



**MEASURE LC CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
AGENDA**

**LANCASTER MEASURE LC CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT  
COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA  
Wednesday, June 2, 2021  
5:00 PM**

**TELEPHONIC MEETING PURSUANT TO GOVERNOR'S ORDER**

**N-29-20**

Council Chambers – Lancaster City Hall  
Posted by 5:00 p.m. on May 27, 2021  
at the entrance to the Lancaster City Hall Council Chambers  
*44933 Fern Avenue, Lancaster, CA 93534*

**MEASURE LC CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

Chair James Vose

Vice Chair Kristine Sisson

Committee Member Cassandra Harvey

Committee Member Dave Gomez

Committee Member Geoff Yeager

In response to Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, this meeting will be conducted telephonically and audio streamed live on Channel 28 and the City's website:

<https://www.cityoflancasterca.org/about-us/departments-services/city-clerk/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/public-meetings-web-streaming>

**PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDIZED ITEMS MAY BE RECEIVED BY DIALING**

**1-877-853-5257**

**USING MEETING ID: 995 0326 1006**

**PASSCODE: 376281**

## **CALL TO ORDER**

## **ROLL CALL**

Commission Members: Geoff Yeager, Dave Gomez, Cassandra Harvey, Vice Chair Kristine Sisson, Chair James Vose

## **INVOCATION**

## **AGENDA ITEMS TO BE REMOVED**

Sometimes it is necessary to remove items from the agenda. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause you.

## **PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR - AGENDIZED ITEMS**

In accordance with Governor's Order N-29-20, the public may observe this telephonic/ virtual meeting by listening to the live broadcast on local cable channel 28 or live stream on the City's website (<https://www.cityoflancasterca.org/our-city/departments-services/city-clerk/meetingsagendasandminutes/public-meetings-web-streaming>). The public may participate in the meeting by DIALING 1-877-853-5257 USING MEETING ID: 995 0326 1006# PASSCODE: 643868#. Individual comments are limited to three (3) minutes unless a different time limit is announced and caller will be re-muted after the allotted time.

Consent Calendar items under the Legislative Body may be acted upon with one motion, a second and the vote. If you desire to speak on an item or items on the Consent Calendar, you may fill out one speaker card for the Consent Calendar. You will be given three minutes, unless a different time limit is announced, to address your concerns before the Legislative Body takes action on the Consent Calendar.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

**CC 1.** Approve Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes of May 5, 2021

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**NB 1.** Approve Adoption of Measure LC FY22 Budget Proposal

## **COMMITTEE/STAFF PRESENTATIONS/UPDATES/REPORTS**

## **COMMISSIONER MEMBER COMMENTS**

## **CITY MANAGER'S/ FINANCE DIRECTOR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR - NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS**

by listening to the live broadcast on local cable channel 28 or live stream on the City's website (<https://www.cityoflancasterca.org/our-city/departments-services/city-clerk/meetingsagendasandminutes/public-meetings-web-streaming>). The public may participate in the meeting by DIALING 1-877-853-5257 USING MEETING ID: 995 0326 1006 # PASSCODE: 643868#. Individual

comments are limited to three (3) minutes unless a different time limit is announced and caller will be re-muted after the allotted time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Next Regular Meeting: July 28, 2021 at 5:00PM

**MEETING ASSISTANCE INFORMATION**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this meeting will be held at a location accessible to persons with disabilities; if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk at (661) 723-6020. Services such as American Sign Language interpreters, a reader during the meeting, and/or large print copies of the agenda are available. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting/event you wish to attend. Due to difficulties in securing sign language interpreters, five or more business days notice is strongly recommended. For additional information, please contact the City Clerk at (661) 723-6020.

**AGENDA ADDENDUM INFORMATION**

On occasion items may be added after the agenda has been mailed to subscribers. Copies of the agenda addendum item will be available at the City Clerk Department and are posted with the agenda on the windows of the City Council Chambers. For more information, please call the City Clerk Department at (661) 723-6020.

All documents available for public review are on file with the City Clerk Department.



**MEASURE LC CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES**

**TELEPHONIC/VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, May 5, 2021**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Vose called the meeting of the Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee to order at 5:08p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee Members: Gomez, Harvey, Chair Vose

A motion was made by Committee member Gomez to excuse Committee member Yeager and Vice Chair Sisson and was seconded by Committee member Harvey.

Committee member Yeager joined the meeting at 5:13p.m.

**STAFF MEMBERS:**

City Manager; Assistant City Manager; Finance Director; Public Safety Director; Recording Secretary

**INVOCATION**

Chair James Vose

## **PRESENTATION**

### **BUDGET PRESENTATION**

Presented by: Assistant City Manager, Trolis Niebla; Finance Director, George N. Harris II

The presentation began with a recap of the last meeting and the purpose for Measure LC and the Citizens' Oversight Committee.

Chair Vose expressed concerns as to the duties of the committee asking if they were in an analysis and recommendation mode to the Council or were they just to be observers of what is presented. If they are to be in an advisory capacity, Chair Vose reminded all present that in order to not be in violation of the Brown Act, they would be unable to come to a consensus or to take any definitive action this evening inasmuch as none of the items being presented tonight for consideration had been agendaized. George Harris explained that what would be discussed this evening would be the expansion of existing City programs. The committee then, by each committee member's comments, would have opportunity to state whether or not they felt the individual projects presented would be worthy of expansion or not. Mr. Harris went on further to state that dollar amounts had yet to be assigned to any of the projects that will be mentioned in the presentation and that the input and advice that the committee members will share is very important. The comments would be on an individual basis and if anyone feels that one project is not worthy of expansion but the emphasis should be placed on another one, all of that will be noted in these minutes and shared with the Council. Mr. Harris acknowledged Chair Vose's concern and will confirm as to what capacity the committee is to relay their comments, whether in consensus and confirmative vote or through recordation of the comments of all members.

Trolis Niebla started the list of proposed projects with the following:

Renovation and Maintenance:

- 1) ADA/Sidewalk Program which would provide sidewalk ramps, repair damage and trip hazards and reduce the number of claims.
- 2) Pavement Management
- 3) PARCS Maintenance – switch lighting to LED lights that can be controlled remotely, update the sports courts, turf maintenance.
- 4) LMD refurbishment program which would include the Sierra Highway Bike Trail, refurbishing the medians with drought tolerant plants.

Committee member Harvey asked - "On those LMDs are we focused more on a sustainability perspective, because what I do when I drive around town, I do see some of them with broken up based on, we covered initially, we talked about sidewalks and some other areas where its breaking up and doing root damage or that sort of thing. Is that one of the reasons we're going with a more of a xeriscape inside of it so we don't have so much of a concrete jungle?"

Trolis Niebla advised that the City would be looking at drought tolerant plants that would be more sustainable, saving water and being more cost effective and not damage the sidewalk.

- 5) Fleet Maintenance Program – the average age of the City’s fleet is 11 years and we would like to bring the fleet up to industry standards which is 10 years/100,000 miles. A younger, more well-maintained fleet will help prevent down time, thereby saving time and money.
- 6) Annual Long Line Striping – Cost is approximately \$400,000.00 per year to upgrade the striping to thermoplastic (5 to 7-year life span). The goal is to refurbish 1/5 of the City’s striping every year.
- 7) Neighborhood Improvement Program which would help cut down on the Code Enforcement issues and improve neighborhoods by implementing a grant program to help homeowners make the necessary corrections that cause the Code Enforcement issues.
- 8) Community Clean Up Program – illegal dumping is a big problem in the City and this program will help keep up with the hot spot areas and requests.
- 9) Safer Streets Action Plan – identify locations in the City that need enhancements and improvements, engineering to mitigate certain collisions that were happening in those areas.
- 10) Green Infrastructure Advancement Plan which will include solar, electric vehicles, expanding the recycled water line and introduce the hydrogen plan.

George Harris next presented the following projects:

Smart City/Infrastructure Advancement Program:

- 1) SiFi Project which would install high speed fiber optic cable throughout our community at the cost of the installer, who would then lease to internet service providers. The City would also be able to tap into the high-speed internet capacity and create a Smart City. We will be able to expand our wifi capabilities, to leverage the capacity to distribute our own information, traffic control for better protection from a public safety standpoint and to add a digital camera traffic system, license plate readers, etc.
- 2) Information Technology – smart applications and operations systems to help keep all of our systems going and correct any deficiencies we currently have. Will also protect our technological infrastructure.

Jason Caudle commented that in making these determinations we balance two things – ongoing operation expenses and one-time capital expense. All the programs mentioned are in the one-time capital expense category so at any point if there is a down turn in sales tax we can easily remove the programs, but if they are completed then it frees up funds to be used in the next year for new programs.

Lee D’Errico completed the presentation with the Public Safety Hybrid Policing Model which has been in the development process for several years. Certain structure has been put in place

related to some of the things that have been going on in the criminal justice system for some time now, non-revocable parole, AB109 releasing low level offenders into the county probation system, Prop 47 and Prop 57, etc. There has been a significant release of prisoners in the last 5 years.

Law enforcement has suffered through vacancies as well as resource issues, budget cuts, law enforcement reform, etc.

We have been working with our community criminal justice partners to develop the infrastructure to move forward to this formalized model.

This is not a replacement for the Sheriff's department, it is more of a filling the role and the gaps in service of law enforcement and their general duties as it relates to the Sheriff's Department policy for ongoing problems that progress and continue and affect quality of life issues; more of an intervention and causation type model that looks at a reduction of calls for services in households where there are chronic calls.

Next on the pyramid is the Economic Development Level:

- 1) Corridor Beautification Program
- 2) Business Attraction and Retention
  - a) Health District
  - b) High Paying Jobs
  - c) Good Living
  - d) Good Restaurants

The top level of the pyramid is the New Facilities and Programs:

- 1) Event and evacuation center
  - a) Indoor Football
  - b) Basketball
  - c) Concerts
  - d) EOC
- 2) Tutoring and Childhood Development Program for underprivileged children
- 3) Cultural, Arts and Events Programs
  - a) Food Festival
  - b) Film Festival
  - c) Upgrade MOAH to LACMA Standards
- 4) Public Banking System

## Questions and Commentary:

At this time George Harris opened the meeting up to comment by the committee members and explained that the all of the items laid out this evening far exceed the amount of funds that will be generated in the 2021/22 fiscal year are meant to be projects that will span over the next ten years. What we are seeking as far as commentary input from this body, is there anything on the list that is not necessary or not worth investing in. The committee's comments are vital as the City Manager and the Council progress through deliberations on the new budget for FY 21/22. It is also things that the committee may want to remove or add or reprioritize.

George Harris turned the meeting back to Chair Vose.

Chair Vose: – “Certainly Mr. D’Errico, the model you have been working on and facilitating over time has really proven to be a very positive thing for the community and in my point of view it certainly deserves support, that’s for sure.”

Committee Member Yeager: – “I find it hard to really throw a lot of input towards... I have no idea what kind of money we’re talking about going towards each section of these projects specifically, I mean obviously I agree that everything that you guys have shown us so far is definitely important, how important as far as money is a whole other topic, I am a big supporter of the public safety program and I really want to make sure we do everything we can to support that wholeheartedly, and the streets and the parks, those are no brainers from my point of view as well, I just really don’t know... Should we spend X amount of dollars on this one project, I don’t know what those numbers are and its kind of hard to really give an opinion. All the projects have merit to what degree are we going to be supporting them is kind of the question I have.”

George Harris: “That’s a fair question. We don’t know yet. And the reason why I say it that way, there is such a long list of needs. Below each one of those categories, and if you talk to Trolis he’s got specific projects with specific dollar amounts listed, but conceptually we want to make sure that - are parks more or less important than economic development? On our pyramid we’re saying that they are, it’s that level of feedback ‘No, economic development is 100.. no, you should be feeding that at the bottom rung’. Its that kind of feedback we are looking for. Until we actually get into the final deliberations on the budget it will be very, very difficult for us to put specific dollar amounts to present to you because at the end of the day we still have constraints of what our actual resources will be in any given year to be able to put resources. Now one item could be a brand new park that we want to fund in one single year, well guess what, that becomes a high priority in year one, in year three it is no longer a priority because we have already built it, if that makes sense. Conceptually we are talking about the programs here and do we have it right as far as the priority for those programs and so as we have listed them conceptually are we going along the right path in regards to how we are prioritizing those programs because that is how we are going to address the priorities as we go into the actual deliberations as to how we present the final budget to the Council. It’s a fair question.”



Jason Caudle: “And if I could add to, George, if you want to call it consensus, I understand the Brown Act issues, but from the standpoint of that commitment, Jeff you bring it up and Chairman Vose brought it up as well, the finality of that what we are recommending to the Council, if we want to tighten that up a little bit and have another one of these meetings I’m sure you guys are committed to that timeframe, bring those numbers back once it gets shuffled into the other programs and priorities, we’d be happy to do that, I think we can within the timeframe we have, we’re looking at a month from now going to Council before the first budget hearing so we have some time to do that, if that’s a concern to the group we can bring it back and say we are going to be spending \$2 million dollars on public safety, we’re going to spend \$1 million dollars on roads; we’re going to spend, it will be generalized; I don’t think you want the list of Trolis’, he’ll be spending \$800 million dollars on roads, but – it may not repave 10<sup>th</sup> from 20<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup>, but its going to be \$1 to roads improvement, \$500,00. to smart cities those types of things, that is something we can put together prior to.

Chair Vose: “If I understood you all correctly, you talked about your revenue certainly balances the books and you have adequate reserves forecast for this next fiscal year, right, so, so then you have continuing projects that have a life over time. Those to me would need to be prioritized and valued in whatever method you value them at. The engineering side of the numbers game. And those may or not be categorized as appropriate additional funding for Measure LC or they may well be. And then you have, I don’t want to call it a wish list, because it is not a wish list its, to me, they are extremely important categories of future development whether its economic or public safety or whatever, so I’m not belittling the term, okay. But those then have different categories of potential priority. We all have worked in different arenas through our lives and most of us have worked with staff who have come to us with recommendations in our public and private endeavors, and we typically rely on staff. I have been involved with the City for, directly for over 13 years and the staff that I work with over the last years certainly are professional and understand their job very well and come to us in our commissions with very well thought out recommendations, sometimes we don’t agree with them, but for the most part we certainly value their recommendation. A hundred million dollars is an awful broad brush when you are looking at a \$13 million annual revenue over time. Has any consideration been given, for instance, to bonding out the entire list and using LC as debt service?”

Jason Caudle: That is a component of some of these projects, some of the larger ones that are specifically the event center, that’s going to be more than a one-year allocation. That would be the tool to fund something like this. So that would be an ongoing expense that would be over a 10-15 year period as debt service. Again, you wouldn’t want to use up your entire year on one project, maybe you would, but we wouldn’t recommend it. Like a road system, if you are going to build a \$2 million dollar road, then this year is \$2 million dollars, next year you might pick a different road or you might do 10 roads with \$2 million dollars, next year you might pick another one, but its not something you would have to program \$2 million dollars every year. The things that are likely to program a certain number every year is going to be debt service on the larger projects, I think we have only identified one project would categorize that way, and then the ongoing operational, the largest being Public Safety, some of the smaller ones being the tutoring program things like that would be an ongoing program operation, so you kind of break those up,

debt service, ongoing program operation and capital and that capital would just be recurring every year. We might come back and say, yes, it's still valid to do roads, we are just picking different roads this year.

Chair Vose: "Then there's other approaches that you don't leverage anything and pay as you go."

Jason Caudle: "Correct"

George Harris: "Which is the one I absolutely prefer because capital costs, as I discussed under the banking concept, capital costs for cities is not insignificant."

Chair Vose: "No, and well, there is always a payday at the end of the day. Someone has to get paid and the dollar you borrow today on a 30 year bond is worth how much over time – 2 ½ dollars maybe."

Committee Member Harvey: "Chairman Vose, I just have one question, so from a prioritization perspective, and Jason, I was going right down that line of thinking prior to you mentioning it because I know that sometimes we can fall in the ocean trying to do too much at one time. From a prioritization perspective how did we, how were those items prioritized, was there some sort of mini \_\_\_ or something done or focus group with the public, how did we determine what gets looked at or funded first or the front of our mindset first how do we get to those particular line items?"

Jason Caudle: "Well you guys are the focus group so this is part of the process, um two ."

Committee Member Harvey: "No, but I mean before it even hit that list, so I get the whole Maslow hierarchy, I get all that and of building in a good foundation but I'm saying how did we, today's list, how did some of those things arrive on the list? Is it just because of someone is considered an expert on the matter from the City?"

Jason Caudle: "There's best management practices, obviously a firm financial base, reserve is number one, if you have ten dollars in the bank you're not going to be able to self-actualize, right? The next one is infrastructure perspective, some of those infrastructure needs are financial losses as well, so if your road system breaks apart and you don't maintain it well, it becomes more expensive to maintain later, so it's more financially effective to maintain that now. That goes for sidewalks, all infrastructure, that's roofs on buildings, that's electrical systems, that's toilets in bathrooms, it's the whole nine yards. So that's kind of first and foremost because those are going to continue to dilapidate, they are going to continue to cost you more money five years from now."

Committee Member Harvey: "I get that, the reason I drove to that, because, Trolis you made a comment about LPAC but you didn't finish what that would be for LPAC, I was taking notes, I didn't know what on LPAC would have been, because LPAC would have been for me personally, I would not have looked at LPAC as a part of first list of items. I would have looked at public safety, I would have looked at infrastructure as far as roads, some of the other things that you have talked about, that's why I was wondering how did we get to that initial list."

Trolis Niebla: “Well, LPAC was under the PARCS program, it could one of, as an example of what could be one of the first, and the reason we put that on the list is because it actually has a very aging lighting system, that’s archaic inside its about 25 years old and it’s been breaking down a lot and the manufacturers of that system just don’t support it any more. So it’s one of those things that we go in and redo the lighting inside and so we can keep the show going, basically. That’s why that made the list and that’s that how we look at, and the other thing I’ll add to what Jason was saying, too, when we come up with these lists too, these are a lot of, especially in our infrastructure realm, these are where our Comcates are generated. So, that resident service system, where residents say hey, here’s illegal dumping or there’s pot holes, we look at those too and say where are we getting the most resident requests in, so we looked at those and said hey, here’s where they are so we need programs to address these or if we already have a program we need a bigger program so we are able to address these Comcate issues.”

Committee Member Harvey: “That’s what I’m trying to drive you too, that’s my question, that’s what I’m driving at. Okay, thank you.”

Chair Vose: “So what you are saying, the list of infrastructure, for instance, these proposed programs are not currently adequately funded to meet the community’s need, perceived or otherwise.

Trolis Niebla: Correct, and in some cases, we have claims data, that shows we are not keeping up. We are getting too many claims on our sidewalks and too many trip and falls happening so we know we need to put money into that to stop that.

Chair Vose: “So to me the bigger question then is, those life safety issues then would be a priority, certainly from a liability standpoint for local government. Public Safety, I don’t categorize that as public safety, it is, but it’s not police, okay, public safety I my mind is police, as life safety are the list of the ADA sidewalks, so for me, if those are categorized in a way of value over time and you’re looking at ADA sidewalks, you know you have 150 to put in and they cost you \$15,000.00 per, you’ve got a number. I don’t know if you have gone through the exercise but it seems to me you have got to go through the exercise before you can put it into a budget. So that is one group of categories. Then you have the Public Safety aspect. To me the hybrid police issue is primary, but also the quality of life, and how the community looks, what people perceive when they see the community, the debris, the trash, the neighborhood, that really is not a place where you would want to walk around at 10 o’clock at night, okay. So, those kinds of things are in another category, at least that is the way I see it. You talked about the tutoring, the child development, that sort of stuff, I mean there are partnerships out there I’m presuming that the City can develop with other non-profit agencies, who then can partner with the city with some sort of seed money to get those kinds of programs started. But I see basically two major categories, public safety and life safety issues really, that’s how I see it.

Jason Caudle: “I think I would add too, there is a quality of life component, too, that there are certain things that, the expectation, that are not life safety or public safety but there is a community image/atmosphere whatever that may, so if you don’t mind, I would add a third one

to that, and as it relates to priority then you can start layering in those priorities similar to the pyramid but broken down into an easier fashion.

Chair Vose: “I’ve often said to myself as I drive around the community, as you know with the planning commission there are a lot of projects and they are scattered all over the place over time, but we all, most of the commissioners drive around looking at the project sites prior to the meeting, to get some sense of where it is in the community and that sort of thing but you see a lot where and I say to myself ‘Gee, I wonder who else is coming out, from local government, to actually look around the community to see what the heck is going on here’, and it’s not a criticism it’s just the sense I have, and that’s the community, that’s what attracts development into a community, if it looks sharp all the years of fighting commercial projects in the community, when doing a tour with a project development, a primary tenant and they spend 45 minutes in your town, or an hour and a half maximum, they get a distinct impression whether they are going invest millions or not, and if they see the wrong thing, your dead. I’m preaching to the choir, you guys are shaking your heads because you know exactly what I’m talking about. So, the Walmarts of this world or the Targets, or whomever they may be, you can’t even drive on the same street more than once when you do a tour. It’s amazing how it works. So, anyway, that’s how I see it. I’ll be quiet and let everybody else talk. Mr. Yeager, I appreciate what you said and I sense you have got more you would like to add.

Committee Member Yeager: So, I’m listening and the discussion itself doesn’t clarify how I should be looking at this, as Mr. Harris said, you know, the time we’re supposed to be prioritizing the effort is the main thing we are supposed to be imparting our opinions on and I think that’s kind of what we are doing. I like the life categories and the public safety and the quality of life categories. And I can relate to all that.

Lee D’Errico: It’s important to note those all those interrelate, right? You know, I mean how we represent our community has a direct connection to what proliferation of criminal activity will take place. If it looks like we care, the community cares, that’s a stopgap for that type of activity in public safety. And especially on the quality of life emphasis is exactly where we are going with this model, and we really want to focus on raising the standard of quality of life in the community which makes all these other things grow and thrive and that’s I think the focus.

Jason Caudle: I would add to, and Jim you bring up a good point, there are certain things that we can’t half fund. We can’t half fund the Hybrid Law Enforcement Model or it doesn’t work. We can pave \$1 million dollars of street or \$2 million dollars of street, you are just going to be getting less street that gets paved. But there are doing to be certain things that we will be recommending to you that we’re not going to half fund, that say going to cost whatever number, say \$2 million bucks, if that’s what it costs, we’re not going say ‘oh, lets fund it at \$1million dollars’ because it just doesn’t work without it. So, those are some other categories we have to calculate in our mind as well. Some things you can’t half do, you have to do it the whole way.

Chair Vose: And then as you add programs, that also adds people, you know your staff resources, at whatever level, you can certainly ask people to do more with less to a point, but then you max out eventually, as you know. So that has to be factored in too, I mean, between the

labor cost and burden, that's substantial. So, if I am hearing from everybody, I haven't heard from Mr. Gomez. I'm sorry David.

Committee Member Gomez: No, not a problem. I think it comes down for me as, priorities, what is staff looking for. Also, of the existing programs and not-existing yet. The question is, what I see is \$13 million dollars the first year, how much are we willing to spend. Yes, these create jobs, I think part of it will create other taxes or whatever from the jobs but it is come down to priority. Public safety I think, this is an important one on my list. And then seeing, you know, what I consider the new program, I've been talking about, working with the sheriff and Lee, I call it Lee's program. I think this is going to grow the economy and create new jobs and it's like a recycled wheel, so hopefully we will get there. But that's basically where I'm at right now. And also, it's a lot to take in. I'm definitely going to be calling Jason to get more information so I can dissect this, it's all for an hour and a half of this, I want to know where the money is going to go, where we want to put it and that. I'll be relying on staff to help me get there.

Jason Caudle: One comment you made is how much are we going to spend. I think the voters intent - it's our responsibility to spend it all. And spend it all on good projects, you know, we always tell the story from a job creation perspective. If we are sitting on \$100 million dollars of revenue and we're not building roads, then there is somebody that doesn't have a job, there is somebody that is not getting employed building roads or there is not a road getting built. So, it is the intent of the taxpayer as well, that they entrusted us, all of us on this call, to spend wisely but more importantly to spend them and improve their community and build the things that they are going to benefit from or build the programs that they are going to be safer because of. So, that's our intent and then hopefully after the budget is approved, after our meeting on the budget, we'll be able to come back and say 'how'd we do?' Right? And Trolis will be able to share how many roads are under... ready to bid, Lee will talk about how many people he has employed and where we are at with the implementation. It's going to be those type of things the expectation is then to spend and to implement it. And that's the second part of our goal.

Committee Member Harvey: Chairman Vose, I have another, I guess, comment or question, I guess because I'm such a process oriented person in all facets of my life and going to your earlier point, as far as, because I almost feel like, not that we are deliberating now, what are we allowed to say when it comes to the Brown Act, I mean, what can we do in this particular meeting, or is there another meeting? What is the decision going forward, I feel like it's a little bit loose I'm not sure, going back to your earlier point, we know there is not a vote that takes place. And then oh, by the way, because it's a lot to take in at one time, is there another meeting that we need to have prior to the public meeting? I don't know, that's just a question.

George Harris: And I think upon your request, we can facilitate another meeting where we kind of share, in anticipation of the council's workshop, kind of where in each one of these categorie's final budget numbers fell. After we have our package ready to go and share that with you all in a meeting before it goes to the Council. And so, in that advisory capacity, once again, I will still have to research whether an affirmative vote of that is required, as opposed to simply relaying your commentary over to the Council for their consideration as they are making the actual final choice, that's the research I will do with the attorney, and whatnot, and make sure but , we

definitely want to provide you with , and the intent to provide you with, the actual specific numbers that are coming out of the budget into those, it's just as to whether or not is was before the council's deliberation and decision or after. It sounds like, it seems to be a legitimate consensus that you want to hear that information prior to the Council and not after, so that you can actually advance.

Committee Member Harvey: I personally want to hear because it makes our role for not, as far as I am concerned. That's one Committee Member's opinion.

Committee Member Yeager: I agree with that opinion

George Harris: Okay. So, we will work with Diane to try to get that scheduled either the last week of May or the first week of June. We will try to avoid pulling you away from any further birthday dinners if we can, so we will try to coordinate with each one of you on your schedules.

Committee Member Harvey: Well, I opened my big mouth so I need to make myself available. So, there it is.

George Harris: Fair enough. Do you have a birthday coming up at the end of the month?

Committee Member Harvey: No, the end of the year

George Harris: Okay, the end of the year. I just to want to make sure. I don't want to have lightning to strike twice on us.

Jason Caudle: I would add too, George, that even if it's not required by the resolution or the ordinance, if that's the wish of the group to have consensus and take a vote, we will plan to do that as well. There is nothing in the ordinance that is going to you preclude from doing it. But definitely we will share that information with you and be prepared to for you guys to do that.

Trolis Niebla: And think what I am hearing is that, in general, you're good with the pyramid and the prioritization that we came you with where we focus on public safety, life safety and quality of life, now you just want to see more of the details of how that lays out and that's what we will come back with that the next meeting.

George Harris: Right. Now I specifically actually heard, that there was a bit of prioritization and I know we are not voting, but if I can get an eye wink or a nod, that the life safety issues were somewhat higher priority than the public safety, then quality of life. Is that a fair enough statement as we are approaching; so those issues that we have received some claims or requests to consider, as they are either a vio – I won't say they are a violation of ADA but can improve upon ADA capabilities, those sidewalks that need to be addressed, like all of those things get some consideration either in parity with the public safety or slightly above the public safety, that's how its presented. I just wanted to get some clarity on that.

Committee Member Harvey: Let me first ask, I'm sorry, so Lee, I was going to call you D'Errico – that's what I call you behind your back – so where does Lee's fall? What does yours fall under now again, your category?

George Harris/Lee D'Errico: Public Safety.

Trolis Niebla: No, Public Safety is the third block on the pyramid. You've got fiscal reserves, infrastructure, and then public safety.

Chair Vose: Maybe if you get a chance, the slides that were created, if you can email them to all the members, that way we've got something in hand we can look at because, you folks work on two screens, most of us only have one, right?

George Harris: We will definitely get that Power Point presentation sent out.

Chair Vose: Appreciate that. Anything further from anyone, members? You good? Okay. As part of the public meeting, we are obliged to ask if there are any public speakers relative to the presentation.

The Recording Secretary announced the procedures for public comment.

No public comment at this time.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **CC1. Approve Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee Special Meeting Minutes of March 31, 2021**

The Recording Secretary announced the procedure for public comment.

No public comments at this time.

On a motion by Committee Member Yeager and seconded by Committee Member Harvey. The Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee approved the Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee By-Laws by the following vote: 4-0-0-0; Ayes: Yeager, Gomez, Harvey, Chair Vose; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Vice Chair Sisson

## **CITY MANAGER'S/FINANCE DIRECTOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No additional comments from the City Manager or Finance Director at this time.

## **RECORDING SECRETARY ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Recording Secretary provided the public with the procedure to address the Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee regarding non-agendized items.

**PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR – NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS**

No public comment at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Vose adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and announced the next regular quarterly meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 28, 2021 at 5:00 p.m.



PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 31st day of March, 2021 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

---

DIANE DOSH

RECORDING SECRETARY

---

JAMES VOSE

COMMITTEE CHAIR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA            }  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES       }ss  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES           }

CERTIFICATION OF MINUTES  
MEASURE LC CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

I, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ of the City of Lancaster, CA, do hereby certify at that this is a true and correct copy of the original Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee Minutes, for which the original is on file in my office.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CA on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

(seal)

\_\_\_\_\_

**STAFF REPORT**  
**Measure LC Citizens' Oversight Committee**

06/02/2021
NB

Date: June 2, 2021

To: Chair Vose and Committee Members

From: George Harris, Director of Finance & Information Technology

Subject: Adoption of the Measure LC FY22 Budget Proposal

---

**Recommendation:**

Submit to Council staff recommendation of the Fiscal Year 2021/22 Measure LC Budget Proposal

**Financial Impact:**

Financial impact is currently estimated at approximately \$13,700,000 in new District Transactions and Use Tax Revenue

**Background:**

On July 14, 2020, the City Council unanimously adopted Resolution 20-39 wherein the City Council proposed to submit a ballot measure to the voters of the City of Lancaster to establish a City ¾ cent Transactions and Use Tax thereby generating approximately \$13,700,000.00 in additional General Fund revenue annually.

On July 28, 2020, the City Council unanimously adopted Resolution 20-40 calling for a Special Municipal Election to be held on Tuesday, November 3, 2020, in concurrence with the General Presidential Election.

On November 3, 2020, the voters of the City of Lancaster approved by the required majority vote, the City of Lancaster Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance. The collection of the ¾ cent Transaction and Use Tax began on April 1, 2021 and is being administered by California State Department of Tax and Fee Administration.

**Analysis:**

After thorough review and analysis of the fiscal year 2021/22 budget proposal staff is prepared to present the year 1 plan for the use of Measure LC funds. The Measure LC committee, through recent discussion identified that the priority for the use of the year one Measure LC funds shall be as follows:

1. Life Safety
2. Public Safety

### 3. Quality of Life

Staff recommends to add an additional priority entitled “Sound Fiscal Foundation/Support.” As staff identified the number of specific uses of the funds all of these four priorities were taken into consideration.

#### Priority 1 – Life Safety

- Community Clean-Up (\$466,536) – In fiscal year 2020/21, the City Manager responded to multiple complaints regarding illegal dumping in certain blighted areas of the City. This prompted a response to create a pilot program which constantly surveils these blighted areas and removes any dumped materials and debris. The program was initially created as a pilot program as staff was unaware of the ability at the time to annually fund the effort. With Measure LC revenue, the ability to annually fund the program exists and staff believes there is a large life safety benefit to do so.
- City Hall Resiliency Project – (\$309,000) – This project is the city’s match for a grant funded program to add battery back-up electricity storage to power City Hall. The addition of a battery bank paired with the current solar electricity system will enable City Hall to be completely resilient and protected from and local power loss which may affect sustained operations.

#### Priority 2 – Public Safety

- Hybrid Policing Model (\$2,531,829) – The initiation of the Hybrid Policing model will begin with the addition of 7 new Full-Time positions. Two (2) officers; two (2) Technician I; two (2) Sr Specialists; and one (1) Specialist I. The total cost for the addition of these positions is \$847,724. The project will also include the increase in an amount of \$400,000 in an existing temporary staffing contract totaling \$800,000, the purchase of the RIMS case management software in the amount of \$250,000; Addition of the LEAPS system in the amount of \$250,000 and consulting fees for the plan development in the amount of \$120,000. There is an additional \$264,105 in vehicles, Emergency Preparedness equipment, AED and Drone equipment and communications costs.
- Traffic Enforcement Enhancement (\$250,000) – The City has experienced an increase of traffic related incidents as a result of a shift of policing priorities with County Sheriff. Through research and discussions with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) it has been determined that pursuing a contract arrangement with CHP will result in increased traffic patrol and enforcement. The concept involves amending the Sheriff contract to shift funding to a contract arrangement with the CHP, with a net increase of total costs at approximately \$250,000.

#### Priority 3 – Quality of Life

- PARCS Programs and Events (\$5,232,015) – In our first full budget year out of the COVID-19 pandemic the full slate of PARCS programs and events are planned for the year. In comparison to the last full fiscal year budget, approximately \$5.2M in events and programs have been added. From fully opening the Soccer Complex to tutoring

programs to Summer Camps and Community Events, the City is “all-in” regarding community programs and events.

- Event Center/Evacuation Center (\$1,500,000) – At the joint Council meeting held on May 10, 2021 the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale agreed to work together on constructing a regional event/evacuation center at the AV Fairgrounds. The ultimate project costs are yet to be determined. This initial investment is for architectural, environmental and structural design and development of the concept. The project is intended to be ultimately funded with public bond financing with debt service supported by lease agreements with both cities.
- Biotech Incubator Lab (\$1,000,000) – In an effort to expand our footprint in the Biotech industry and create job opportunities in Lancaster at the direction of Council, staff proposes a \$1M investment in an existing facility to create small laboratory space for lease by investors and entrepreneurs in the Biotech industry. Collected rents will reimburse the City’s investment.
- Art in Public Places (\$300,000) – The City Council has adopted an Art in Public Places policy which commits a percentage of the annual Capital Improvement Program resources to public art. This is the first year that the General Fund has been able to contribute to this cause. \$300,000 has been proposed to support the program out of the Measure LC revenues.
- Community Development Special Studies (\$300,000) – This study is being completed to ensure that proposed development located in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) challenged area will be able to mitigate traffic impacts through payment of a fee. This is a high priority because this approach will ensure these projects have a path forward that is not cost prohibitive and also ensures the City will be able to meet its active transportation goals.

#### Priority 4 \_ Sound Fiscal Foundation and Support

- Measure LC Reserve Contribution (\$1,033,874) – An expected balance of \$1.2M will remain at year end in unexpended Measure LC reserves that can be programmed by the City Council during the fiscal year or in a future fiscal year.
- 5 new full-time positions (\$776,745) – One (1) position is in the City Manager’s office Communications Division. Three (3) positions are in the Human Resources Department. And one (1) new IT support position.

#### **Summary Table:**

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Item</u>
5,232,015	PARCS Programs and Events
2,531,829	Hybrid Policing Model
1,500,000	Event Center
1,000,000	Biotech Incubator Lab
776,745	5 New Support Positions (CM, HR, IT)
466,536	Illegal Dumping/Encampments Clean-Up
309,000	City Hall Resiliency (Battery Back up Program)
300,000	Art In Public Places
300,000	Programmatic EIR - VMT Study
250,000	Traffic Enforcement Enhancement
1,033,874	Measure LC (Reserves)
<u>13,700,000.00</u>	

**GH:dd**