywhere in the General Fund. He knows if we get some money it is going to be earmarked for public safety. We are not going to put the funds into roads or the City Manager's office, it is going to be used for public safety. This is your call. If you do a general tax, you would probably have a higher success rate. He is just trying to provide you with information to help you make a decision and direct him as to what you want to do.

Council Member Ramsey moved to go with a utility tax and since the average is about 5.5 use it specifically for police and fire public safety.

City Manager Ramirez asked for verification on what utilities to include water, sewer, natural gas, solid waste, power, cable or satellite TV, telephone both land lines and cellphones.

Mayor Garcia said if Claremont ever materializes, this is a tax we can come back to the Council to terminate.

City Manager Ramirez said you can put a sunset in there. If you want it to sunset in five years you can do that. When it comes back up you could put it back out to the vote.

Council Member Ramsey said you can always lower it but you cannot raise it.

City Attorney Laurie Avedisian-Favini said we talked about that in connection to rates.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said if we can sunset this thing, we could do a general tax and tell people it is a general tax to pay for public safety. If we don't do a general tax, we are not going to win; we will lose because of 2/3 majority. When was the time we got something with 2/3 of the people. We can do a general tax with earmarked funds to public safety and we can sunset it for three years.

Council Member Lander said what if we do a sales tax. What kind of money would that bring?

City Manager Ramirez said it would be rough numbers. Right now we generate about \$650K per year. If you need to generate \$1M additional, you would need probably 1.5% or 1.6% or so increase in sales tax. Right now we pay Fresno County 8.225%; if you had 1.5% to it, you are talking about almost 9.00%. There are cities in California that have almost 10%. Santa Monica has one of the highest sales tax rates in the State.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said people are going to be upset about sales tax, too. They are going to shop out of town more and they will say that is their reason. Then local businesses are going to get upset.

City Manager Ramirez said he thinks Mr. Keough makes a good point. Let's put it out there and say if we don't do this, there is going to be cuts in service. So the choice is, do you want to maintain the standard of service you have in public safety? If so, we don't have the money coming in (no Claremont contract) and we need some help. Here is the community's opportunity to help us. If they choose not to, then your choice is clear, the community has spoken and they are ready for cuts in service. They have made that decision for you.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said he would reverse his "no" from two weeks ago and join your guys. That is just for the simple majority. He does not feel comfortable with the 2/3s majority vote requirement. He does not like to go out for something he thinks we are going to lose.

Council Member Ramsey said he has a motion on the floor. Does he have a second?

Mr. Sean Brewer read from an article: On the local revenue measures from the June election, you have city general taxes (majority vote) 100% passed 8 of 8. City special tax or general obligation bonds requiring 2/3's vote, 73% passed with 11 total 8 passed. The County special tax requiring 2/3's vote, 40% passed, 5 total 2 passed. For special districts requiring 2/3's, 75% school parcel tax passed 100% with 5. School bonds requiring 2/3's, 100% with 1 passed. School bond at 55%, 43 measures and 32 passed. It is saying this was one of the highest rated election in years and it is 76% pass rating for all of them.

He remembers reading that the City of Parlier put on the ballot a special tax (UUT) for public safety this past June, it requires a 2/3 majority vote and they got only 64% of the vote and needed 67%.

These municipalities are throughout the State.

Mayor Garcia said it is just frustrating we have to go to this when we have a nice facility out there that the State will not sign a contract and fill. We try to be self-sufficient and the State does this to us again. It is mind boggling. We should not be going through this.

Ms. Irwin (could not hear married name) ask a question of the Council. You keep talking about (cannot understand words as she talks very rapidly and not into microphone).

City Manager Ramirez said if we had a UUT of about 5.00 based on the number of customers we have in the City (just an average) we would be real close to a million dollars. He cannot give you real numbers. What many cities do is to hire companies to put together this information and it takes them 3-5 months.

They then give the Council all the details on each tax. If you do a parcel tax, it is \$??? and this is what you are going to get. If you do a sales tax increase at 1.5% based on the demographics this is what we are going to get, etc. He is trying to provide you information right off the tip of his shoes, again. Some simple math he thinks if we did a 5% for the UUT for cable TV, phone, water, sewer, etc., it is probably going to cost them at 5% about \$23- \$30 per month. If you multiply that by the customers we have here in town, we would be at over \$1M revenue. If you have a similar tax for non-residential it is just going to augment that. He does not know exactly how much but he feels comfortable that a 5% would generate close to \$1M. It is either the augmentation of revenue or those types of cuts in departments. It is not both unless the Council wants to get out of the hole quicker, then it could be both.

Council Member Keough said even if we do the tax, we are not going to balance the budget for this year. City Manager Ramirez said the Council has to have a plan. As long as the Council has a plan and you stay on that track, you are doing the right thing. If you are not doing anything at all other than just waving your hands then you are not doing anything.

Ms. Irwin (Cannot understand what is being said.)

City Manager Ramirez said you would get a bill from PG&E and your bill is \$100, at 5% tax, your tax would be \$5.00. PG&E would take from your bill \$5.00 and they would submit that to the City of Coalinga for this tax purpose. If your phone bill is another \$100, the phone bill would take \$5.00 and that money would come to the City of Coalinga. The city utility bill is \$150, 5% of that would be \$7.50.

Fire Chief Henry said as far as your fiscal responsibility for years 2014-15, one of the proposals addresses that. The Fire Department does have an option. The answer to this option would reduce the Fire Department Budget, roughly, to \$2.1M. We would not be exercising the entire budget for the entire year so the savings we would see from that consolidation is only \$500K necessary for EMS service. The Fire service side of it would be paid in arrears and spread out over 2014-15 and 2015-16. The second half of the year, there would be some savings. He would anticipate to be approximately \$2.1 instead of the \$2.9M we are budgeted for/or for what we are asking. The service level would stay the same under the performance standards set forth by the Council.

Council Member Ramsey said and with a lot less service. We would only have two people on fire trucks; right now, we have six.

Fire Chief Henry said the service level would stay the same under the performance standards set forth by the Council. Service could even increase, Fifty percent of the time, we only have two people. The two people we have in the station would be for fire calls.

In June, Medic 251 was gone 50% of the time. That would mean we have two people in quarters to fight fires. That same level of service could be addressed in the performance standards or it could be raised. It all depends.

Council Member Ramsey said Medic #251 was making money for us, too.

Fire Chief Henry said that same amount of money would still be coming in; we would be paying less of the labor cost because American or a contract service would be paying that. We are taking the labor costs and reducing it. We are still seeing that revenue.

The City of Coalinga would retain fire apparatus, real property and fix assets. They would all stay as positions of the Fire Department. We would enter into a MOU with the service provider to be able to use it. Council Member - cannot understand questions.

Fire Chief Henry said they elected not to go to CalFIRE as a service provider. CalFIRE was competing for fire and EMS. The cost there was different. In this particular scenario in separating those out, the savings you would realize is approximately \$800K per year. We would still own the rights to bill, still own the rights to have an ALS. You can reinstitute that at anytime. The same is true of a fire service contract. Three years go down the road, and things are different, you would have that option to reactive. When you do you are looking at hiring new employees at a lesser rate. You retain that right as a City, you would never give up the right to provide your own fire station. He can guarantee you that CalFIRE does not want those rights. They won't come out here unless we invite them. The savings we see, you will see it next week; he has the spreadsheet and the memo to present to you.

The saving you will see in next year's budget, we would only be obligated for half the million dollars or so it would cost for EMS. That is savings in this next fiscal year. In your planning, you can rap that into how we are going to do that in determining this year's budget. Please don't hold him to the numbers because it is just off the top of his head and the are round figures.

City Manager Ramirez said in getting back to the tax, in sounds like Council Member Ramsey has a motion on the floor.

Council Member Ramsey said he made the motion to do a Utility Tax at 5.5 percent and go with the utilities we have talked about.

City Manager Ramirez asked about the non-residential customers. Typically it is lower but it does not have to be. The example is, if the business that has a huge power bill, a 5% utility bill on \$6000 is \$300 per month. At 1% it would be \$60.00 per month. It is up to you, but we need to know this to put it in the urgency ordinance should the Council decides to move forward with this issue.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said what if we talk about what the Chief is talking about, could we make it a 3% UUT tax or a 3.5% tax or maybe a 2.5 % tax to make up the difference. We can tell the public this is what is going to take to make up the difference and allow it to sunset in 3 years. We do a simple majority and pass this thing and get out of debt.

Mr. Glenn Adams said leave it at \$1.5M at 5.5%, it works. It is a hard item to pass because of State. If you want to keep the type of service we need, we need the tax. This is the falut of the State, not the City. Down the line, the tax could be reduced. if we want to keep the kind of protection we have, at least close to it, the Council should vote to put this on the ballot. Mr. Ramsey has a good point. You are probably going to need a \$1.5M give or take at 5.5%. it works in that range. If you wish, the differential is for the commercials. You are going to need it if you want to keep the police service. He agrees it is going to be a hard item to pass but you need to put it out there that the only reason this is happening is because the State has stuck it to the City of Coalinga and the County and so on down the line. If we want to keep the kind of protection or close to the safety that this Council is responsible for, we need to have this tax passed. If the return to custody happens down the line, we could reduce that amount. Maybe Council can have that answer by next week when you plan to meet again. Or you could have a pretty good indication that it can be dropped. You have to have the answers because you need the \$1.5. We need the fire and safety protection. You have a week to finalize whether you put a sunset or not. He would say leave it where it is until things get better, because whomever gets elected on Council can change it down the line. Leave the option so you can lower it if possible and keep you public safety where it should be regardless of what happens.

City Attorney Laurie Avedisian-Favini indicated she does think that the Council would be able to reduce the tax later on but she will confirm that for you next week. She wants to remind the Council that Council Member Ramsey does have a motion on the floor.

City Clerk Earls indicated we need to know exactly what the motion is.

City Manager said is it 5 or 5.5% and then for non-residential is there a difference in the tax. If you want to withdraw your motion because Mr. Keough brought something up. We need a second on the motion on the floor.

Council Member Ramsey said he is going with 5.5 for the motion for everything even non-residential.

City Attorney Avedisian-Favini confirmed it is a special tax.

City Manager Ramirez said there is a motion on the floor and we need a second.

Mayor Garcia said he would second the motion and he called for roll-call.

Council Member Oxborrow verified it is a special tax and takes 2/3rds vote.

Motion to Move Forward at a July 17 Special Meeting of the City Council for the Preparation of an

Urgency Ordinance to Place Utility Tax at 5.5% so Initiative Can be Placed on November 2014 Ballot.

*Motion Made by Council Member Ramsey, Seconded by Mayor Garcia. Motion **Approved** by a Roll-call 5/0*

Vote: Ramsey, Garcia, Oxborrow, Lander, Keough

City Manager Ramirez clarified that it is going to be a 5.5% UUT (special tax) for all utility users and it effects all the difference utilities.

Mayor Garcia thanked the Council for all the discussion and input.

7. Police Department - Monthly Report

Police Chief Cal Minor

Chief Cal Minor:

Personnel: We have 19 of our 21 positions filled. We lost one officer last month and anticipate losing another next month and that will be the two positions we probably won't fill combined with our third one from last year. We are hoping to maintain our budget at 18 and then go down to 16. We have one officer off duty due to injury and one of light duty which leaves us working with 17 uniformed personnel. Later in the report you will see how that impacts us because our detectives have to cover patrol shifts. We are not doing as many investigations as we had been doing and the ones we are doing take longer because of the lack of availability. We are still getting them done.

He spoke with Mr. Ramirez yesterday, concerning the State Water Resources Control Board. They were having a hearing activity discussing fining cities and other water service agencies \$500 per day if they are not doing an adequate job of enforcing the water restrictions. He thinks they need to do their part in the Police Department. He put out a direction yesterday that our officers will participate (we are not counting

on citing people) during the day, they will stop and make them aware of what is happening. At night, they are not going to wake people up but just record the addresses and will turn that over to Code Enforcement for follow-up. The handwriting is on the wall that we should do this and it could be substantial fines against the City should that pass at \$500 per day. They are not talking about the users but the provider. That is what they are doing and he will report to you next month on how it is going.

Animal Control (ACO) we are still busy: A dog and a cat were surrounded by their owners. They picked up 15 deceased animals this month.

- 25 dogs

- 32 cats

- 3 skunks

There were 77 animals we picked up in the 3 1/2 weeks since the last meeting.

Shopping carts are down, we only picked up 20 this last reporting period. None were in double digits, the numbers were all 6 and below for each market, etc. They are making steady progress on this.

One item of bad news; we are one of the few cities in the County activity participating in the Abandoned Vehicles Abatement program and it was on the ballot to extend it in the June Primary and it fell so we just submitted our last report for reimbursement. We received notified from the County they are shutting that program down because of no more funds. We liked that program and it was another \$5 or \$6K annually which we all paid for through our registration.

He is very happy with the hard work our officers are doing. We have had a decrease in crime. He does not know how long the numbers can be sustained.

- 0 - homicide

- 1 - forcible rape

 - aggravated assaults dropped from 11 last year to 4

- 0 - simple assaults

 - Burglaries (he feels they affect our citizens the most) at 80% reduction from, 15 to 3.

 - Overall thefts - 52% reduction from 19 to 9

 - Vehicle thefts - down 1 from 2 - overall reduction of 58%

Case Highlights:

We have been very busy following up on the ones we can when we have time. One of the stages that impact us is the Court decisions. Our investigations involve a lot of cellphone stuff. When a cellphone is in the position of a person when arrested, we have to write a search warrant for that.

Search Warrants:

One was for a physical address and the others were for bank records and cellphones. It takes about 3 hours to prepare and then we have to find a judge to serve us. It seems like not that big of thing; the Court makes a decision like that but it impacts us in our operations. The one search warrant we did serve was a credit card fraud operation. The person has been arrested numerous times for it. The name on the card and application is fraudulent. A merchant would not pick it up because the ID and everything matches. It is a fraudulent account from day one.

We finished an investigation on one of our apartment buildings where there has been an embezzlement of over \$100K over a three year period, a substantial amount of money. This has been very time consuming because of going through records, the suspect confessed to it and the case has been forwarded to the DA's office requesting charges.

He put out a press release on one of our shooting suspects. We are starting to see some cases where the sentences are being handed down. Our Walnut shooting - six years. About three months ago, he reported on a search warrant we served in Kings County right out of Lemoore. The person was dealing drugs in our City, we hauled it back to there and they decided to plead guilty and they are doing six years in state prison. It took 4 months vs. 2 years.

They spent a lot of time on a problem at an intersection right off of Walnut and Elm. Our officers identified a problem there. We were getting calls for service. In the last four days, we have made 5 arrest there. We will continue making arrests there. It is an internal struggle between residents and they are moving it out on the street which is unexceptionable. The officers on both night shifts have adopted that as a policing problems. We want to put the resources into that to solve that problem. They have made a significant impact the last 4 or 5 days.

He will finish on their major check fraud case that he has talked about a number of times. They spent a lot of time and served search warrants in Los Angeles. It is a multi-state investigation. We are the lead agency

and the San Obispo County Sheriff's department, Santa Barbara Sheriff's department and Los Angeles County Sheriff's department all have cases on these people. We are the only one to identify them. Now they are assisting us. A Federal Ice investigator is involved because there are some immigration issues and there are some Home Land Security issues and the Kern County Sheriff's office are all providing us personnel to assist us in surveillance down there. We discussed who would be appropriate to file this with an assistant U.S. Attorney because of the many instances of interstate movement on the people and crimes committed.

The U.S. Attorney said it is a federal crime but there is too much state involvement in it. We get criticized for following up on a crime; we should have given it to a federal agency. The good news is because of the multi-counties we now have a deputy attorney general for the State of California who has adopted the case and will be doing all the prosecution. We have our own prosecutor who will bring some assets to it and take this case from the arraignments all the way through prosecution. Sometimes we get a little bad news from one side but they are very happy about this aspect. All the Counties agree the prosecution should be done in one central location.

He will be pleased to answer any questions.

8. Fire Department - Monthly Report

Fire Chief Steve Henry

Fire Chief Henry:

The new fire engine arrived. The guys have been working on it the last couple of days. He is excited about having it here. Within another week the radios should be installed and graphics put on it. They are taking the current graphics and saving where they can and matching it to the Coalinga graphics. They should be doing some in service training on it because it has some nuances because of a newer engine with updated technology. It should be on the road within three weeks. There is a new apparatus number, because of the new numbering system in the County. We have engine 171 as our primary response engine, this is the second out engine and will be identified as 371. There is a 200 count difference between our first out and second out at the same station.

He has continued to meet with the rural cities; Selma, Sanger, Kingsburg and we are getting together to try and determine how we can get into an economy of scale with our ambulance services for administration and for ambulance billing. We are hoping to save money on ambulance billing and enter into a JPA for administration or start exercising some economy of scale with labor and joint sharing of resources to save us money on the EMS side. It will take a long while as we are looking into the legality of a JPA. We don't want to lose our ambulance rights if we do enter into a JPA so they are all very, very cautious.

He was notified that in reference to our State Home Land Security grant we were able to access \$2K to help us in purchasing some pagers and he was just awarded \$4700 for this year. We have to have the State approve that but by Christmas time we should be able to start spending that money and getting new equipment. These funds are for equipment that we normally would not be able to access.

We are going to participate in some of the purchases of some of the equipment that has that decon. We have loaned that out to PVSP and they are in the process of putting together a decon class. We have eight positions offered to us so we will have our folks go over there and get a State Certified class by firing our equipment.

On the 4th of July they upstaffed for the activity. Our first out engine had two paid personnel on it. Our patrol has a captain assigned to it. Our truck had one paid and one reserve personnel. We increased that number only because of the potential for call volume.

Two medic units were staffed and we had 10 medical calls that day and one small grass fire started by fireworks. Over that Holiday weekend we also sent out two line paramedics to the fire in Sequoia National Forest. They have since come back to us and the patrol has been assigned to the Nappa unit on the Montcello 67 hundred acre up by Lake Berryessa. It came back today.

He thinks he is looking at about \$65K in reimbursements. We do have overtime costs associated with that. Mari has him outlined on the P&L and the Balance Sheet for that and he can accurately track those revenues.

To go along with what Mr. Brewer was saying about the landscaping and sidewalks for Elm Street Captain Krider has a plan (he is assigned to that Capital Improvement Project) on the eastside of the station along

that sidewalk. Once the City work is done, we are going to do the same thing and improve that eastern side of the station to beautify that side of the station in conjunction with what is going on in the street. If we can place some of the park benches there and with the landscaping it will be a nice shaded area for the community. We are going to try and beef that up.

Calls for service have dropped a little. We are at 208 calls; 81% of the time for medical transport and that is also down a little. The medic units (Coalinga) was committed 51% of the time and the Huron unit was committed 24% of the time. That is not counting the time they came and covered Coalinga. If 251 is out, they are in town. They are getting some of the Coalinga calls. We had one hazard condition call which would be natural gas at 1% of call volume. In asking what we can do with natural gas lines, he can hang his hat on that with only 1% of call volume. There were 5 unable to staff calls. Auto aid and mutual aid have gone down about 2 for 1. Instead of being very, very lopsided. that has balance out for us with is productive for us.

Our fire loss for June was \$142K. We, also, realized about \$1.1M in savings. Approximately \$100K of that was from Ace Hardware. He has not talked to Gary to confirm what the insurance is claiming. He will follow up with him and find out about the actual dollar loss.

We had 191 hours of training. He still has Captain Gabriel out on a prevention class for three days. When he comes back he will have the ability to start our fire prevention bureau. He is excited about that. We did some fireworks booths and had no issues. Our nonprofits do a bang-up job in making sure they are following the Code to the letter. They are very, very cooperative and we try to be the same with them. He is willing to answer any questions.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said a citizen asked him this question and he thinks you could probably answer it best. There was some sort of an accident out near Gale and Hwy. 33. by the Welcome to Coalinga sign. A citizen called for an ambulance and was told it is not in the City and that is not our deal. They said it is next to the sign and they got into an argument as to what side of the street it was on. He told them he does not think that is part of the City limits.

Chief Henry said the southwest corner of Gail and Elm is within the City limits.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said (too many people talking).

Chief Henry said even if in the County we would have responded because we are the closer unit. (Too many people talking at once.) We did respond to Jayne and Calaveras on a car accident because we were the closest unit. In turn, units come to our fires. It is an agreement that is working very well.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said he would get back and tell that person.

Chief Henry said as far as the jurisdiction we don't really care. Law enforcement just because is truth and right to report. They figure it out after they get there not before they get there.

Mayor Garcia asked what was the cause of the fire at Ace Hardware.

Chief Henry said it is undetermined. He is going to make contact with the fire investigators assigned to the insurance company. We were not able to definitely determine that. He can tell you where it started but not what started it. He is confident it was not an incendiary type of event.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. City Manager's Announcements

City Manager Ramirez said on a monthly basis, staff, Mr. Lander and I attend the COG meeting. They have a technical committee which Mr. Brewer typically attends. He usually attends the Policy and Advisory Committee which is the city manager and folks from the County. Mr. Lander attends the Policy Board which is for mayors and council members. For this upcoming twelve month period, he was selected to be the Chairperson for the Policy Advisory Committee. He will be heading that meeting selected from all the city managers in Fresno County. He wanted to share that with you because he thinks it is not always that Coalinga has a presence on the COG board. We are there to make sure we get our fair share of the money. Staff and he were talking to Shift Sector folks. It is approaching fall and they want to come at the end of October; they are looking at the 25th and 26th. On the 24th which is Friday, they would like to come downtown again and show off their cars and let people take pictures, etc. We were speaking with Katie Delano because the air balloon festival is that same weekend. In talking to the Shift Sector folks they said it could be November 1st and 2nd. If they do a Friday event, that would be Friday, Halloween day.

He thinks it would be great to have two events going on the same weekend the 25th and 26th of October. I don't think they interfere with each other. They just give folks another thing to do on a particular weekend. Mayor Pro-tem Keough said on Halloween they have Trunk for Treats at Frame Park.

City Manager Ramirez said he is thinking that we should probably stay on the 25th and 26th of October even though there might be more activities for folks to do. These guys are going to try and see if they can get more folks to come. We are talking about getting some poster board up and down the Valley and some radio spots and TV spots. We are looking forward to that. Again, we are talking about some kind of revenue sharing so we could get some money to help take care of the Airport out there. The airport is a General Fund activity and we just don't have a lot of funds to budget toward the airport right now.

One of the resolutions the Council adopted tonight starts your election process of open Council seats. There are three seats open and they are Mayor Garcia, Mr. Ramsey and Mr. Oxborrow. Folks can begin taking out papers on Monday, July 14th. If you want to do that please come and see Ms. Shannon Jensen our Deputy City Clerk. She is making herself available Monday - Thursday to assist you. Papers have to be submitted by August 8th which is the same time as the tax measure we are talking about.

2. Councilmembers' Announcements/Reports

Council Member Lander said he has one announcement and that is Jeff Webster is retiring as the CEO for the Rural Transit Authority; he has been with them for over 40 years. Unfortunately, he has had some major surgery so he is extending the time of his retirement due to recovery. The person who will very likely be his replacement will be Moses Stikes whom he has been mentoring the last couple of years. He would like to say that Jeff Webster is not only know in the County but he is know nationally for his abilities in dealing with transit. He has been awarded many, many things throughout the years. He has enjoyed working with him and he has always looked after Coalinga and the Rural Transit Agency out here.

3. Mayor's Announcements

Mayor Garcia said he has no announcements.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Council Member Oxborrow would appreciate an update on the EDA buildings.

Mayor Pro-tem Keough said he would like to bring to the Council how to get speed bumps put in near our public parks. He has noticed there is some fast driving with kids playing near by. He is surprised we have not had a disaster. He knows over in the Posa Chanet area, Centennial Park we have a basketball court, tennis court and kids flying in and out of there. People like to drag race there. It is hard parking to begin with because it was not designed well and he wants people to be able to use the park. His agenda item is how do we go about getting speed bumps? Maybe on Monroe and for Olsen Park, etc. He has seen kids running back and forth and he would like to know what our options are.

Does it take a citizens vote or petitions? Does it take General Fund money. How do you do it?

9. CLOSED SESSION

1. REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS - Government Code Section 54956.8. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS. PROPERTY: APN 072-123-13. CITY NEGOTIATORS: City Manager, Rene A. Ramirez; City Attorney, Laurie Avedisian--Favini. NEGOTIATING PARTIES: City of Coalinga and Joe Knight. UNDER NEGOTIATION: Price, Terms of Payment
2. City Manager's Performance Evaluation - Government Code 54957
3. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS – Government Code 54957.6. CITY NEGOTIATORS: City Manager, Rene A. Ramirez; Human Resources Director, Marissa Chavez; City Attorney, Laurie Avedisian-Favini. EMPLOYEE (ORGANIZATION): International Association of Firefighters

4. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – Potential Litigation. Significant Exposure to Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(b) - 1 case

10. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Garcia adjourned the meeting at 9:55 PM.

Tony Garcia, Mayor

City Clerk/Deputy Clerk

Date