

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES  
June 21, 2022**

**1. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE IN HONOR OF THE US MILITARY TROOPS**

The City Council Meeting was held in a hybrid format (in-person and via Zoom videoconference and broadcast) from the Pinole Council Chambers, 2131 Pear Street, Pinole, California. Mayor Salimi called the Regular Meeting of the City Council to order at 5:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

*Before we begin, we would like to acknowledge the Ohlone people, who are the traditional custodians of this land. We pay our respects to the Ohlone elders, past, present and future, who call this place, Ohlone Land, the land that Pinole sits upon, their home. We are proud to continue their tradition of coming together and growing as a community. We thank the Ohlone community for their stewardship and support, and we look forward to strengthening our ties as we continue our relationship of mutual respect and understanding.*

**3. ROLL CALL, CITY CLERK'S REPORT & STATEMENT OF CONFLICT**

*An official who has a conflict must, prior to consideration of the decision; (1) publicly identify in detail the financial interest that causes the conflict; (2) recuse himself/herself from discussing and voting on the matter; and (3) leave the room until after the decision has been made, Cal. Gov. Code § 87105.*

**A. COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT**

Vincent Salimi, Mayor  
Devin Murphy, Mayor Pro Tem  
Norma Martinez-Rubin, Council Member  
Anthony Tave, Council Member  
Maureen Toms, Council Member

**B. STAFF PRESENT**

Andrew Murray, City Manager  
Heather Bell, City Clerk  
Eric Casher, City Attorney  
Stephanie Downs, City Attorney's Office  
Markisha Guillory, Finance Director  
Sanjay Mishra, Public Works Director  
Lilly Whalen, Community Development Director  
Misha Kaur, Capital Improvement and Environmental Program Manager  
Roxane Stone, Deputy City Clerk

City Clerk Heather Bell announced the agenda had been posted on Thursday, June 16, 2022 at 4:00 p.m. with all legally required written notices. Written correspondence had been received in advance of the meeting, distributed to the City Council and posted on the City website.

Following an inquiry, the Council reported there were no conflicts with any items on the agenda.

City Attorney Eric Casher reported the City Council had received written correspondence indicating there could be a conflict of interest related to Item 9D. He had advised the City Council members referenced in the letter that based on the facts and in his opinion, there was no conflict of interest that would prohibit or prevent any of those Council members from participating in the discussion of Item 9D, and this opinion was consistent with a legal opinion provided by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) on the same issue.

#### **4. CONVENE TO A CLOSED SESSION**

*Citizens may address the Council regarding a Closed Session item prior to the Council adjourning into the Closed Session, by first providing a speaker card to the City Clerk.*

##### **A. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS**

Pursuant to Gov. Code § 54957.6

Agency designated representatives: City Manager Murray, City Attorney Casher, Human Resources Director Shell and Greg Ramirez (IEDA)

Employee organization: AFSME, Local 1

Unrepresented employees: Management Compensation Plan

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

Cordell Hindler, Richmond, was interested in learning more about the Closed Session item.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

#### **5. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION TO ANNOUNCE RESULTS OF CLOSED SESSION**

At 5:49 p.m., Mayor Salimi reconvened the meeting into open session and announced there was no reportable action from the Closed Session.

#### **6. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD (Public Comments)**

*Citizens may speak under any item not listed on the Agenda. The time limit is 3 minutes and is subject to modification by the Mayor. Individuals may not share or offer time to another speaker. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act, no action may be taken on a matter unless it is listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. The City Council may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Council meeting*

Roxane Stone, Deputy City Clerk reported there were no public comments.

#### **7. REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS**

##### **A. Mayor Report**

##### **1. Announcements**

None

##### **B. Mayoral & Council Appointments**

None

### C. City Council Committee Reports & Communications

Council member Martinez-Rubin reported she had attended the League of California Cities Revenue and Taxation Policy Committee as Chair and briefed the Council on the discussion of two ballot measures to be considered for the November 2022 ballot.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy welcomed Ike's Love and Sandwiches to the community.

Council member Toms reported she had attended the League of California Cities Policy Committee for Housing and Economic Development and briefed the Council on the discussions of reforms to state housing laws and possible economic development funding from the East Bay Economic Development Alliance (EDA). She had also attended the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) General Assembly and briefed the Council on the discussion on housing and ABAG's potential sponsorship of a regional ballot measure in 2024 for a bond measure to support housing. She had also attended the Regional Fire Safety Mitigation Program Subcommittee and briefed the Council on the discussions of moving forward with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and continuation of meetings with elected officials in Alameda and Contra Costa County to move forward the fire codes that all jurisdictions must adopt by January 2023.

Council member Toms added the law enforcement community would carry the Special Olympic torch through the City of Pinole on San Pablo Avenue starting around 8:45 a.m. on June 22, 2022, with the Summer Special Olympics to be held in Santa Clara.

### D. Council Requests for Future Agenda Items

Council member Martinez-Rubin requested a future agenda item for the City Council to have a discussion with the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) about the possibility of future funding of School Resource Officers (SROs) on campus. Consensus given.

### E. City Manager Report / Department Staff

City Manager Andrew Murray thanked the members of the community who had participated in the recent Community Service Day that included a memorial for former City employee Dean Allison; detailed upcoming community events including the Pinole Car Show and Fourth of July celebration with a fireworks display in collaboration with the City of Hercules; and provided a preview of potential agenda items for the July 5 and July 12, 2022 City Council meetings.

### F. City Attorney Report

None

### PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Cordell Hindler, Richmond, requested a future agenda item for a representative from the WCCUSD to provide an update on SROs; consideration of a consultant to provide diversity, equity and inclusion and suggested that CPS HR Consulting be considered; and asked that the City of Pinole extend an invitation to Sabrina Landreth, General Manager, East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) to provide an update on how COVID-19 had impacted park services.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

Mayor Salimi re-opened public comment for Item 6, Citizens to be Heard at this time.

Debbie Long, Pinole, reported that in 2007, 2008 and 2009, the then-City Manager had hired a number of new employees which had impacted the City's budget, and which was still impacting the budget. In 2010 as part of cutbacks, Fire Station No. 74 had to be closed for the City to avoid bankruptcy. She understood the City Council was working on details for a labor contract with the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (Con Fire) related to the reopening of Fire Station No. 74. She had been contacted by individuals who were part of Fire Chief Wynkoop's presentation and expressed concern the Fire Chief did not fully understand the budget. She highlighted the current 2022/23 budget for the reopening of Fire Station No. 74 and stated the budget would have to be doubled if a second fire station were to open. She suggested there could be a significant shortfall of \$1.1 million not including unfunded California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) liability. She asked the City Council to consider the discussion of a contract with Con Fire and preferred that the City Council explore a partnership with the Rodeo-Hercules Fire Department or a total annexation with Con Fire, which options had not been discussed and which would be more equitable in terms of risk. She asked the City Council to consider a Town Hall meeting to discuss those issues and not limit the public to only three minutes.

Mayor Salimi advised that staff would provide a response to Ms. Long's comments offline.

### **8. RECOGNITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **A. Proclamations**

None

#### **B. Presentations / Recognitions**

##### **1. Presentation by City of Hayward on the Recycled Water Program**

Public Works Director Sanjay Mishra introduced Cheryl Munoz, Water Resources Manager and Suzan England, Utilities Engineering Manager for the City of Hayward who would be making a presentation on the City of Hayward's Recycled Water Program. He expressed his appreciation to the City of Hayward's City Manager and Public Works Director for making the presentation possible.

Cheryl Munoz, Water Resources Manager, City of Hayward and Suzan England, Utilities Engineering Manager provided a PowerPoint presentation of the City of Hayward Recycled Water Project, which included an overview of the utility services provided by the City of Hayward including water, sewer collection and wastewater treatment services. The objective of the Recycled Water Project was to enhance the sustainability of the City's drinking water supply, help meet the City's long-term water needs by using recycled water, with a mix of water sources helping to protect the City from potential disruptions due to emergencies or natural disasters, provide resilience during periods of drought and address issues such as climate uncertainty, regulatory changes and population growth.

The background and development of the Hayward Recycled Water Project was provided and included Phase 1 details, project costs and funding sources. Photographs of the storage tank, pump station, and treatment facility were also provided as were customer retrofits and the requirements of the State Recycled Water Permit. As it moved forward, the City of Hayward would continue to provide technical assistance to its customers as needed, work with additional potential Phase 1 customers, and begin preparing a Recycled Water Master Plan to identify infrastructure expansion needs, pipeline routes, customers and cost estimates for future phases of the project.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

Debbie Long, Pinole, suggested that while the presentation provided viable solutions, she recalled in 2010 when this topic had last been discussed that the City Council at that time had been informed the water belonged to the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). She asked whether that remained true today.

Public Works Director Mishra advised that EBMUD was the purveyor of the City's water, although because the recycled water system was so vast it was possible that EBMUD would help the City do its own Recycled Water Program. He acknowledged he had not discussed that issue with EBMUD.

City Manager Murray clarified the item was not an action item but a presentation. The City Council had provided relevant direction already with a project in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for a Recycled Water Feasibility Study. If the CIP was approved by the City Council as part of the Consent Calendar, direction would be provided to staff to conduct that assessment.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

Council member Martinez-Rubin asked whether the intent was that the Pinole-Hercules Wastewater Treatment Plant would eventually recycle water. She also asked of the financing alternatives the City of Hayward had sought and requested clarification from the inception of the City of Hayward's Recycled Water Program and its start date, which appeared to be a 15-year period. She asked if that was a typical timeframe between feasibility study and actual delivery of water and requested more details about the later phases of the Hayward Recycled Water Program.

Public Works Director Mishra clarified the Pinole-Hercules Wastewater Treatment Plant had tight space and providing potable water from that facility was not feasible. The intent was for the City of Pinole to determine the feasibility of a recycled water facility on a small scale, which was why Pinole staff had been interested in Hayward's program. He noted that the cities of Hercules, Pinole and Rodeo may work together to find a facility near Rodeo where the treated water was being sent prior to going to the Bay but at this time staff had not explored an alternative site. Once done, a feasibility study would provide guidance on financing options and would scope out grant opportunities. As such, it was possible the process may end up being faster than what the City of Hayward had experienced.

Ms. Munoz and Ms. England again detailed the financing options Hayward had explored; reiterated that Hayward had received a loan and a grant for its project totaling \$21,500,000; and acknowledged that federal funding had not worked out in Hayward's case.

Both pointed out that the use of recycled water had not been a big driver in 2007 at the time the project had first started but the intervening years of drought had made recycled water projects a priority.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy again clarified with Ms. Munoz and Ms. England the Hayward Recycled Water Program Phase 1 details. Both reported that feedback from their customers had identified the main concern as water quality. Hayward's customers had been very supportive of the project given its reliable supply. Hayward's customer management process was also highlighted where customers were encouraged to contact the City with any concerns.

Council member Toms again clarified with Ms. Munoz the financing details of the loan for the Hayward Recycled Water Program and was informed that Hayward was in the process of repaying the one percent interest loan with rates established in 2019. It was noted that 100 percent of the costs including staff time, maintenance, supplies, capital replacement and debt service were expected to be recovered from customers. A return on investment had not been done as yet and would be revisited in 2023 when Hayward's rate structure would be revisited. It was also clarified that customers were currently using the recycled water for landscape irrigation, but Hayward was in conversations with industrial customers interested in using the recycled water for processing purposes.

Council member Tave clarified with Ms. England and Ms. Munoz the average dry weather flow from Hayward's Recycled Water Program was around 11 million gallons per day; chemical costs had not been reduced since the same types of chemicals were being used; and the footprint of the recycled water plant was around 300 feet by 400 feet with significant open space between for access roads and the like. The existing rates had been established in 2019, a rate analysis would be done in 2023, and the general operating cost for the plant could be provided to the City Council if desired. It was also clarified that the ability to use recycled water for firefighting purposes had been discussed and would be revisited as part of the Master Planning process.

Council member Martinez-Rubin further clarified with Ms. Munoz the different phases for the project in the future may include continuation of the pipeline through Hayward's commercial/industrial base and inclusion of parks and schools, all depending on how much they wanted to spend.

The City Council expressed its sincere appreciation to the City of Hayward staff for the presentation.

## **9. CONSENT CALENDAR**

*All matters under the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and noncontroversial. These items will be enacted by one motion and without discussion. If, however, any interested party or Council member(s) wishes to comment on an item, they may do so before action is taken on the Consent Calendar. Following comments, if a Council member wishes to discuss an item, it will be removed from the Consent Calendar and taken up in order after adoption of the Consent Calendar.*

- A. Approve the Minutes of the May 31, 2022 Special Meeting and the June 7, 2022 Regular Meeting.

- B. Receive the June 3, 2022 – June 16, 2022 List of Warrants in the Amount of \$1,536,275.67 and the June 10, 2022 Payroll in the Amount of \$630,094.70 (\$526,422.44 Regular Payroll and \$103,672.26 PD/Fire Holiday Pay)
- C. Final Proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23 Operating and Capital Budget **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Guillory)]**
- D. Final Proposed Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Years 2022/23 Through 2026/27 **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Mishra)]**
- E. Resolution Approving the Final Proposed Long-Term Financial Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23 – 2026/27 **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Guillory)]**
- F. Adopt Resolution Establishing the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23 Appropriations Limit **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Guillory)]**
- G. Call Election for City Council Seats, Request Consolidation of the Pinole Municipal Election on November 8, 2022, with Contra Costa County, and Set Specifications of the Election Order **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Bell)]**
- H. Resolution Approving an Amendment to the Agreement with RSG to Extend the Contract Term and Increase the Budget By \$10,000 for Affordable Housing Monitoring, Compliance and Reporting, and Appropriating Funding from the Housing Successor Fund for this Purpose **(Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Whalen))**
- I. Resolution Authorizing the Adoption of the First Amendment to the Tri-City Dispatch Agreement **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Casher)]**
- J. Adopt a Resolution to Adopt a List of Projects for Fiscal Year 2022/23 Funded by SB1: The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Mishra)]**

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Cordell Hindler, Richmond, referenced Item 9A, and expressed disappointment his voice had not been heard since he had to wait until almost midnight to provide public comments, which he suggested was unfair. As a result, he provided written comments to the City Clerk of the comments he planned to provide at that time. As to Item 9C, he expressed concern with the lack of a traffic analysis as it related to businesses along the Pinole Valley Road Corridor and questioned new businesses coming to Pinole given potential impacts.

Irma Ruport, Pinole, referenced Item 9C, and questioned the appropriation for the Faria House renovations. She recommended the building be sold as-is or the Faria House be placed on a future ballot. She questioned using money on a losing project and suggested this agenda item should be continued to a later date.

Ms. Ruport also spoke to the City's organizational structure and reminded the City Council that residents of Pinole were in charge, voted for Council members and any time a decision was made it affected residents. She also commented that every year the City received an excellence award for its budget and asked when the City had last conducted a forensic audit and suggested it was time that was done. As to Item 9D, she questioned the appropriation of funds for the unfunded Faria House renovations, a project that had been discussed in the past. The City did not have the money for this project, it was not a priority, the building was vacant, the country was heading into a recession, and she asked that the appropriation of funds be removed, and the item be removed from the CIP. Additionally, she understood including an unfunded project in the CIP would result in removing another project and she asked what project had been removed in place of the Faria House renovations. She urged the City Council to remove the Faria House from the CIP, wait a few months and let the taxpayers decide.

Debbie Long, Pinole, speaking to Item 9C stated the summaries of the General Fund revenues and expenditures should have two additional line items for the 2006 and 2014 Measure S accounts. While there was a summary in another part of the document, it appeared to be hidden at a time when transparency should be honored. Also, Measure S 2014 had shown \$718,000 being appropriated to General Government, Sewer Fund and Planning. She asked what the numbers were comprised of. She also referenced the 115 Pension Trust and asked how it was to be used. The Trust had been established to make up the difference when CalPERS had miscalculated its interest earnings and she offered examples noting that the Trust had been established to cover any gap so that the General Fund was not adversely impacted.

Ms. Long commented the current City Manager had stated that 2018/19 was a base year and any additional increase in CalPERS including all new employee pension costs could be taken out of the Trust. Having spoken to every Council member who had been involved in the establishment of the Trust as well as the City Manager at the time, who all remembered it the same way, while it was not illegal to use the Trust as a pension slush fund that was not the intent of the Trust. She noted that actuarial work had been done and it was anticipated the Trust would last if used as gap funding until 2034.

Ms. Long went on to comment that if the proposed budget was structurally imbalanced, City policy was that staff be directed to create a structurally balanced budget for the subsequent fiscal year, and absent misusing the 115 Pension Trust the budget would be structurally imbalanced. She requested that efficiencies and expenditures be reviewed sooner than later, and the City Council refer to the use of the 115 Pension Trust in 2018. If that was not done, she suggested it was proof that what had been promised today could not be counted on by future City Councils.

Rafael Menis, Pinole, speaking to Item 9C, explained that a broken out variant of the Measure S funds had been shown on Page 114 of the agenda packet and Page 46 of the budget document itself, which had highlighted the expenditures and revenues for Measure S funds. He praised Finance Department staff for the chart shown on Page 3 of the budget document and Page 59 of the agenda packet, which included a high level overview of the City's budget in a simplified version. He also commended the information for expenditures by category and department in the breakdown shown on Page 101 of the agenda packet. As to the revenue shown for PCTV on Page 108 of the agenda packet, he asked whether inflation had been considered as part of the numbers shown. For Page 110 of the agenda packet, he pointed out the increase in capital expenditures across funds and cited the non-departmental category.



As to Item 9D, Mr. Menis expressed concern with the recommendation to defer the Storm Drain Master Plan to future years. He asked whether there was any way for the City to restructure the CIP to allow the project to move forward and take place in its original timeframe, which should be a priority. As to Item 9E, he spoke to Page 423 of the agenda packet and cited the core liabilities the City was facing, as shown, and the fact the City was conducting an Asset Assessment Study.

Mayor Salimi advised that the technical questions Mr. Menis raised would be answered by staff offline. He understood that staff had expressed a willingness to meet with Ms. Long to discuss her concerns with respect to the 115 Pension Trust.

Finance Director Markisha Guillory confirmed that staff would be happy to meet with Ms. Long to discuss the 115 Pension Trust further and staff could prepare an information memorandum for the benefit of the City Council and the public on the details of the Trust.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy referenced Item 9D and asked why no defined funding source had been identified for the Storm Drain Master Plan. He was informed by Misha Kaur, Capital Improvement and Environmental Program Manager, that Measure S funds supported the Storm Drain Master Plan. The project was not recommended for removal from the CIP but had been deferred into the next fiscal year. The summary sheet had shown no funding source since the funding sources were only shown for projects planned for the next fiscal year. The project would be funded via Measure S funds.

Council member Martinez-Rubin requested a revision to Item 9A as follows:

To the last sentence of the fourth paragraph on Page 14 of the June 7, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes (Page 29 of 689 of the agenda packet), to read:

*She [Council member Martinez-Rubin] suggested the City Council not move forward with the options on which staff was seeking direction from Council.*

And to the first sentence of the fifth paragraph of Page 14 (Page 29 of 689 of the agenda packet) to read:

*Council member Toms agreed the City Council should not move forward with the staff options as outlined, but if three Council members decided to continue that was not such a bad thing since it would provide education for finding a solution, which she suggested would not be found through this process.*

**ACTION: Motion by Council members Martinez-Rubin/Toms to approve Consent Calendar Items 9A through 9J, as shown, and with Item 9A as modified.**

<b>Vote:</b>	<b>Passed</b>	<b>5-0</b>
	<b>Ayes:</b>	<b>Salimi, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Tave, Toms</b>
	<b>Noes:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Abstain:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>

## 10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

*Citizens wishing to speak regarding a Public Hearing item should fill out a speaker card prior to the completion of the presentation, by first providing a speaker card to the City Clerk. An official who engaged in an ex parte communication that is the subject of a Public Hearing must disclose the communication on the record prior to the start of the Public Hearing.*

Mayor Salimi requested the public hearings be taken out of order and the City Council consider Item 10C prior to Item 10A.

### C. Resolution Adopting Updated User and Regulatory Fees **[Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Guillory)]**

Finance Director Guillory introduced Jeanette Hahn with ClearSource Financial Consulting, the consultant who had assisted staff with the Fee Study, which covered a number of areas for the costs of services and analysis for providing various services in the area of planning, building, engineering, recreation, code enforcement, police, fire and some administrative areas but did not include taxes or fines that were based on the Pinole Municipal Code (PMC), or Development Impact Fees to be studied separately through a future Nexus Study.

Jeanette Hahn, ClearSource Financial Consulting, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the City of Pinole User and Regulatory Fee Update, which included an overview of the project background. She noted that the City maintained a Master Fee Schedule and identified the applicable fees for various City services, which fees had been reviewed and updated periodically. The City collected fees and charges for governmental services performed at the request of, or specifically for, a particular individual, business or group as opposed to services performed for the community as a whole. Communities used their tax revenues to fund services that provided general community-wide benefit and communities used fees and charges (direct recovery) to fund services that provided direct benefit.

The types of fees that had been examined were identified, municipal fees were clarified, and fees that had not been examined as part of the study included Development Impact Fees, taxes, assessments, fines or penalties, franchise fees and utility rates and services charges. The City Council had the authority to directly approve user and regulatory fees and to increase fees.

Ms. Hahn highlighted municipal fees in California, terms consistently used for cost recovery analysis and fee setting, cost of service, cost recovery and subsidy, cost recovery framework, alignment to the City's mission and goals, and an overview of the proposed updates to the user and regulatory fees including proposed fee changes for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23. All information had been included in the June 21, 2022 staff report. If the City Council adopted the fees changes, as proposed, the changes would become effective on September 1, 2022.

### PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Guy Houston, Pinole, representing MRK Partners and California Gold Advocacy Group, thanked the City Council for making this project a priority. He emphasized the importance of Pinole being competitive with its neighbors and the updated user and regulatory fees would allow Pinole to be competitive with Alameda and Contra Costa County while also removing any nexus issues related to Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 that would open the City to litigation by having fees out of the normal

range. He commended City staff and the consultants for the presentation and the City Council for making this happen.

Rafael Menis, Pinole, understood the intent of the update to the user and regulatory fees, although he found a marked decrease in the building permit and plan review fees as they went up in scale and a slight increase for the lower end of the scale. He understood the fees had been scaled as such since the higher fees were not linked directly to the City's overall costs, but it seemed to be a mismatch in the report which should be clarified. He also asked how the City had recovered 171 percent of its costs for "address adjustment." For permit type "rooftop heliport," he asked whether the City would grant such a permit or whether it had been included as part of Con Fire permits. He also spoke to the renewal and amendment fees for concealed weapon permits which had decreased and asked whether that was related to different court cases regarding constitutional views on concealed weapon rights or some other reason.

City Manager Murray advised that the Finance Director would get back to Mr. Menis with a response to the more technical questions.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

In response to Council member Toms, Community Development Director Lilly Whalen clarified deposit-based submittals where an applicant would be required to enter into a Reimbursement Agreement, with the work to be billed to the applicant.

Council member Tave requested further clarification of the deposit-based submittals and Ms. Hahn explained where fees were restructured to remove deposits was because the variability of that happening was low and setting an average unit cost for the fee was acceptable. Where there was concern for high variability, staff had recommended that those deposits remain. She clarified the industry did not intend to make money off of the fees, it was intended to be cost-based. Fees were not based on comparisons, nor should someone else's fee schedule be adopted, and while it had been common for that to happen in the past the intent was to make the fee structure for Pinole fit the City's costs and practices.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy understood Development Impact Fees had not been part of this study although would be part of a future Nexus Study, and there had been a recommendation to increase those fees by 15 percent and he asked staff to provide clarification.

Finance Director Guillory explained that a Nexus Study would be required for the Development Impact Fees and that study would look at the cost of services versus the estimated impact of new development. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was due to be released in July 2022 to engage a consultant to review the City's Development Impact Fees, with the completion date for the work to be outlined in the RFP. Pursuant to the PMC, staff had reviewed the changes in the cost index over the last 12 months from April 2021 to March 2022, which equated to about 15 percent. Staff had applied 15 percent to the current development fees and what staff had recommended as part of the updated fee schedule. She also clarified, when asked, that PCTV fees had been referenced in the staff report but had not been part of this study, and would be evaluated separately as part of the PCTV Master Plan, to be added to the Fee Schedule in the near future.

Ms. Hahn added that Nexus Studies for Development Impact Fees may take upwards of 150 to 280 days before it could be brought to the Council depending on the data accessibility and condition of the planning information required to develop the study.

In response to Council member Martinez-Rubin, Ms. Hahn explained the intent was to propose fees based on the most currently available costs, whether a prospective budget or available actual, and in this case, fees had been based on the City's prospective budget. The consultant's recommendation would be to keep the fees in-line with the regional Consumer Price Index (CPI) between comprehensive studies, a reasonable and generally accepted approach to moving forward. Significant changes on how services were provided or whether the City's practices were to change would be when a particular department had been studied at a more detailed level. Generally, if a massive change was not seen the City would not likely see another comprehensive cost analysis for another three to five years other than recommending the City keep pace with inflation between those studies.

City Manager Murray commented, when asked by Council member Martinez-Rubin, that he would not suggest there was a consistent relationship between providing services in-house as opposed to using consultants and the total cost for those services, but it was true there had been an increase in staff in certain areas to take on services that consultants had provided in the past to provide more continuous and consistent City services. Significantly changing the service level or service model may trigger a focused fee study for that service area, otherwise mimicking increases in general price levels as allowed by the PMC between comprehensive studies had been done every five years.

The City Council thanked the consultant and staff for working to bring the City's fees into alignment.

**ACTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Murphy/Council member Tave to adopt a Resolution Updating and Establishing User and Regulatory Fees with the fees to become effective September 1, 2022.**

<b>Vote:</b>	<b>Passed</b>	<b>5-0</b>
	<b>Ayes:</b>	<b>Salimi, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Tave, Toms</b>
	<b>Noes:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Abstain:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>

Mayor Salimi moved on to agenda item 12A since another consultant was present, with the City Council to return to the remaining public hearings after the completion of Item 12A.

## **12. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Overview of Public Banking and Provide Direction to City Staff [Action: Receive Report and provide Direction (Whalen)]**

Community Development Director Whalen presented the staff report and asked the City Council to receive the presentation from Global Investment Company (GIC), which would provide an overview of the public banking in California and provide direction to City staff to take the next steps to explore establishing a public bank in Pinole.

Cathy Jackson-Gent, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), GIC, provided a PowerPoint presentation which included an overview of GIC, a registered investment advisor licensed for over 26 years that had assisted individuals, small businesses, nonprofits and municipalities. She defined public banking as a corporation organized as either a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation or a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation for engaging in the commercial banking business or industrial banking business that is wholly owned by a local agency, as specified, local agencies or a Joint Powers Agency (JPA). The presentation included a brief video on public banking.

Commons goals related to a public bank included cutting infrastructure costs, spurring economic growth, saving money and generating revenue. Sample goals were provided along with relevant public banking timelines from the foundation of the Bank of North Dakota in 1919 to other public banking timelines and legislation related to public banking through 2022. Public banking efforts in which GIC had been involved and the establishment of the California Public Banking Alliance (CPBA) were highlighted. In addition, a map was displayed to show the activities in public banking throughout cities and states along with new legislation where over 25 initiatives for public banks were being pursued.

An overview describing AB 1177, California Public Banking Option, the first bill in the nation guaranteeing universal banking access created a new retail banking option provided by the State of California, and AB 857, the Public Banking Act and other pending legislation for House of Representatives (HR) 8721, Public Banking Act 2000 was presented. Public banking oversight through the California Department of Business Oversight, now the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation (DFPI) and other public banking oversight criteria were all highlighted.

Ms. Jackson-Gent walked through the requirements to start a public bank through AB 857, the prohibitions as part of AB 857, and the numerous benefits and challenges of a public bank. She explained that the Council should consider whether a public bank was right for the City of Pinole, and described a number of factors to consider such as investment in economic development, creation of jobs, potential new revenue sources, debt repayments, additional shared resources, collaboration with other jurisdictions and intermediaries, and cannabis banking in the future. A decision tree was also detailed to determine whether the City of Pinole desired a public bank. Even if the City decided not to move forward with a public bank, she suggested it may consider utilizing some of the other public bank programs that had already been created.

Ms. Jackson-Gent explained that the primary reason for the feasibility study was to determine whether a public bank was feasible, whether it could include cannabis banking and to interview stakeholders. She described the methodology GIC had used to conduct the multijurisdictional study and stated the majority of respondents had agreed if a public bank were to be created such an entity could be supported, although the willingness to support a public bank was not without conditions.

In terms of the next steps, Ms. Jackson-Gent advised that GIC could assist Pinole by working with the City Council and staff in the planning and implementation of economic development strategies, facilitate and assist in outreach to the state regarding market analysis, i.e., feasibility for the City of Pinole partnership, facilitate and assist interested persons (i.e. intermediaries) and other jurisdictions and facilitate and assist with related projects.

City Manager Murray stated if the City Council decided to consider this option, the direction to City staff would be for staff to return to the City Council with an action plan for proposed next steps. Staff would have to outline the staff time, cost for next steps and identify a reasonable timeline.

Council member Martinez-Rubin clarified with Ms. Jackson-Gent the examples of jurisdictions that had public banks had greater populations than the City of Pinole. Ms. Jackson-Gent also advised that while Pinole was a smaller jurisdiction, California State Charter Banks offered a range of asset sizes along with the reserves needed. For the City of Pinole, it made sense to participate in one of the existing ten banks, either the Public Bank of the East Bay or one of the other local banks. There were also monies available as part of the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) through the state, which funds were available to municipalities, and possible grant funds. The state was also trying to come up with financing for municipalities regardless of size.

In terms of what Pinole needed to get started would be part of the viability study or a feasibility study with regulators providing specific direction on what was needed in an analysis, which included a pro forma and feedback from citizens among other factors.

Ms. Jackson-Gent added the sources of capitalization were limited and may also include private funders. Also, a public bank would not only include state oversight, there was a suggestion to create an Ad Hoc Committee dedicated to this effort, with the County of Alameda offered as an example of having formed an Ad Hoc Committee or working group to get its process through a certain project and time and make sure things got done, which involved members of the community, members of the Council and legal counsel. As another example, a feasibility study of which GIC was involved in the City of Oakland involved a working group with participation from the City Treasurer, Finance Director and other stakeholders. Based on her experience, regulators appreciated the use of working groups.

Council member Martinez-Rubin asked how one neutralized the representation to ensure community benefit that would eventually be financed, and Ms. Jackson-Gent suggested it meant taking time for focus groups. She noted a multijurisdictional study involved the participation from treasurers from all over the state and numerous focus groups and finance and banking industry personnel were also involved. The focus groups provided input as to who should be on the Ad Hoc Committees and that would help neutralize since it would be transparent and ensure feedback and active outreach.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy again clarified with Ms. Jackson-Gent the criteria for a public bank and the two forms of oversight that included a JPA and supervisory board, although Ms. Jackson-Gent stated while there was not a requirement for a separate Ad Hoc Committee, it made sense to have a working group to move things along and suggested that be considered.

Stephanie Downs, Attorney, Meyers, Nave, Riback, Silver & Wilson, and a member of the City of Pinole Attorney's Office, clarified a JPA was not required in order for the City of Pinole to charter its own bank. If the City was in a County that had less than 250,000 people, a JPA would be required. Contra Costa County had far more than 250,000 people. She again detailed the requirements for a public bank including the fiscal analysis of the start-up, including costs, legal analysis as to whether the public bank would comply with the requirements of the State Constitution, conflicts of interest and the like. She added that the City itself could apply to charter its own bank.

The public bank must be formed as a nonprofit public benefit corporation or a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation, and either the City or the City in concert with other public agencies, or as a JPA or with other agencies as a JPA and the City as a separate agency, would be the shareholders in that bank, which as a nonprofit public entity would be considered members.

City Manager Murray further commented that the Ad Hoc Committee that Ms. Jackson-Gent had referenced was a committee that would explore the formation of a public bank, different from the Board of Directors that would oversee the bank once operational. It may be infeasible for Pinole to have its own public bank given its size but it may be feasible for Pinole to have one as part of a JPA with other jurisdictions, different from requiring a JPA to form a bank.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy requested more information from some of the smaller cities (population of 50,000 or more) that GIC had evaluated and which had benefitted from public banks, and Ms. Jackson-Gent confirmed that additional information could be shared with staff and be brought back to the City Council as part of a future discussion.

Council member Toms asked whether there was grant funding available for public banking and sought more information as to how an established JPA for a public bank would benefit if the City of Pinole were added to an established JPA.

Ms. Jackson-Gent again explained that since Pinole was a smaller jurisdiction there were options available such as looking at existing public banks locally and possibly tapping into those; start with the state that may provide tools and additional resources to analyze a public bank; and determine whether to establish a new public bank or join an established public bank as part of the analysis. The idea of possibly purchasing an existing bank (regional banks) could also be explored. Purchasing an existing bank or starting a new bank had benefits in that the more partners like the City the better since they could leverage each other's assets. In addition, larger cities had different tools and resources that could be utilized. As an example, the Bank of North Dakota was very proactive working with community banks and smaller counties and cities that needed funding and made sure all of the cities and jurisdictions it was working with also were working with their intermediaries. The idea of being a collaborative effort while new would work well for Pinole.

Ms. Downs clarified there had not been any other public banks formed in the State of California and no other public banks other than the Bank of North Dakota.

Ms. Jackson-Gent confirmed that the Bank of North Dakota and the Bank of Samoa Islands was it at this time.

Council member Toms clarified with Ms. Jackson-Gent the operational costs for a public bank entity would be answered as part of an analysis, and Ms. Downs explained that the public bank would be created as a separate nonprofit public benefit corporation and the City would be either the sole member or there could be other cities that could be included if they decided to become members. It could also be created as a JPA with other cities.

Council member Tave understood the concept of local banking but given the potential for risk, he requested more information as to whether municipal banks could merge and create JPAs and become institutions that may fail. He asked whether the City should start small.

Ms. Jackson-Gent commented that was something for the City Council to explore. Legislation was trying to reduce competition by having the public banks coordinate their efforts with community banks, Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) and private banks. The Bank of North Dakota had discussed successfully working collaboratively with private banks and she again noted they could leverage off each other rather than compete against one another. Ms. Jackson-Gent emphasized the importance of seeking state funding and resources as soon as possible which would help to answer many of the questions being asked.

Council member Tave also asked whether or not the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for Contra Costa County would be involved in the formation of the JPA and whether or not there were case studies available.

Ms. Jackson-Gent suggested this was all new information to be explored with much of the information having been developed over the past few years. Risk management, scale and policy were all requirements of the regulators that must be analyzed prior to implementing a public bank.

In response to the Mayor, City Manager Murray explained that if the City Council decided to move forward he would have to consult with his economic development staff on the staff time that would be required, and get back to the City Council with a timeline and next steps.

Mayor Salimi understood that banks were required to have 10 percent in reserves, which had been waived as of April 2020 due to the pandemic, but Ms. Jackson-Gent was unsure that was relatable to a public bank and was a question that should be posed to the regulators.

Ms. Downs confirmed the Mayor's comments and stated with respect to the Federal Reserve requirements the requirement was currently at zero percent. For deposits into the bank, which were liabilities to the bank, there was a zero percent requirement in terms of lending those deposits in that the federal regulations allowed lending those deposits out.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

Rafael Menis, Pinole, referenced the suggested resources for public banking and read into the record information from Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) as part of the California Banking Alliance Resources Booklet. He noted that fractional reserve banking seemed to be a significantly higher risk activity and was one of the factors that had led to the 2008 crash due to prime loans and needed bailouts. He also understood nine entities within the State of California were actively pursuing a public bank and suggested Pinole should consider joining the East Bay Regional Public Bank.

Mr. Menis asked about the expected cost to the City if the City were to pursue a public bank in five to ten years and the expected profits to the City during those timeframes. He cited a White Paper related to public banks, which stated the Bank of North Dakota had access to far more larger capitalization on a larger basis and was returning on average \$30 million to the state per year, but based on the amount of capital Pinole could raise for a public bank he suggested there could be far less return with significantly more cost.

Debbie Long, Pinole, expressed concern with the discussion for a public bank since the City had a balanced budget only if raiding the 115 Pension Trust, whereas the City was short millions of dollars and now was considering funding a public bank. She suggested that a future feasibility



study would likely cost the City a quarter of a million dollars and she questioned whether City staff had the expertise to oversee a public bank or that an oversight committee would not be political. She also questioned the risk to City assets and partnership with other cities or agencies and pointed out that public banks were a recent decision in the state for counties and cities to consider.

While Ms. Long understood that public banks had been around since 1919, she stated that North Dakota was neither the City of Pinole nor the State of California. North Dakota was a large agricultural state with 770,000 residents whose needs were vastly different from the needs of Californians. She also questioned using cannabis as a potential for public banking and noted that since the public bank must be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), it was likely cannabis dollars could not be legally taken and that issue would have to be explored.

Ms. Long commented that based on her research, general law cities required voter approval for a public bank but charter cities did not, nor did charter cities require approval to use citizen participation bonds, if necessary, which questioned the push for Pinole to become a charter city. She urged the City Council to get its house in order prior to using any tax dollars for any study and suggested the City Council already had too much on its plate.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy offered a motion to direct staff to invite department staff from the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation (DFPI) to make a presentation about public banking management and compliance in the State of California.

Mayor Salimi stated staff had recommended that staff be directed to return to the City Council with next steps but City Manager Murray clarified that was one option that the City Council may consider as direction to staff. The motion offered by the Mayor Pro Tem was another option for consideration and was acceptable direction to staff.

City Attorney Casher confirmed Mayor Pro Tem Murphy's motion was acceptable.

**ACTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Murphy/Council member Tave to direct staff to invite Department staff from the California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation to make a presentation about public banking management and compliance in the State of California.**

<b>Vote:</b>	<b>Passed</b>	<b>4-1</b>
	<b>Ayes:</b>	<b>Salimi, Murphy, Tave, Toms</b>
	<b>Noes:</b>	<b>Martinez-Rubin</b>
	<b>Abstain:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>

City Manager Murray reiterated, when asked by the Mayor Pro Tem, that staff had no recommendation on specific next steps but if the City Council wanted to pursue public banking further, City staff could be directed to return with a proposed Action Plan of next steps.

**ACTION: Motion by Mayor Salimi /Council member Tave to Direct staff to return with an Action Plan that outlined next steps.**

<b>Vote:</b>	<b>Passed</b>	<b>3-2</b>
	<b>Ayes:</b>	<b>Salimi, Murphy, Tave</b>
	<b>Noes:</b>	<b>Martinez-Rubin, Toms</b>
	<b>Abstain:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>

The City Council thanked Ms. Jackson-Gent for the presentation and Ms. Downs for her input.

Mayor Salimi declared a recess at 9:30 p.m. The City Council meeting reconvened at 9:45 p.m. with all Councilmembers present either in-person or via Zoom.

The City Council returned to the remaining public hearings at this time as part of Item 10.

- A. FY 2021/22 Annual Review of Utility User's Tax and Adoption of a Resolution Modifying Household Income Eligibility Thresholds for Utility User's Tax Exemptions for FY 2022/23 [Action: Conduct Annual Review and Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Guillory)]**

Finance Director Guillory provided a PowerPoint presentation for the FY 2021/22 Annual Review of the Utility User's Tax (UUT) which included an overview of the UUT; the annual review process each June as part of the budget process; total UUT collections and breakdown of the UUT collections and ten-year trend; with a recap of the UUT collections for FY 2020/21 and projected collections for 2021/22. UUT communications collections, UUT exemption guidelines and the recommended changes to income exemptions thresholds were all highlighted.

Finance Director Guillory recommended the City Council adopt the resolution contained in Attachment B to the June 21, 2022 staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

City Clerk Bell reported there were no public comments for this item.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

**ACTION: Motion by Council members Toms/Martinez-Rubin to adopt a Resolution Modifying the Household Income Eligibility Thresholds for Exemptions from the Utility User's Tax for FY 2022/23.**

<b>Vote:</b>	<b>Passed</b>	<b>5-0</b>
	<b>Ayes:</b>	<b>Salimi, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Tave, Toms</b>
	<b>Noes:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Abstain:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>

- B. Conduct First Reading of Ordinance Amending Chapter 12.04 "Street Excavations" of the City of Pinole Municipal Code and Adding Permitting Procedures, Insurance Requirements, Construction Standards and Pavement Restoration Guide for Encroachments into Public Right-of-Way [Action: Conduct Public Hearing per Staff Recommendation (Casher)]**

City Attorney Casher presented a PowerPoint presentation which included an overview of the background for an ordinance amending Chapter 12.04 "Street Excavations" of the City of Pinole Municipal Code and adding Permitting Procedures, Insurance Requirements, Construction Standards and Pavement Restoration Guide for Encroachments into Public Right-of-Way and the key changes to Chapter 12.04. The Municipal Code Update Subcommittee had discussed the proposed ordinance and had recommended approval as presented. The City Council was asked to conduct the public hearing and first reading of the ordinance as proposed. If approved on the first read, the item would return to the City Council on the Consent Calendar for a second reading and would go into effect 30-days thereafter.

#### PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Rafael Menis, Pinole, read into the record Section 12.04.050, Permit - Application – Issuance, (D), as shown on Page 501 of the agenda packet, and asked for clarification since there appeared to be a typographical error in the last sentence.

Mayor Salimi suggested staff review that section for clarity.

Council member Toms agreed that staff review Section 12.04.050 (D) and return with any required modifications.

#### PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

**ACTION: Motion by Council members Martinez-Rubin/Toms to conduct the first reading of an Ordinance Amending Chapter 12.04 "Street Excavations" of the City of Pinole Municipal Code and Adding Permitting Procedures, Insurance Requirements, Construction Standards and Pavement Restoration Guide for Encroachments into Public Right-of-Way.**

<b>Vote:</b>	<b>Passed</b>	<b>5-0</b>
	<b>Ayes:</b>	<b>Salimi, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Tave, Toms</b>
	<b>Noes:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Abstain:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>

- D. Adopt a Resolution Declaring Intent for the Levy and Collection of Annual Assessments for the Pinole Valley Road Landscape and Lighting Assessment District (LLAD) for FY 2022/23, Setting the Date of the Public Hearing, and Approving the Annual Engineer's Report [**Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Mishra)**]

Public Works Director Mishra provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Pinole Valley Road Landscape and Lighting Assessment District for FY 2022/23 Assessment Report, which included an overview of the background of the Pinole Valley Road LLAD to address traffic signals, streetlights, median landscaping, irrigation for landscaping, electricity to traffic signals and streetlights and graffiti removal. The Assessment District was identified as Zone A north of I-80 and Zone B south of I-80. He acknowledged that Zone B involved two streetlights/poles which had been knocked down in the last year, had not yet been replaced and were costly items estimated at \$15,000 per traffic light.

## PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

City Clerk Bell reported there were no public comments for this item.

## PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Council member Martinez-Rubin clarified with Public Works Director Mishra the figures in the Assessment Summary for FY 2022/23, which had also been detailed in the June 21 staff report, with the maximum assessment based on the maximum assessment for 2021. Mr. Mishra also clarified that staff was exploring less expensive options for the replacement of the two streetlight/poles previously described and stated the assessment had been kept to the CPI, which was around five percent.

Council member Toms also clarified with Public Works Director Mishra that the City received some replacement costs via insurance for the damaged streetlights/poles but the costs were not 100 percent reimbursed.

**ACTION: Motion by Council members Toms/Martinez-Rubin to adopt a Resolution Declaring Intent for the Levy and Collection of Annual Assessments for the Pinole Valley Road Landscape and Lighting District (LLAD) for FY 2022/23, Setting the Date of the Public Hearing for July 5, 2022 and Approving the Annual Engineer's Report.**

<b>Vote:</b>	<b>Passed</b>	<b>5-0</b>
	<b>Ayes:</b>	<b>Salimi, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Tave, Toms</b>
	<b>Noes:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Abstain:</b>	<b>None</b>
	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>

## 11. OLD BUSINESS

None

## 13. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD (Continued from Item 6) (Public Comments)

*Only open to members of the public who did not speak under the first Citizens to be Heard, Agenda Item 6.*

**Citizens may speak under any item not listed on the Agenda.** *The time limit is 3 minutes and is subject to modification by the Mayor. Individuals may not share or offer time to another speaker. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act, no action may be taken on a matter unless it is listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. The City Council may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Council meeting.*

Rafael Menis, Pinole, reported the City of Pinole had over 162 new cases of COVID-19 in the last fourteen days, with the case rate the third highest in Contra Costa County. He urged everyone to continue masking indoors especially in relatively crowded locations.

Mayor Salimi reported COVID-19 vaccinations were now available for children 6 months to five years of age and residents were encouraged to contact their health providers.

Cordell Hindler, Richmond, invited the City Council to the Mayor's Business Round Table on July 7, 2022 at Riggers Loft Wine Company in the City of Richmond, with tickets at \$35 per person. He asked that the City Council consider changes to the meeting procedures and keep Council reports brief. He too encouraged everyone to continue masking indoors.

**14. ADJOURNMENT** to the Regular City Council Meeting of July 5, 2022 in Remembrance of Amber Swartz.

At 10:15 p.m., Mayor Salimi adjourned the meeting to the Regular City Council Meeting of July 5, 2022 in Remembrance of Amber Swartz.

**Submitted by:**



Heather Bell, CMC  
City Clerk

**Approved by City Council:**

