[Speaker 3] (0:00 - 0:22)
It's seven o'clock. It is May 3rd, 2022. Welcome to the first meeting in May.

I will remind you all this is an open meeting, both online and you can come and visit us in person. There are chairs sitting in the audience. And with that, Janet, we've called to order.

Could you call the roll, please?

[Speaker 14] (0:23 - 0:24)
Council Member Diaz?

[Speaker 3] (0:24 - 0:25)
Yes.

[Speaker 14] (0:25 - 0:26)
Council Member Wang?

[Speaker 3] (0:26 - 0:26)
Here.

[Speaker 14] (0:27 - 0:28)
Council Member Wolf?

[Speaker 3] (0:28 - 0:28)
Here.

[Speaker 14] (0:28 - 0:31)
Vice Mayor Tillman? Here. Mayor Clovin?

[Speaker 3] (0:31 - 0:38)
And I am here too. We'll move on to item two. And Janet, if you don't mind, could you roll the meeting protocol video, please?

[Speaker 15] (0:46 - 2:26)
Conducted as a Zoom webinar pursuant to the provisions of the AB 361, which modifies certain requirements of the Brown Act and is also being conducted in person. This meeting is also being webcast on the City of Clayton's website. The Mayor will call upon its Council presenters, staff and other speakers by name and ask that they speak clearly and state their names before giving comments or remarks.

The Mayor will call on members of the public that are attending in person first and then shall call on members of the public that are participating via Zoom. Persons participating via webcast and Zoom with their cameras enabled are reminded that their activities are visible to viewers.

Members of the public participating in person wishing to speak on an item may submit a speaker card with the City Clerk.

Members of the public participating by Zoom wishing to speak should use the raise hand feature or dial star 9 and the Mayor will call upon them at the appropriate time. Telephone attendees will be called upon by the last four digits of their phone number. It is requested that public speakers state their name, but providing such information is voluntary.

Written public comments received by Clayton City Clerk by 5 p.m. today will be entered into the record, but will not be read out loud. If authors of the written correspondence would like to speak, they are free to do so and should raise their hand and the Mayor will call upon them at the appropriate time. A roll call vote will be taken for all action items.

The chat feature is not active. In order to get the full Zoom experience, please make sure your application is up to date.

[Speaker 3] (2:32 - 3:29)
Thank you, Janet. And we'll move on to item number three, the Pledge of Allegiance. Please stand.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Excellent. Let's move on to item number four, which is the Consent Calendar.

Are there any items in the Consent Calendar that any of my fellow Council Members would like to pull for discussion? Thanks. I appreciate the first and the second.

Before we can do so, let's open that up for public comment. Janet, could you tell me if there are any hands raised for this item, please?

[Speaker 14] (3:30 - 3:34)
Mayor Kloven, I have 28 Zoom attendees and zero hands raised.

[Speaker 3] (3:35 - 3:42)
Thanks, Janet. Appreciate it. We have a first by Council Member Diaz, second by Vice Mayor Tillman.

Janet, will you call the roll, please?

[Speaker 14] (3:44 - 3:45)
Council Member Diaz?

[Speaker 3] (3:45 - 3:45)

Yes.

[Speaker 14] (3:46 - 3:46)
Council Member Wan?

[Speaker 3] (3:47 - 3:47)
Aye.

[Speaker 14] (3:47 - 3:48)
Council Member Wolf?

[Speaker 3] (3:48 - 3:49)
Yes.

[Speaker 14] (3:49 - 3:51)
Vice Mayor Tillman? Yes. Mayor Kloven?

[Speaker 3] (3:51 - 7:21)
Aye. It is approved five to nothing. And we'll move on to item number five, which is Recognitions and Presentations.

Item 5A is Information Only. We have previously recognized Cinco de Mayo on May 5th, Armed Services Day on May 15th, Peace Officers Memorial Day and Police Week on May 15th, Asian Pacific Heritage Month in May, as well as Jewish American Heritage Month in May. And since we have already recognized those previously, we'll just recognize them verbally now without having to read the proclamations.

And we'll move on to item number 5B. And this item is a proclamation declaring Friday, May 6th, 2022 as a Lease Warrant Day in the City of Clayton. And Chief Warren, it's been a while since we've been in person and had a chance to do a proclamation.

I'm not even sure what the protocol is. It's been so long. But I have a proclamation here.

And so what I'll do is I'll read it now. And if you don't mind, I'd like to come up and hand it to you at the podium when I'm finished in appreciation. And this is a proclamation declaring May 6th, 2022 as a Lease Warrant Day.

Whereas on May 5th, 2022, after more than four years in Clayton, Chief of Police Elise Warren will complete her services to the City of Clayton. And whereas Chief Warren began her law career in enforcement in April 1990 with the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office. And while there, she gained valuable experience in an array of law enforcement skills.

And whereas during her law enforcement tenure, she served as Deputy Sheriff, Sergeant,

Lieutenant, Captain, and Assistant Sheriff. And whereas on February 12th, 2018, Elise Warren became the City of Clayton's first female police chief. And whereas under her tenure, Chief Warren initiated the Regency Drive parking permit program, added cameras to the Grove Park to enhance safety and upgraded all the police department equipment, vehicles, and technologies to their highest industry standards.

And whereas during Chief Warren's tenure, she earned the community's trust, confidence, and support by being fair, just, and responsive to the public needs while also enforcing law and protecting life and property. Now, therefore, I, Peter Klobin, Mayor of the City of Clayton, on behalf of the entire City Council and our community, do congratulate Elise Warren on her long and distinguished career by declaring Friday, May 6th, 2022, as Elise Warren Day in the City of Clayton. And do with, herewith, declare her to be an honorary Clayton citizen in perpetuity for her contribution to the people in our community.

If any other Council Members have comments, but I just, you know, the proclamation is nice, but as long as I've been here, I've always admired you silently for everything you've done, and I really appreciate your service to the City. Thank you very much.

[Speaker 5] (7:23 - 9:20)
I'd like to add a couple of things here. First of all, when Chief Warren arrived, the department, although had been through a number of competent and prior chiefs of police that filled that role, Chief Warren brought a particular professionalism and organization to the department, which now, whoever is her successor, will benefit from that. She has brought to the staff of the department much training and professional development, to the point where she's got three excellent sergeants that fill in for her role when she's not there.

And that's something that wasn't done to any great degree in the past. Further, she upgraded our entire fleet of patrol vehicles. We now have a complete Ford SUV patrol set, and upgraded our radios and all the other things that go that make our department one of the best in the area.

We have better equipment, we have well-trained staff, and we have a leader that is leaving us, but she brought a lot of professionalism to this organization, and specifically to our police department. And I really want to commend her for that. And that's due primarily to her abilities, not only that, but also her professional background that she had at the sheriff's office.

So thank you very much, Alyse, and we wish you well in your new endeavor.

[Speaker 8] (9:21 - 10:04)
Well, not to make you feel more uncomfortable right now, I've never seen you this red before. But you know that we all respect you a great deal. And the entire city of Clayton right now is pulling their hair out because you're leaving.

And I'm one of them, as you can see. So thank you for all you've done for us for years. It's a

good run.

Wish you well, and we look forward to seeing in your new position. I wish you were staying here in Clayton. But you have certainly, and I echo what Jim has said, you certainly have defined the term leader.

So thank you so much.

[Speaker 7] (10:08 - 10:36)
I just want to say thank you for all you've done. Personally, I've always enjoyed our talks. And one of the things, the qualities that I appreciate the most is your pragmatic approach to law enforcement, which in this city, given our constrained resources, has been very creative.

And I think the result has been great. And so, you know, you'll be missed, and I wish you the best of luck.

[Speaker 4] (10:41 - 11:41)
Dude, I can't believe you're leaving. But thank you. I can't echo everything else that they just said, but I did appreciate you reaching out to me after I was elected and sitting down and being candid to share some of the concerns you had with what was going on in the city and the department and all the things that needed to be fixed and helping shine a light on that.

So thank you. I also appreciated working with you on the Upper Keller Ridge Key Lockway project that both Jim and I worked on on the Public Safety Committee. That was really important to do for those residents at the time, and I do appreciate you actually taking the extra time to do that.

And everybody's saying their conversations that they've had with you personally, but I have to say on behalf of my daughter, thank you very much for the candid conversations you had with her and just opening up your arms and inviting her in to actually come and speak to you whenever she wanted. That day in the department was a big one for her. So thank you very much, and I will miss you.

Good luck.

[Speaker 18] (11:44 - 12:07)
Okay, I'll give my very short speech because I don't like speaking in public much, but you know, it's been a challenging four years and very rewarding, and my motto has always been to leave a place a little bit better than how I found it, and I feel like I accomplished that. So thank you all for your friendship, your support, and it has been a good four years, and it's time for a new adventure. So thank you.

[Speaker 3] (12:09 - 12:39)

Thank you. And with that, we'll move on to item 5C, which is the Certificates of Recognition for Public School Students, exemplifying the do-right-thing character of integrity during the months of March and April 2022. And with this, I'm going to let Council Member Wolf take it on.

[Speaker 8] (12:40 - 12:53)
Okay, here we go. Let's see who's on the screen. Janet, are we starting with the elementary school?

Okay, good. Do we have Ms. Sanchez with us today?

[Speaker 11] (12:55 - 12:58)
We do. Can you hear me?

[Speaker 8] (12:59 - 13:00)
Principal Sanchez.

[Speaker 11] (13:01 - 13:04)
Can you hear me? Yes, can you hear me okay?

[Speaker 8] (13:05 - 13:06)
Oh, there you are. Hi.

[Speaker 11] (13:08 - 13:10)
Hi, can you hear me okay?

[Speaker 8] (13:10 - 13:12)
Yes, we can hear you just fine.

[Speaker 11] (13:13 - 13:18)
Okay, I know there's a little delay, so I will try to talk slower because I talk very fast.

[Speaker 8] (13:18 - 13:20)
Who do you have for us today?

[Speaker 11] (13:23 - 14:54)
Well, first, I already see him in the camera. We have Cole Hamza. Hello, Mr. Cole. Hello. How are you? I'm good.

Good. So Ms. Blazer has written a few things for me to read, and I know my own, you know, Cole's one of my favorite people to see every morning. He always has a smile on his face and is ready to start the day, so he is absolutely one of my favorite second graders to see.

From Ms. Blazer, Cole is a perfect student to represent integrity. Cole can always be counted on

to make the right choices at school. Cole is honest, and he is a wonderful role model for others.

Cole consistently follows the school rules and class rules. He also helps others make good choices as well. He is a kind, supportive friend to everyone.

Cole is helpful and responsible. Cole makes my job as a teacher, and I'm going to echo my job as a principal, much easier, and we can always count on him. It is a pleasure to have Cole as Ms. Blazer's student and as one of the 674 students that we have on our campus. And side note, Cole is also a very amazing big brother. He takes care of his little sister on a daily basis. So, congratulations, Cole.

Thank you.

[Speaker 8] (14:55 - 15:09)
Here, here. Good job, Cole. Well, Cole, you are the epitome of integrity, and we appreciate your being here.

Where's your little sister today?

[Speaker 11] (15:15 - 15:24)
She is currently sleeping. Sleeping. Why is she sleeping?

Because tomorrow is the what? The fun run. Eagle run.

Yeah.

[Speaker 8] (15:24 - 15:50)
Yeah. All right. Terrific.

Well, thanks. Thank you very much for being here and for being a great big brother and a great student. And we have a certificate signed by all of us here, and we'll get that to you ASAP.

So, congratulations, Cole Panza. Thank you. He's overwhelmed.

Thank you, Cole.

[Speaker 11] (15:50 - 15:56)
It might be almost his bedtime as well. All right.

[Speaker 8] (15:56 - 16:03)
That was almost my name. I was almost named Cole, too, at one time. Anyway, go ahead.

Principal Sanchez, go ahead.

[Speaker 11] (16:03 - 16:11)
The seized. The seized. And next, we have our fourth grader from Ms. Baker's class, Ms. Elyse Zedeker.

[Speaker 19] (16:12 - 16:14)
Hi, Elyse. Hi. Hi.

Thank you.

[Speaker 11] (16:15 - 17:12)
Yes. And I'll do a quick side note. Elyse always has a smile on her face, and it is so good to see her on a daily basis when I actually get to get out of my office and see all the kids walking and playing at class and going into the Feather Store like I did today.

So, it's always fun to see Elyse. Ms. Baker has given me a little paragraph to read. And here we go.

Elyse is an extremely focused student. She is methodical about everything she accomplishes and works very hard to follow instructions to the letter. Elyse always does the right thing, even when she knows no one is looking.

And that is an incredible, incredible asset. If she thought an assignment was incomplete or that she did not follow some rule to a game, Elyse would be the first to admit in the blink of an eye. She is the embodiment of integrity.

And congratulations, Elyse. Thank you.

[Speaker 8] (17:15 - 17:48)
All right, Elyse. Very good. Well, you know, doing the right thing, even when no one is looking, that's very, very important.

That is the definition of someone with great integrity. And we're so happy that you're here and that you won this award. And congratulations to you.

And as with Cole, we have a certificate signed by all of us for you. And keep your integrity. That's the most important thing you're going to have in life is your integrity for both of you.

So, thank you both. And thank you, Ms. Sanchez, for being with us.

[Speaker 11] (17:49 - 17:51)
OK. Bye.

[Speaker 8] (17:51 - 18:06)
Bye. Bye. Bye.

Thank you. And we have Mr. Fong with us today, an entire group. Hello, Mr. Fong. Good evening.

[Speaker 16] (18:06 - 18:08)
How is everybody? Middle school?

[Speaker 8] (18:08 - 18:10)
We're good. How are you?

[Speaker 16] (18:11 - 18:28)
I am doing well, thanks. I just want to say I don't find it coincidental that we're talking about integrity and honoring Chief Warren on the same evening. So, I just want to say congratulations to Chief Warren.

We will miss her as well.

[Speaker 8] (18:29 - 18:37)
And we even had a student from the grade school named Elyse, which was amazing, too. What a coincidence. Yep.

[Speaker 16] (18:38 - 19:37)
All right. So, talk about integrity. So, to me, integrity is about honor, morals, honesty, and goodness.

People who have integrity do the right thing. They do it regardless of the situation. They do it regardless of whether they're being supervised or watched.

And they do the right thing even if other people aren't doing the right thing. The students that I have here tonight epitomize that trait. I have Ms. Sophia Bushnell and Mr. Justin Reimer. Both are excellent students, but more importantly, they're just great people and great human beings. Their teachers were all very consistent in what they said about them, and that is that they are extremely trustworthy. They make great choices.

And it doesn't matter what the kids around them are doing. They're just always, once again, doing the right thing. So, I'm proud to be their principal, and I'm honored to be presenting them with this award for integrity.

[Speaker 8] (19:37 - 19:48)
Thanks. Thank you. Thank you, Principal Fong, and thank you to both Sophia and Justin.

You're both in the eighth grade, is that right?

[Speaker 19] (19:50 - 19:51)
That is correct.

[Speaker 8] (19:51 - 20:06)
Yeah. Thank you. Did I win something?

No. Good. Anyway, so you're both in the eighth grade, and you're going to be going on to your high school career here soon.

Are you looking forward to that?

[Speaker 14] (20:06 - 20:14)
It's going to be really fun.

[Speaker 8] (20:15 - 20:29)
All right. Justin, how about you? I just don't want to be in middle school anymore.

Said from a man with integrity. That's very good. Wait a minute.

[Speaker 4] (20:29 - 20:31)
I'm sorry. Can I interrupt really quickly?

[Speaker 8] (20:31 - 20:32)
Was it Justin that just spoke?

[Speaker 4] (20:32 - 20:46)
I just don't like middle school. Holy smokes, his voice has changed. Justin, you grew up.

He lives up the street from me, like literally five houses up, and I have not heard him speak in years, and that's shocking.

[Speaker 8] (20:46 - 20:49)
He has that low voice. I don't want to be in middle school anymore.

[Speaker 4] (20:49 - 20:49)
Yes. Congratulations.

[Speaker 8] (20:51 - 21:18)
Well, congratulations to both of you, and Mr. Fong said it all about integrity. Carry that on with you for the rest of your life. It's so very important.

Keep doing the right thing, and we will get your certificates to you, so congratulations. Thank you, Mr. Fong, and thank you to all of our students and to our principals today. Thank you, and back to you, Mayor.

Thank you, Council Member Wolff.

[Speaker 3] (21:19 - 22:00)
I really appreciate you to do that. I really appreciate the students and this exercise we do. I'm looking forward to the next one, and hopefully next time you'll all be able to join us in person as things are starting to loosen up a little bit.

That finishes item 5C on the agenda, and we get to move to item 5D, which is the annual fire district update, and, Janet, if you can let our speaker in, that'd be wonderful. Thank you. It's already there.

Sweet. Good evening, Mayor. Can you hear me?

I certainly can. Welcome.

[Speaker 2] (22:02 - 22:37)
Great. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Vice Mayor and Council Members. My name is Terence Carey. I'm an Assistant Chief of Contra Costa County Fire, and it's my privilege to be here to come back again to brief you folks on just some updates with Con Fire and some lessons for our community members of things to be aware of. I don't know if Janet can help me.

I do have my PowerPoint, and I have it on a shared screen, I thought. Are you picking that up at all, Janet?

[Speaker 14] (22:39 - 22:44)
I am not. Make sure you click the share screen and share sound.

[Speaker 2] (22:45 - 23:00)
Yeah, just give me a minute here. Let me just try a different screen. Bear with me.

[Speaker 6] (23:42 - 23:46)
Please hold while we work through a few technical issues.

[Speaker 7] (24:04 - 24:52)
As a suggestion, if you have the deck, you can share it as he walks through the slides. Disregard that.

[Speaker 6] (25:04 - 25:22)
Yes, I have the presentation up on our presentation computer and our technical wizard. It's in

the back room. We're going to make that visible on the screen.

So I'm not sure, Terence, if you can see it, though, at the same time.

[Speaker 5] (25:22 - 25:24)
There it is.

[Speaker 7] (25:41 - 26:02)
Terence, hold on just one moment. We're having audio problems here. Just a moment while we try to resolve.

[Speaker 6] (26:05 - 26:08)
Chief Carey, are you muted on your side?

[Speaker 5] (26:10 - 26:13)
Your audio is gone, Chief Carey. We can't hear you.

[Speaker 7] (26:33 - 26:56)
Can you try one more time, Chief? So it's not his audio. His audio is fine.

It is our display audio for the mics because I could hear him over it. Oh, okay. That's my test.

So you'll have to give us a moment while we resolve in the room.

[Speaker 19] (27:03 - 27:03)
Okay.

[Speaker 2] (27:15 - 27:16)
Any luck here?

[Speaker 7] (27:17 - 27:26)
We have you back now, but I think what happens when we switch over the presentation mode, it switches the audio orientation to point to the other screen. So we'll have to figure out how to resolve that.

[Speaker 6] (27:26 - 27:31)
Yes, we will be working on that because we're going to have another opportunity when we get to the next item.

[Speaker 2] (27:34 - 27:37)
Do you just want me to go ahead and start while you work on that in the background?

[Speaker 6] (27:37 - 27:53)

Yes, because the feed out on the web does show the slides right now. So if you have your agenda that has the packet, you're in the Zoom meeting. You are not on the web.

[Speaker 2] (28:01 - 29:57)
Yes. Okay, then I'll go ahead and start. I apologize for the difficulties on my end of today's meeting.

Again, my name is Terrence Berry. I wanted to go over some updates in regards to pathogens in Conocos County. Fire, some were, most of them are going to be external to the City of Clayton, but they do have a nexus and a benefit to the City of Clayton.

Some of the topics I wanted to cover would be the annexation update and the annexation capabilities countywide, as well as a brief fire weather outlook. I know that's always of interest. Some safety tips for our residents, as well as some links.

I know in the past it's been a desire to have the citizens to go to and also what our citizens can do. And I would urge you throughout the presentation, please don't wait until I'm finished. If you have questions, I welcome them throughout the presentation.

So going to the overview of the Clayton on slide 2021-22, year-over-year fire experience. It can give you, there's a lot of data in there. I believe that's going to be slide three, if that can be transferred to that slide.

In that, that gives us a little snapshot of our emergency responses in the calendar years 2020 and 2021. And with also a little preview of where we're at year-to-date as of this week, in regards to responses within the City of Clayton. So as you can, can anybody see any of slides or just want me to kind of give you an overview on that?

[Speaker 7] (30:08 - 30:15)
We can see the slides. We have both physical copies and then they're being projected. So thank you.

Okay, great.

[Speaker 2] (30:16 - 44:41)
As you can see in 2021 and 2020, you're pretty flat on our emergency responses in the City of Clayton. But looking at our year-to-date so far, what kind of leaps off the page to me is the EMS responses have increased within the City of Clayton. That's what we're finding throughout the fire district.

So that's not an anomaly within the City of Clayton. We've seen that with people that are just a general broad brush with COVID restrictions. People are more apt to call 911.

Now we're during 2021 and 2020, people are a little more reticent to call for emergency services in regards to EMS. So those just give you a little overview. I would say from a City Council's viewpoint within the City of Clayton, any emergency is something you don't want to see. But we do consider Clayton one of our slower response areas, which is a good thing for your folks and your citizenry.

Okay, moving on to annexation. Annexation has been in the works for years, and we're really poised. We're closing on the finish line.

Contra Costa County fire is going to be annexing East Contra Costa County fire as of July 1st is the official day. We really appreciate the elected officials' assistance with this, taxpayers who voted in a revenue source for us to have some revenue to do this. And we're excited about it, and we're looking at that it'll be a value-enhanced service to the citizens in East Contra Costa County.

Presently, there's three fire stations in East Contra Costa County. If there's any significant emergencies of note, our units are pulled into East Contra Costa presently and have been for the last years. And so we're looking forward to dropping that barrier there and becoming one organization.

And what our plans are is actually as of June 1st, prior to the official annexation date, Contra Costa County is going to open Fire Station 55, which is in East Contra Costa County's present footprint. We're going to staff it with Contra Costa County employees, and we're going to open it with, and it's called Advanced Life Support, which means there's a paramedic on the apparatus responding from there. Presently, in the entire footprint of East Contra Costa County, they are only EMTs on their fire apparatus.

So as of June 1st, we'll be opening a fourth station there, and it will be Advanced Life Support. Following very quickly on the heels of that, on July 1st, once the annexation is complete, we're going to upgrade Fire Station 52 in Brentwood to ALS as well. So now you'll have two of the four stations will be ALS.

Over the next 9 to 12 months, as we hire additional personnel, we're going to add ALS services to those stations. We're also going to be adding a truck company in that jurisdiction, as well as an additional truck company in Antioch, and those will be occurring in March. In closing, just going back retrospectively to July 1st, we're also going to be opening a closed fire station in Walnut Creek.

That's Fire Station 4, and that's on the border of Alamo and Walnut Creek. So the benefits is it's going to create more depth to the fire district, which creates more resources for us to rely on when we have emergencies throughout the district, whether it's in the City of Clayton or elsewhere. Looking at that station in Alamo, that's not going to be a first due into Clayton by any means, but that gives us resources in a closer proximity as well as those ones in East Contra

Costa when there are greater levels of emergencies or drawdowns in the City of Clayton.

So we're excited about that, and like we said, a lot of work has gone into this over the years, and I really thank the citizens for their support and the elected officials to get us across the finish line. Any questions on the annexation? Okay, following that, under the direction of our County Board of Directors is we're looking at the City of Pinole.

City of Pinole right now has one fire station, but they do have an additional fire station that's closed. We are looking to contract for service, or excuse me, Pinole is looking to contract for services with us, and when that occurs, we would open up that second fire station. So again, that same depth of resources would be increasing to the district as a whole, and specifically in West County.

So again, that's Measure X, funds are helping with that, and another exciting thing that's occurring. Don't really have a date for you on that, but we're really going full scheme ahead with discussions with Pinole on that, and I know there's a desire to have it done sometime in 2022. Hopefully we can accomplish that goal.

Going on to fire service improvements. We talked about this, I believe, at my last meeting with you folks, is we have, it's called a hand crew. They're 16 personnel led by two captains, so a crew of 18, and they were on duty limited times last year.

It was our first year we tried it, and it was very successful. So what we've done is we've expanded the program, and they're known as crew 12, and they respond out of Martinez, and now they're on seven days a week, and we have two separate crews of 16 personnel each. They're a force multiplier, so they're dispatched to any vegetation fire, and they go out, and they will cut line and assist us with what we call overhaul, extinguishing the fire as well.

During the months, they've done a lot of trail work and have worked throughout the county to mitigate where there's been overgrowth, etc. So again, we're really excited about this, and I think that you'll see them out and about when there's incidents that's out in Marsh Creek. They're automatically dispatched, and they're a great asset.

For example, yesterday we had a seven acre vegetation fire out in East County in our battalion eight in Antioch. These crew responded to that. Once the fire is extinguished, and we're getting our apparatus back in service, our personnel back in service, crew 12 can stay on scene, remain on scene, monitor the extinguished area, and do any mitigation efforts to ensure that the fire is truly out.

So that's a big plus for the organization and the community, and I think a real benefit to everybody. We continue to add to our fleet. I think last time we talked about what we call type six fire apparatus.

The fire station, for example, in Clayton has a type one and a type three. Type one is your regular, what you would consider what you see driving around town, stays on cement, handles house fires, etc. Type three is a little more elevated and able to handle wildfires and climbing hills.

Type six is even more flexible and be able to get into smaller areas, etc. So we've continued to add to our fleet. We purchased type six fire engines.

We continue to place them in service, so another asset to the organization. Continuing, we have two staff fire dozers that when fire season hits, we staff 24 hours a day, and they are, again, as a crew 12, they're a force multiplier. If you've seen the dozers go out and do work, they'll cut lines during active firefighting, as well as they'll go out and do mitigation efforts outside of active firefighting.

We've also purchased water tenders. Water tenders we've had, but they've been gated, and a water tender is basically a big water tank, you know, two to three thousand gallons of water. When you get back into some of the remote areas where there are not fire hydrants, we bring the water out to them using these water tenders.

Finishing up on this slide is fire station 86, which is in Bay Point. We're really pleased to say that, and you know, hold on your seats for government saying this, but we're months ahead of schedule and under budget on this project, and we're looking to have the opening later on this month at fire station 86. It's going to replace an existing station, but which is really gated and just very small.

As I previously mentioned, fire station four is reopening Walnut Creek that was closed during the recession. It's been renovated, but it'll be the existing station, so that's going to be an addition. At fire station nine, which is close proximity to Buchanan Field, the airport, we are in planning stages and working with the FAA, as well as local officials, to build a fire station on the airport grounds itself, and that's in play.

Lastly, as I mentioned, the East Contra Costa stations as well. Any questions along those lines? You've got to have questions.

Moving along, technology. The fire service is keeping up with technology, and we have what they're called alert wildfire camera, and it's a network. They're actually throughout the state, and I believe through the western U.S. For example, there's one on top of Diablo, so if a call comes in right now in Clayton that's a vegetation fire, we can go on, turn that camera towards Clayton, and look and see if there's smoke showing. So we'll have information as well as the dispatch center before the first in engine company even arrives on scene. So it's a great tool, and as stated, there's 10 cameras spaced throughout Contra Costa County, and they continue to add to these tools. They're throughout, like I said, the western U.S. I was on one in Washington, because there was a fire up there last year, and I was able just remotely from here to be able to

pull up that camera and take a look at what was going on. So a great tool for us, and it's come out in the last, I'd say in the last year is really where it's gained a lot of traction. Some other tools that we utilize is tablet command. I know I've discussed this before.

One of our retired assistant chiefs, Will Pidgeon, as well as one of our existing captains, Andy Bozo, they developed this tool. They saw a need. They developed this tool, it's called tablet command, and it's how we are dispatched, and we can look at any call when it's a rundown of all the calls, all the radio traffic is stored in a written format.

So you can look at any call right now that is going on, see what units are available, what personnel are on those units, which is a safety feature for us. You can see a map of it, of the incident. If there's any stored data on the building that we're responding to, that's in there, as well as the incident commander, instead of the old pad and paper, can keep track of all the resources utilizing this tool.

Wonderful tool, and I'm proud to say that it's used in many departments, and it was started here in Contra Costa County just by, at the time, two company officers that just saw a need and brainstormed and put their heads together and developed this tool. Another tool that has gone live, it's called Zone Haven. It's a commercial product, and all of our response areas are zoned, and so, for example, if there is a fire in an area in Clayton, we can pull up the map, and instead of meeting with our law enforcement partners, it's a command post and a joint command and saying, hey, what streets do we want to evacuate?

We can click on the zone and tell them, hey, we want to evacuate the zone Charlie 9 and C9, and it will send out a notification to folks that live in that area, and it gives us the parameters of where we're evacuating. It's much cleaner, and it's a great tool, and we'll look forward to being able to utilize it more so. It's been used.

It was used on the Dixie Fire last summer, and on a daily basis up there is that fire group. Any questions on the technology?

[Speaker 4] (44:42 - 44:58)
Yes, I have one, if you don't mind. Can you tell us a little bit more about how the notification works for Zone Haven? So, what modes of communication do the residents receive?

Is it email, text messages?

[Speaker 2] (44:59 - 45:17)
I'm not the expert on Zone Haven, but my understanding is that you will get them via text alerts as well as phone calls, but I will have to get you more details on that, and I can get that information back to you, because I don't want to misspeak.

[Speaker 4] (45:18 - 45:30)

Great. I'm just curious if residents have to opt in to receive these. Is there something that they need to do within their local communities to receive that?

And if so, I think we would want to share that with the residents as well.

[Speaker 2] (45:31 - 45:55)
Absolutely. Let me look if I have a link on that. Oh, at the end of the slideshow, there is a reference sheet for a link for Zone Haven, and I can still do a little research for you, Vice Mayor, and get back to you folks with that, but there is some reference material there.

[Speaker 4] (45:56 - 46:01)
Thank you. It sounds like City Manager Schwartz has some more intel as well. I do.

[Speaker 6] (46:01 - 46:42)
Thank you, Vice Mayor Tillman. There is a link on the City's website on the front page to sign up for Zone Haven, and at the time that that was rolled out, which I want to say was in December, it was around the same time that we did the Nixle rollout. PD put it out on their social media, and I think we put it out on the City's social media as well, so it has been pushed out broadly at least once, if not twice, and we can certainly do that again, but that information is on our website as well, so we'll make sure that we continue to push that information out so people are aware of that, but we definitely have it.

[Speaker 4] (46:42 - 46:47)
Thank you. I recall Nixle, I just don't recall this one. Thank you very much.

Sorry to interrupt.

[Speaker 2] (46:47 - 46:54)
Thank you, City Manager, and Vice Mayor, does that suffice, or do you still need me to run anything down?

[Speaker 4] (46:54 - 46:57)
No, that was perfect. Thank you. I'm all good.

I'm set. Thank you. Great.

[Speaker 2] (46:58 - 54:13)
Great. Thank you. Just continuing along, this is, I hate to beat the drum on the wildfire threat remains high, but you've heard me say this before, and it, you know, this goes all the way back to when CAL FIRE and CONFIRE did a joint presentation, I think probably three years ago.

I hate to say it, it's just not changing. The fire season's getting longer. It's really, what we're facing is just unprecedented, and peers of mine that I talk to, it's just, we're scratching our head.

It's fire behavior where it's not used to. You know, I referenced the Dixie Fire up in, I think that was the biggest fire in state history, up in, you know, five different counties up north. The fire behavior we were seeing there, and the magnitude and the geography that was burning is just unprecedented, and so taking that back to our local level is we really want to stress to our citizens that we need all the help we can get.

You know, clear clearance of 100 feet minimum around your properties. Expect the unexpected. I know we talked about evacuations in the past.

Think through with your family how you're going to evacuate, where you're going to evacuate to, and really, if you do get a notification, whether it's a knock on the door or something through Nixle or something through Zone Haven to say evacuate, please evacuate. It's just, when folks stay behind, it's problematic for first responders, and you know, we end up having to, you know, deal with the emergency and then try to deal with people evacuating, and I know it's hard to believe that when it happens that it's really happening, but just to err on the side of caution is my message to the community and locally, and I'd rather people evacuate earlier and then be able to come back into their homes rather than waiting too late, and we're seeing throughout the county. There's no specific area that is immune to the wildfire threat, so that's just my mantra to you, and you know, we pretty much, we've got a little respite a little bit, but kind of our mantra is it's just a year-round fire season now for us and in regards to the wildfire, so that threat, so please take it seriously, and you know, spend some time looking at your property and where you live and make plans and try to give us a defensible space. Just speaking from experience in my career, you know, when we pull up and something's not prepped and we're making choices, split-second decisions on what we can try to save, what we can't, the folks that really have put some time into trying to save their property, it matters, and it really gives us a fighting chance to try to save your property, so moving on beyond wildfire, I've talked about this before, near and dear to my heart is smoke alarms save lives. Please, please, please check your smoke alarms, change your batteries when your clock changes twice a year. If you're fortunate enough now, you can get smoke detectors that last 10 years, you don't have to change your batteries, you know, whatever works for your budget, we really encourage you to do that, and you know, this isn't always easy, especially people with young kids, but if you sleep with your bedroom door closed, you know, that's another avenue of protection for you, and planning with your family members or your, you know, roommates, etc., knowing how to get out of the home, not just the way you always come in, you know, I encourage you that from, you know, when you go to the movie theater, just don't, don't just look at the way you walked in the door, but look at other options on how to get out, same thing when you're on an airplane, etc., just kind of common sense, and if you, you know, you spend a little time with occupants of your residence, that can really help you when the chips are down, you know, just continuing along those lines is kitchen, if people have kitchen fire extinguishers, we really applaud that. One of the things, though, is don't put your kitchen fire extinguisher by your stove, you don't want to have to go across your kitchen through the area that's on fire to get your fire extinguisher, so you really want to put it on it on the means of where you're exiting your kitchen in order to be able to retrieve that, but if

ever in doubt, just evacuate, call 9-1-1, and, and, you know, then we will obviously respond. One of the things that I always stress to people is baking soda does wonderful stuff on, on a grease fire, you know, if you keep a little box of baking soda in your kitchen somewhere that's close and handy, people try, people tend to panic when they get a grease fire in their stove, they'll grab the, they'll grab the, you know, whatever's on fire and try to move over to the sink, and then they end up spreading the fire and, more importantly, burning themselves, and I've seen that countless times in my career, so, you know, just thinking through some of those things. Lastly is carbon monoxide.

Carbon monoxide, a lot of folks are buying those detectors now, we encourage that. If your detector goes off, you know, carbon monoxide is a silent killer, you know, please evacuate your residence, call 9-1-1, we will respond, as well as, we'll also call PG&E out, and, you know, maybe it's just a bad battery, but maybe it's not, so, you know, Aaron's side of caution, caution there. In closing, I would just say, as I, as I stated earlier, you know, we need your help, the citizens' help, first responder is, is our citizens, and we're there to assist them and respond in as prompt a manner as possible, and, you know, don't ever hesitate to call us, we'd rather you call us for whatever assistance you need, and not really need us, or cancel us, you know, we move a lot of resources, for instances, you know, if a call comes in, we think it's a structure fire, there's a lot of resources that are moving to that, but we just cancel them if we don't need them, and that's the nature of our business, and we're comfortable with that. In closing, I'll open up for further questions, but reference sheets, as I know in the past, was asked of me to have, so please, you can see that those, there's references there, and I would just ask, perhaps they can be put on the city website, if, if they're not already there. That concludes my presentation, but I'm more than willing to take any questions, if there are any.

[Speaker 3] (54:17 - 54:17)
Jeff, please.

[Speaker 7] (54:19 - 55:03)
Hello, I, I have a question about the, the wildfire threat zones. Do you have insight into how those were derived? I know on the map, it's, it has a small map on the deck, but when you look to the actual map that's published, you could see the city of Clayton is surrounded on all sides, well, on three of four-ish sides by high, and somewhat very high zones, but then Clayton is, is not, so I don't know if you have insight into that.

If you, if you look around town, or if you ask residents, I, I think that the sentiment may differ from what the zone reflects, so I'm just curious if you have insight into how the zones are established.

[Speaker 2] (55:04 - 56:44)
No, I, I don't know the intricacies of how they, they laid them out, but one thing, and this is not necessarily exactly what you're asking, but I'll take the question this way a little bit, is surrounding Clayton, as you have what we call, we call different areas, we call local threat

zones, mutual threat zones, and state responsibility areas, and there's, there's others, there's federal responsibility areas, but just generally in our area is surrounding, surrounding your area, you get out into the Marsh Creek area, that's called SRA, that's a state responsibility area, so a call comes into that area, we respond immediately, but also CAL FIRE responds as well. Our relationship with CAL FIRE is, if we have a mutual threat zone between CAL FIRE and the, in the local, it's called local response area, LRA, if we have a feeling that it might get into the mutual threat zone, which would be the mutual threat between the local, local response area and the state responsibility area, CAL FIRE, we can request CAL FIRE, and again, they bring a lot of resources and at a lot of cost, and they're great partners with local communities and local fire departments, that there's, there's not a charge, you know, back when I first started, the concern was, oh, if you call CAL FIRE and they put aircraft in the air, they're going to charge us, that's not the case anymore, so that's a little bit of a touch on the different zones in regards to who's responsible for what, but as far as how they determine high hazard versus, you know, low hazard, I don't have a good response for you on that, Councilman, I'm sorry.

[Speaker 3] (56:52 - 56:54)
Any other questions of Council?

[Speaker 5] (56:55 - 57:26)
Yes. Chief Carey, thank you for the presentation. You briefly touched about the annexation of the East County Fire Organization.

Can you expand a little bit on the benefits to our nearest neighbors out on Morgan Territory Road? They are very concerned about response time and other matters related to that.

[Speaker 2] (57:28 - 59:41)
How's that going to benefit them? Sure, absolutely. So, presently, as I stated, there's three fire stations in East Contra Costa County's footprint.

All of them at this time are staffed with three personnel, and they are with a battalion chief on duty, so you'll have a total of 10 personnel. They are basic life support, so they're what we call BLS, so they're staffed with EMTs. Once the annexation occurs, we'll be opening a fourth station, which is going to create more depth, which will be more resources to respond into that Morgan Territory's area, as well as two of the four stations by July 1st will be advanced life support, meaning the paramedics on those apparatus, and they'll bring more tools and abilities to deal with medical emergencies.

So that fourth station will add more depth and responses throughout the East Contra Costa County area, as well as it'll cause less of a draw of some of our, what we call Battalion 8, Pittsburgh Antioch Bay Point resources. There'll be, you know, one less resource that we're going to have to send across the border, and that border will be no longer, obviously, will be annexed, but there's just that synergistic effect that there'll be less pull on the resources. And then in addition to that, we have that fourth station we're opening by, I'm looking at my notes

here, I believe it's by March of 23, we're looking at opening, we'll have opened a fifth station, as well as added a truck company downtown Brentwood.

So that, so we'll be going between now and March of 2023, we'll be going from three apparatus in that footprint of East Contra Costa County to six, as well as an enhanced service of ALS. So that will provide more depth to, and quicker responses into that Morgan Territory. Not on that initial company, but those additional companies that will be responding, they won't be coming as far away.

[Speaker 5] (59:43 - 1:00:16)
Okay, thank you. Speaking of staffing, I was, had the honor of attending the graduation of Class Academy, Class 56. That struck me as being one of the largest graduation classes.

Tell me again how many, I don't recall offhand, how many graduated. So obviously, the district and Chief Burchard is trying to prepare the bench, if you will, to have additional staffing ready for replacements or other matters. How many graduated?

[Speaker 2] (1:00:16 - 1:02:10)
Yeah, that class of 56 was 27 people, to my memory. We are on, I'll be honest with you, it's hard to keep track, they're going so fast. We're on Class 57 right now, which is our lateral academy, which means we hired folks from other fire districts, and there are presently 27 people in that, of which 12 are paramedics.

There is a hiring boom going on in the fire service, and we cannot keep up. All those stations I was telling you that we want to open, we have the academy, this academy, the academy in October, and the academy in March of 2023, already earmarked for where those folks are going. We cannot keep up.

We would open more apparatus, more stations, more quickly if we could hire the people and get them through the academy. Our department's becoming quite a bit younger, but it's really exciting, it's really exciting times for somebody who's been around the fire service a while. It's just great energy and a lot of new folks, but that also causes a lot of work for the folks in the field that have been around a while, because you're training, we're constantly training new folks as well.

So exciting times. There'll be graduation if you're interested. I believe it's May 23rd for the present academy.

It'll be the same spot, same kind of routine as we've done before. Obviously all you folks are welcome, and I think the invites do go out to you, but that's a class of 27. And then we're looking for a class in October of this year.

We just did interviews today for that, believe it or not, where the process starts in January of the

year for the class that starts in October. So they were interviewing, those are entry-level folks, and we're looking for tentatively another class of third.

[Speaker 5] (1:02:13 - 1:02:34)
One final comment is that the citizens of Clayton are very proud of and supportive of Engine Company 11, and I noticed the apparatus come by the other day, and somehow the serving the community of Clayton is missing off the side of it. So take a look at that. Thank you.

[Speaker 3] (1:02:37 - 1:02:43)
Copy that. Thank you. Janet, are there any questions from the audience?

[Speaker 14] (1:02:44 - 1:02:50)
Mayor Kloban, I have 22 attendees and zero hands raised on this item.

[Speaker 3] (1:02:51 - 1:03:06)
Thank you, Janet. Any other questions from the council? With that, Assistant Chief Carey, thank you.

We really appreciate your presentation and bringing this to our attention, and we appreciate your diligence, and you're excited about the future of the department and all that you're doing.

[Speaker 2] (1:03:06 - 1:03:13)
Thank you for having me, and I apologize for the technical difficulties at the beginning.

[Speaker 3] (1:03:16 - 1:03:38)
No worries. It worked out well. Thank you.

Be well. Awesome. With that, item 5D is closed, and we're going to move on to item 6, which is reports, and we'll start off with the City Manager report on item 6A, please.

Rana, take it away, please.

[Speaker 6] (1:03:39 - 1:04:31)
Thank you, Mayor and members of the council. Really, I only have one thing I wanted to cover this evening, and it is a perfect segue from the fire presentation. We have begun at the end of April the annual weed abatement work that we do to try and manage to reduce our risks.

So started on Peacock Drive, and we'll go through just about the end of May to cover all of the areas that we cover citywide. So just wanted you to know that schedule. We have that schedule from the weed abatement company, and they have started work, and we'll continue through the end of May.

So if there are any questions, just please let me know, and we'll follow up to answer any

specifics. And that was the only item I had for City Manager report this evening. Thank you.

[Speaker 3] (1:04:32 - 1:04:41)
Thank you, Rana. Appreciate it. We'll move on to item 6B, which is City Council reports, and we'll start off with Council Member Wolf.

[Speaker 8] (1:04:43 - 1:07:39)
You are in deck. Thank you. My report.

Okay, so I met with our City Manager, and I met with you a couple times, and also had meetings separately with Planning Commissioner Schaik and Miller. Also met with the CBCA, and I found out that the Memorial Day celebration is not going to happen in downtown Clayton this year. They're going to be having a big celebration on their 100th anniversary at Todos Santos Plaza, and in exchange for not doing the Memorial Day celebration in downtown Clayton this year, they're going to do the 9-11 celebration in Clayton this year instead of at Todos Santos, so it's a trade-off there.

Met a couple of times with our barbecue cook-off committee, which I am a co-chair of three chairs on that committee, and that's moving along quite nicely, and it looks like we're going to have a fantastic celebration in July. Met with our Pride Parade Sponsorship Committee, and that's moving along as well for June 25th at 10 a.m. in downtown Clayton. Excuse me.

Had a good meeting with the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy. I got to chair that meeting because I'm the vice chair, and our chair was unavailable, so this first time I got a chance to chair that meeting. We talked a great deal about the budget, about the Roddy Ranch property, which hopefully, knock on wood, will be finished in my lifetime, so I get a chance to see that.

That's quite a project that they're working on. There's also a property just east of Clayton, which is going to come to the fore, but right now, it's on hold for various budget reasons, and I took emails. Didn't do any calls this time, but I took some emails from citizens, and finally, I just want to say with regard to Art and Wine, an amazing celebration for Art and Wine.

I have to congratulate Sandy Johnson, who is the chair of that committee, the CBC Art and Wine committee. Of course, former mayors Diaz and Catalano had a lot to do with pulling that all together, and Marcy Bussey, who does the kid volunteers or the junior volunteers. She works very, very hard, and every time there's a celebration, she says, I'm not doing this ever again, but she'll come back, so knock on wood.

Marcy, if you're listening, please come back. We need you. So congratulations to that entire committee, and that looks to be my report.

Thank you, Mayor.

[Speaker 3] (1:07:42 - 1:07:47)
Thanks, Council Member Wolff, and with that, we'll go to Council Member Diaz, please. Thank you.

[Speaker 5] (1:07:48 - 1:10:39)
It was a busy three and a half, four days from Friday the 22nd through Monday the 25th, setting up, putting out, and executing the Art and Wine. We had a very successful event. We haven't got the final numbers in, but Chair Sandy Johnson expects that we will have a very, very, very successful event, and I believe Saturday, rolling through town, there was between 15,000 to 20,000 people, and the early numbers for Saturday almost matched what we had done in 2019 for both days.

So that was a really good sign. Very limited any problems throughout the community. We had a great team in place, and again, as I mentioned earlier when we honored Chief Warren, she delegated the responsibility for the Police Department to Sergeant Rich Anea, who filled that position extremely well.

He coordinated with our Police Department, the alcohol-beveraging control unit that was there. They even brought their own trailer in, and, of course, private security. We had an excellent brand-new private security company, most of which, by the way, were the executives, were senior members, were retired from the Oakland PD, so they felt right at home with former Chief Pete Peterson, who was doing the collection of the money and watching out for him.

On Monday after that cleanup, I attended the barbecue, which is a committee meeting, which is coming up July 9 and 10. It's going to be another great event. I attended the general membership meeting of the CBCA on Thursday, the 28th.

On Sunday, I came by and paid tribute to one of our former citizens, Jack Selgamonian, who passed away out of state, but his bride, Cindy, put on a great event at the Grove Park, which was well attended. Then on Monday, yesterday, we met with both the Chief and the City Manager, and that's my report. Although I do want to make a comment, I do see as an attendee tonight, we have Diego Rivera, who's joined us.

Remember him? He died in 1957, so welcome back, Diego.

[Speaker 3] (1:10:42 - 1:10:46)
Thanks, Councilmember. Appreciate it. We'll go on over to Councilmember Juan, please.

[Speaker 7] (1:10:48 - 1:11:04)
Yeah, I primarily took quite a few phone calls since our last meeting. Swim season is back and up and running, so I am an Uber driver, dropping off and shuttling kids back to the pool. So that is going to be a fun summer.

[Speaker 3] (1:11:07 - 1:11:08)
Thanks, Councilmember Juan. Vice Mayor Tillman.

[Speaker 4] (1:11:09 - 1:12:39)
Thank you, Mayor. On the 23rd, I attended the Art and Wine Festival, and as Councilmember Diaz said, it was very packed that Saturday. I didn't stay long because I needed to attend, as a guest, the Opportunity Junction Gala.

I mentioned that to you before. This is our 22nd anniversary, and their goal was to raise $122,000, and as of last week, they almost made their goal. They're still calculating some fees that are coming in, not fees, but some items that are coming in, but that was great.

I was the only elected official that attended, but others were invited as well. Not from our city, though. Not that you can't come.

You guys are totally all invited to the next one, and it'll be in person, and I hope you guys will join me. I'll give you guys more details. On the 24th, I attended with the Mayor and with former Mayor Pierce the vendor breakfast for the Art and Wine Festival, which was nice, before it got crowded, very early in the morning to help set that up, and it was nice to meet some of them and hear that they had their best years.

Some of them was their best years ever here in Clayton, and some it was their best years ever, period. So it was nice to hear that that was good for the vendors, and that was just only as of Saturday, because it was a Sunday morning when we actually met them. So we were pleased to hear that.

That afternoon, I worked a shift and poured beer volunteering. I will say that for the people who are procuring the beer, man, don't run out. People got very, very angry that the one that I was manning was running out as we were nearing the end of the shift.

[Speaker 8] (1:12:40 - 1:12:41)
I'll make note of that for the barbecue.

[Speaker 4] (1:12:42 - 1:12:43)
Yes, please do.

[Speaker 8] (1:12:43 - 1:12:44)
Do not run out of beer.

[Speaker 4] (1:12:44 - 1:14:31)
Don't run out. Do not run out. On the 28th, I attended the Public Services, Community Services Committee meeting, and that the topic this year was or this meeting was homelessness in

California, and what was shared during that meeting is that California, this will come as no surprise, I don't think, has 161,000 unhoused or homeless individuals and other stats that they shared, and the goal was to try to figure out how we can address this. They wanted to speak to a lot of the cities that were present on how they're addressing homelessness. Clearly, we don't have that issue necessarily here in town, but they wanted to know if cities were using enforcement, direct outreach, if they had wraparound services, et cetera.

So a lot of the cities did share that, in particular, Huntington Beach shared that they have full wraparound services. Some of them have bought high-density housing, and they're actually using that for housing for homelessness. They also have mobile crisis conversations that they're having as well, and they want to continue to have those conversations with cities.

So it was just interesting to hear a lot of what other towns are doing or cities are doing throughout the state. One other stat that they shared was from 2010 to 2019, the veteran homeless population has reduced by 50%. They said that there was a slight increase in 2020, but overall, that veterans were reduced by 2019 by 50% since 2010.

What else can I share with you? Let's see. On the 28th, I also attended the CBCA meeting, and I also had a meeting yesterday with Raina when she returned, and that's my report.

[Speaker 3] (1:14:33 - 1:17:43)
Thanks, Vice Mayor Tillman. I want to say it was the first time in two years we've been back, I guess, to Art & Wine, and it was amazing to volunteer for four hours each morning with a vendor breakfast on Saturday and Sunday, and two afternoon shifts, both Saturday and Sunday, selling tickets. I didn't get a chance to talk to people because I was selling tickets, but in between those moments, I talked to a lot of people who were just extremely grateful to be back and doing what we do best in Clayton, which is putting on these festivals and raising money as part of CBCA.

It was just an amazing event. I was fortunate to get a chance to talk to a lot of people who recognized me for the first time as mayor from the pictures in the Pioneer. That was kind of weird.

I'm still trying to get used to that, but the conversations that I had were quite diverse on those personal conversations from issues with our financial challenges in the city, as well as issues related to our housing. I had two different people who I've never met before come up to me and talk to me about their experience with the Balancing Act and trying to work the numbers with a housing element exercise, and both of their comments were consistent. Man, what a pain that took us.

It was a challenge for them to actually do that, not necessarily technically challenged, but trying to fit the numbers where they wanted to, and the consensus was, that's not an easy job. I'm glad I don't have to do it. Well, we do, and that's something that's going to come forth to us in the future.

It was nice to hear that feedback from two people I'd never met before who had gone through the exercise, so I appreciate our staff for putting that out there and for those people for doing that. Great event. We did fabulous, and I congratulate the CBCA for putting that on, and Sandy did an amazing job.

I will say that it was great to be back at the CBCA meeting and to be in person for the first time in this room and actually see faces and have a serious business meeting. Again, it's been a couple years since we've done that. There was no music in the background, so we actually hear each other and actually listen.

There's a lot of strong voices and passionate people in that group who really want the best for Clayton all around, and they're looking at the future and looking at what's good for Clayton. If you're interested, it's a good group to be a part of. That is not the City of Clayton.

That is the Clayton Community Business Association. It's a good group, and if you're interested, you should be checking that out. I will say that, again, a lot of good conversations with people via email on a myriad of topics.

I agree, Jeff. I didn't know what you meant by that, but there's a lot of people calling me and emailing me about finances and housing and a bunch of other things. Some great conversations, again, about ADUs and how can we get maximums as part of the housing element.

People are engaged, and I appreciate that. With that, that's the end of my report.

[Speaker 5] (1:17:44 - 1:18:05)
I have a question. I failed to mention that Saturday night, the concerts return. I think my machine here just went, there it goes, going in and out.

But anyway, technical help. There you go. Yeah, so Saturday night at the Fundamentals, six o'clock at the Grove Park.

We look forward to that.

[Speaker 3] (1:18:05 - 1:18:11)
That is the City of Clayton-sponsored Concert in the Park on this coming Saturday. Excellent.

[Speaker 5] (1:18:12 - 1:18:41)
With that, one other question. Speaking of correspondence, I know we've all received them. I hope we're not losing sight of the famous falling tree over there on Mitchell Canyon and Clayton Road.

A flurry of emails. Never saw the final results, and the only thing that caught my attention was, I certainly hope we weren't trying to get past the statute of limitations.

[Speaker 3] (1:18:41 - 1:19:24)
That has been addressed, and it's not part of the agenda tonight, but thank you for bringing it up again. We'll move on to the next item, which is item number seven, which is public comment on non-agenda items. For those of you out in the public who'd like to speak on any item that's not on the agenda tonight, you have three minutes to do so.

And in this particular case, I will say it every time, please address the Council as a whole. Do not address any one Council member. We're all here doing the best we can.

Be respectful, and if you do happen to have a comment towards a Council member, make it factual and to the point, and without the energy and or flowery language, we'd appreciate that. And with that, Janet, are there any hands raised for this item?

[Speaker 14] (1:19:25 - 1:19:35)
Mayor Cloven, out of 21 attendees, I do have one hand raised. Scott, as I promote you to panelists, if you can please unmute your microphone, you will have three minutes to speak.

[Speaker 17] (1:19:44 - 1:20:39)
Hey guys, hope everyone's doing well tonight. I just want to say how great it was to have festivals back in town again. So wonderful to see the town come together all weekend.

Wonderful to see so many people downtown, all the businesses packed, so many of us in the community just coming out and volunteering. But all that said, sorry, Peter, I actually do have to single one Council member out. Jim Diaz, I just wanted to make sure to give credit where credit is due.

On Thursday night before Art and Wine, there was a real emergency when Oakhurst decided to pull their golf carts, same golf carts the kids who used to volunteer for the event. They used it to get around and help us all out. Jim, my man, you rallied your connections in the community to get all of the carts that we needed at the last minute.

And the show was able to go on seamlessly through your efforts. You and I might not always agree, my man, but you really came through. Great job, Jim.

Thanks for your time, guys.

[Speaker 3] (1:20:42 - 1:20:48)
Thank you, Scott. Appreciate that. Appreciate the positivity as well.

Janet, are there any other hands raised for this item?

[Speaker 14] (1:20:51 - 1:20:55)
Mayor Cloven, I do not have any other hands raised and I currently have 20 attendees.

[Speaker 3] (1:20:56 - 1:21:29)
Thanks, Janet, appreciate it. And with that, public comment item number seven is closed and we'll move on to item number eight, public hearings, for which we have none. And we'll close that and move on to public, I mean, item number nine, which is action items, which is action number 9A.

We're going to receive a presentation from the Strategic Research Institute on their survey with the Clayton voters regarding potential support for a tax measure on the November 2022 ballot and provide direction to staff on the desired next steps. And with that, we will turn it over to you, City Manager.

[Speaker 6] (1:21:30 - 1:23:29)
Thank you, Mayor and Council. I'm really just going to give a brief update. The primary focus of this evening is to receive a presentation by Dr. Mann-Ross from Strategy Research Institute, the survey researcher who was responsible for developing and running our survey. And you've seen the overall results that were in your packet, as well as the more detailed information. Dr. Mann-Ross has a presentation. He has also made recommendations at the end of his report.

And the staff report that came forward to you basically mirrors those same recommendations. But their request is to receive direction from the Council on desired next steps in terms of pursuing a ballot measure or any other actions related to this presentation this evening. So I'm hoping that any second now the screen will show the Zoom view so that we can see Dr. Mann-Ross, who I believe our City Clerk is working on promoting to panelists because we sometimes have that little fun and games, which looks like it's what we're having. So I'm going to keep talking briefly while we are... Oh, thank goodness. So that's Dr. Mann-Ross's office. I do not see the actual Dr. Mann-Ross, but I'm sure he's there. And he has his presentation that he should be able to share. If for some reason that doesn't work, I do have the presentation up and we can make that visible via the Zoom, and you do have it in your packet.

It's the series of charts that were in the staff report. So beginning, I don't know, about 20 pages in.

[Speaker 14] (1:23:29 - 1:23:35)
Well, there he is. Hi, Dr. Mann-Ross.

[Speaker 9] (1:23:37 - 1:23:38)
Hello. How are you, my friend?

[Speaker 6] (1:23:39 - 1:24:03)

Because he does not live super close. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to you, Dr. Mann-Ross, and you should be able to share your screen and make your presentation. As you might have heard, we had a little challenge with the last speaker, but we're going to try this again.

So he's doing that. I'm going to squint at my stuff. Okay.

[Speaker 1] (1:24:12 - 1:24:14)
All right. Can you see the screen?

[Speaker 6] (1:24:18 - 1:24:21)
Yes, we can. Thank you.

[Speaker 1] (1:24:22 - 1:50:57)
Okay, good. You should be able to see the screen now, yes? Yes.

Very good. Okay. Mr. Mayor and Vice Mayor, City Council, City Manager, thank you for allowing me to present the findings. As you know, the real research question here, this is a scientific survey, that we were testing multiple funding measures in order to address the fiscal challenges present and future that is facing city leadership. So methodologically, we wanted a minimum of 300 for the sample size. We ended up with 307 registered voters.

That number gets you a sampling error of plus or minus four and a half to 5.8 percent. The data were gathered from March 21st through 28th. The first slide is very telling.

This I'm pretty confident you'll be very pleased with. It speaks well of the city and the city leadership. How satisfied are your voters?

And remember, this was not a community at large. This was your electorate, local electorate, your constituents. And how satisfied are you with the quality of life as a resident of Clayton?

These numbers are, frankly, almost unheard of. 94 percent are satisfied. Of that, a third are extremely satisfied.

Over half are very satisfied. You only have one percent who are dissatisfied. Now, what I'd like to do at this point, it's just before I go on to explanations, I'd like to give you what we interpret as being the overall finding.

Because again, we're talking about funding measures, placing them on a ballot. Most of them require two-thirds voter support to pass. So as I look at these data, it comes out to, if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

You've got very happy campers. Satisfaction with police services, 92 percent satisfied, 58

percent extremely. Only three percent dissatisfied.

Again, these are just wonderful numbers and it says that the leadership of the city is in good hands. Satisfaction with park and recreation amenities, and in this case it included playgrounds and picnic tables and the like at your community park, at Grove Park, and North Valley Park, including the gazebo over at Grove Park. Again, look at these numbers.

88 percent satisfied, over half, 55 percent extremely satisfied, so five percent dissatisfied. You just simply put, you have happy campers. The county library, high satisfaction scores, over three quarters satisfied, over half extremely satisfied, only three percent dissatisfied.

And then the lowest number, which you would anticipate, county development, but that has to do with code enforcement and planning and zoning, and by definition that's going to be less than the other dimensions tested. But nonetheless, it's 55 percent, well over half, are satisfied. You have a greater number dissatisfied, but again, when you look at the context, I'm sure this comes as little to no surprise.

The issues of concern, now this is very, very interesting and it shows that Clayton is unique. You know, is there a local issue you're especially concerned about? You have over half, 52 percent saying well no, 46 percent saying yes, and we asked what are they?

The top four are about homeless and crime and affordable housing and public safety. Now the reason this is important is this is front of the mind. What it means is what people are seeing in the media, what they're talking about the grocery stores, you know, when at the hair salons, on and on.

This is, this amounts to a media effect. They're not talking about, in this case, homelessness in Clayton, crime in Clayton, affordable housing or anything else. This is a, actually a state and national agenda, and so it's a media effect.

It does not reflect any negativity in the city of Clayton, and you could tell that by the numbers we've already shared. Quality of life, just you have happy campers, it's that simple. But this is where the problem gets, where the rubber meets the road and where we all of a sudden find problems.

Are you aware, prior to the present survey, were you aware of the fact that the city of Clayton is facing huge fiscal challenges? And you've got 81% saying, well, they either weren't aware or only slightly aware of that. 45% said we're not at all aware.

Only 17% said they were extremely aware. So you have, you know, happy campers, everybody's happy. The city's delivering wonderful services and your constituents are aware of it and appreciate it.

So that leads to the next question. Well, if you were to learn of these challenges, these fiscal challenges facing city government, how concerned would you be? And would that make you highly concerned, somewhat concerned, not at all concerned?

And what you have is learning of this from a credible source, and that credible source is critical, somebody you trust. So if you learn about these fiscal challenges, 30%, less than a third, would be highly concerned. About half, exactly half, actually, would be somewhat concerned.

This says you have, if, when this information is shared with your community at large, you're going to have some concerned campers. So the question then becomes, well, okay, at the present time, Clayton officials are considering several ways of dealing with these fiscal challenges. What would your preference be regarding two alternatives, maintain the city services and increase local taxes only enough to keep the services at the current level or cut back the current level of services and programs and create no new taxes at the local level of government?

Well, what you have is slightly over a third, 35% said, well, okay, I would consider paying higher taxes. And then 15% are saying, well, perhaps, but it depends on the amount. Well, that's good common sense.

That said, you have 41% are saying, you know what, no new taxes, cut back the services as need be. Now, there's, you can see here, there's potential support then for a funding measure of 50%. And when we go beyond that, one of the three tax funding mechanisms we tested was a flat tax, partial tax.

We started at $400 a year. How many people would be willing to pay this in order to address your fiscal challenges? And this is something before, I mean, you can see the results, but right here is what you have to understand.

Our institute about 25 years ago created a model called the go, no bill model. And what this does is for, again, for nearly three decades, this has allowed us to predict within one to 2% of reality of the actual voting outcome when statistical margin varies 4.5 to 5.8. So our sample this size. So what we do is we take a hundred percent.

So after, would you be willing to pay this particular tax if it were put on a local ballot, we take a hundred percent of the definitely yes, 50% of the probably yes. And then we also ask definitely no, probably no, but the model, the key to it is right here. And so likely support for $400 partial tax, flat tax is only 24%.

And in this case, you need a two thirds voter support. Also, I know, you know, this any tax, certain funding mechanisms will allow you to get down to a simple majority, 50% plus one vote. But the minute you dedicate the money to any expenditure, it now becomes what's called a special tax.

And again, it requires two thirds. So when we look at potential support, what we do here is we take a hundred percent of the definite yes, plus a hundred percent of the probable yes. Now, if you're dealing with any other research firm than SRI, they would be telling you that instead of 24% support, they'd be saying 36.

And the conclusion would be the same. You're not going to be able to get a $400 per year partial tax passed. But I want you to appreciate what we're talking about with the, with the gonna go model.

Now there's three possible outcomes. One is go, the stars are aligned, everything's wonderful. We, you know, it's a go.

The two is no go, not in my lifetime, probably not yours. The third alternative, which is the most common is, well, it's not possible today, but it could be under certain conditions at some point in the future. So for a $400 partial tax passed, likely support is 24, potential is 36.

It's just not an option. What about 300? Well, you can see support goes up.

Potential support goes to 38, likely support 29.5. You only have 29% half and you've got 30, 36% definite no and another 17 probable no. Well, what about $200? Well, again, support goes up to 40.5, likely support. Potential does get majority, does go to 51%. So the bottom line is because it needs two thirds, a flat tax, partial tax just isn't going to fly, at least not today. Well, what about a 6% utility tax?

Now, when I talked to your city manager, the first time I made a comment to her, I said, I can tell you our experience over three decades of working in this industry, the hardest tax to get passed the utility tax, even though it's the most equitable because everybody pays it. If it's based on utility, everybody shares. And I said, but that's probably going to be the last one.

And she said, well, really? That doesn't make a lot of sense. Well, yeah.

And guess what? 6% utility use tax, 18% likely support, 27%. There's definitely no 59%.

There's something about utilities. And frankly, I have to admit in my own home, I have the same sense of this. Don't raise my utility tax.

Utilities cost me enough. Well, that's the same sentiment in Clayton. So now you don't charge, I probably shouldn't have said increase, but you'll see a one cent increase in the city's sales tax.

The city doesn't today, as you all know, have a sales tax, but there is a sales tax. When your citizens shop, they pay state tax and there's some special taxes out there that have been approved by the regional electorate. And so there is a tax.

So what this means is, would you be willing to pay a cent in additional tax from what you're paying today? And likely support is a third, 33.5%. It's not going to happen. Potential support is getting near the simple majority.

And by the way, I probably should have mentioned, in fact, I'm going to go back to this. Utility tax does require simple majority, but at 18%, 27% potential, you're nowhere near. The one cent increase, just again, isn't going to fly, at least not today.

Well, what about a half cent? And that's over, potential support is over 51%. Likely support, however, and by the way, you might like to know, for those of you who like statistics, if there's a difference, it has to be 3%.

And this one is 10%. So there's a huge difference between likely and potential support. On a couple of them, it was within that 3%.

So there was no significant difference. So one of the, and I, this, you know, we sometimes get criticism in certain communities about these kinds of questions. But what you need to do to make that decision, an informed decision to move forward or not, or move forward down the road, not now, you need to know the implications of certain consequences.

So without additional funds, a city will be forced to lay off at least one police officer. That's realistic. That's not planting any seeds.

That's not biasing the outcome. This is asking, if you knew that, would it have an effect? In this case, would it cause you to have much more or at least some more support?

Or would it make you more inclined to oppose a funding measure that was put on a local ballot? So you can see, and you already remember, go back, your constituents are very happy with your police department. Clearly your police department is doing a wonderful job.

And so if even one, and if you're a small community, so if you took even one police officer off, out of the game, this would, it's a good argument. I mean, it's just your constituents would say, yeah, wow, that's not cool. Well, what about without additional funds, streetlights in certain neighborhoods may have to be turned off.

And I want to read this one because it's really, sensitive. The streetlight assessment currently in place in Clayton does not fully cover the cost of operations. In fact, the rate has not been increased the last 24 years.

Furthermore, it does not include a CPI to control for your normal inflation. Without additional funds, the city may be forced to turn off a portion of the streetlights in certain neighborhoods, the city thus negatively impacting public safety. That again, it's a serious argument.

It's a serious concern. Your constituents go, wow, we do not want to do that. So what about without additional funds, we're going to be forced to cut back on the level of services in general, overall services being provided through the city.

And again, you can see there's a significant difference. It's a push. It's not as good of an argument as the prior ones, but nonetheless, 38% of your local electorate more inclined to support a funding measure.

What about taxes are too high? Clayton residents need tax relief. No, that doesn't fly.

Here's a good example. There is no significant difference between more inclined to support or more inclined to oppose. It, you know, 5% in fact say it's not even believable.

So this is not a good argument. Without additional funds, the city would be forced into deficit spending mode. Again, there's no significant difference.

This is not, and there's a lot of reasons for this. The term deficit spending has a lot of implications to voters in general. So it's just in this case and Clayton, it's not a good argument.

Well, what about the, without additional funds, the city could be forced into bankruptcy and you'll all remember Orange County, right? It went bankrupt. Cities can go bankrupt and they can be taken over by the county if, you know, if they can't meet their financial commitments.

Well, in this case, yes, it's 10% difference, but it's only 30%. And look at this, this is the key right here. A quarter of your voters say, you know, that's not believable.

And a lot of this 20% here, part of the reason they're saying, well, some more likely to oppose or much more likely to oppose is the fact that to them, it's not believable. The only way this argument worked, but it could work is they would have to learn from a credible source, a third party credible source that, you know, it's not a joke. This is real.

At that point, if that message is, you know, grows feet, then yeah, then it could be used. But at this point, it's just not a good argument. So that gets us to, okay, look, if we do, if the city places a money measure on a ballot, and if it passes, would you want it to be made permanent?

Or would you want it to be made to sunset, which means terminate at some point, 20 years, 30 years, 10 years, or at least brought back to voters for renewal. Now, in most communities, the electorate wants to say they don't just want permanent new taxes, they want they even if they support it, they want to brought back at some point. And they want to be asked and that that seems reasonable.

Well, that's certainly true in Clayton. The question then is, well, should it be made to sunset in

20 years? Now, I'll give you a little history here that you might find interesting.

When I entered the industry, the field, what, 30 years ago, the it was a 30 year sunset typically taxes were being passed over the state of California. And we do work outside California as well in other states. And it was a 30 year at work 30 years work, then it went down to 20 years, then it went down to 10 years, then it went down to seven years.

So and some government agencies actually went down to five, but most didn't 10 seems to be the magic number. And so guess what, it's gone from seven, back up, you can see here to 10. So if you have a sunset in 10 years, you'll end up with 60% voter support for a 10 year sunset.

And, and because if they'll have 20 years, obviously, that's why we add the 20 year sunset, and then then the 10 year sunset. So you have 60% support. So our recommendation will be at the end of the day, if you choose to go forward at some point, put a 10 year sunset cause that now could change.

So you'll want to retest that. What about a CPA to control for cost, you know, for inflation, cost of living. The CPIs are really, really important.

If you can get them, the problem is in California today, it's hard to get one. And that's true in Clayton. So in order to control for normal inflation, we support authorizing a modest annual increase in the local tax base that is based upon CPI not to exceed 5% in order to keep pace with the increased cost of providing services to Clayton residents from year to year.

Life and support is only 29%. Potential support is 37. So again, our recommendation is if you choose to come put something on the ballot at some point in time, tested again before you put it on, but today it would fail.

It just wouldn't fly. The last question here that I want to bring out is critical. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Clayton elected officials are completely trustworthy. The findings here are mixed. And the reason we asked this question, by the way, is that if you bring something forward down the road, you're going to want to be absolutely certain that you get a 5-0 vote to put it on the ballot, even if it's 4-1.

A split in the vote for this, for any funding mechanism, raises the question among voters, well, what do the people who, the city council in this case, which city council members, what do they know that they're not telling us? What do they know that we don't know? It just creates controversy, and controversy kills.

Now, I will tell you one other thing, because I'm guessing when I hit the Q&A, you're going to ask it, so I'll answer it right now. This is called a directional question. If you were asked this same

question and say, do you completely trust or completely distrust your local elected officials, no voter would say, oh, I completely distrust.

That would be like 1%. Totally trust? What, I don't totally trust anybody, especially not elected officials at any level.

But if you ask it this way, and this question has been tested over and over and over, you get very close to reality. Do you agree or disagree with the statement that the local officials are completely trustworthy? Now you're going to get differences, and what we're really looking for, as I mentioned a moment ago, it's just these are mixed, and we want to know how mixed.

Is there some controversy? This tells me, and I don't know if it's true, but you'll know. This tells me that you have a significant number of decisions which are split on that a 4-1 or a 3-2 vote.

That's usually what this means, and you'll know whether that's the case or not. But what I do know is that, again, if you put something going forward on a ballot, please don't go forward unless you have a 5-0 vote. You want to send the message to your constituents that you're in concert, that this problem is real, and it has to be addressed.

So that leads us to our recommendations. The first one is no-go for placing a funding measure on the November 2022 ballot. Obviously, I feel bad about this, but we have to understand one thing.

We're putting a mirror up to your electorate, and this has nothing to do with SRA's opinion. These are the empirical facts used on scientific methodology, and today if you were to place it on 2022 ballot, it would fail. And what's worse is if you put it on the ballot and it fails, it makes it even harder to build an argument that explains to your constituents the need.

And putting it on a second time, it puts it on in jeopardy. Better to get it once when you have empirical evidence that that's what your community wants and is willing to support, and it will succeed. So the second recommendation there is to develop a comprehensive public outreach effort to inform the local electorate and the community at large regarding the fiscal challenges facing the city and the consequences for not addressing these challenges.

The first thing I want to say here, I'm really hit hard on, but it's against the law to advocate. We are not recommending that you advocate. Truth is, not only can you not advocate a yes vote, but you can't advocate a no vote.

You cannot advocate yes or no to your constituents. That said, you have a moral obligation and a practical obligation is to share the information with your constituents that they need in order to make an informed decision. And then if you do the appropriate steps, i.e. a follow-up survey, the bottom line is you'll know that you have empirical evidence that, yep, that's what the community wants. Move forward. And if not, then don't move forward at that point. So one thing I will

caution you also on, please don't say we have to educate.

And I'm an educator. I was a professor at UCLA and USC and Cal State System. But the term educate, if I say to you, I'm going to educate you, what do you say to me?

You got to be kidding. I'm already educated. You want to inform the local electorate and your community at large regarding the challenges.

And look, this gets back, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. You've done, if you're guilty of anything, is doing too good of a job. You're providing excellence, public safety, public services.

Your constituents are happy campers. I mean, really happy. You don't see numbers, the satisfaction scores, what we're looking at here.

This is really, really great. Well, if you weren't aware personally, and each of you are, if you weren't aware of the fiscal challenges facing the city and you have a lovely home in Clayton and everything's beautiful and, hey, it ain't broke, who wants to pay more taxes? No, it ain't broke.

Don't fix it. Thank you very much. So you do have a challenge ahead of you.

If you choose to put something on the ballot down the road to really build a case and explain and let your position, your voters to make an informed decision, then do whatever the electorate wants you to do. The message should be driven by the findings in the present scientific voter survey. I've shown you, we've tested arguments.

Now you see why. So what plays well with what becomes believable. And you notice we had that one dimension that it isn't believable.

You've got to make your case believable. As a result, our final recommendation is to go ahead and place a funding measure on the local ballot in November 2024. But that is contingent upon the message and positioning your electorate to make an informed decision.

So, and you can't spoof them, believe me, they're very sophisticated, particularly in Clayton. So, you know, base it on reality and then, you know, what is it? I'm from Missouri, prove it.

So really document anything you tell them. I'll happily answer any questions.

[Speaker 3] (1:51:01 - 1:51:17)
Thank you for the presentation. That was enlightening. And with that, I will open it up to the city council for any questions they have directly for you.

Are there any council questions? Yes, Jeff, go ahead.

[Speaker 7] (1:51:18 - 1:51:49)
I just have some, I have some haphazard questions in no particular order. And maybe a reverse based on where I wrote things down on this paper because my panel isn't working. You said that we can't advocate.

I don't think that's correct. No, I mean, I think you're wrong. I think the city can advocate, but I think we can advocate all we want.

[Speaker 18] (1:51:53 - 1:52:01)
And I would add to that, you cannot use public funds to advocate.

[Speaker 7] (1:52:01 - 1:52:42)
For sure. Yeah. I think your statement was unclear.

So I just want to clarify that. So then I guess I, one of the things that I found throughout the materials were a reference to a scientific study and the scientific method. And even in addendum C, the scientific method is quoted, like it's quote, the scientific method, unquote.

In what way are we saying that this is adhering to the scientific method? Like how do you contrast that with a survey that would be done not according to the scientific method?

[Speaker 1] (1:52:45 - 1:54:57)
You're probably talking to a monkey. And that's a very profound question. And thank you for asking.

In order to be the follow the scientific method to the letter, the sample has to be random. So in this case, it has to be a random sample of your local electorate, because we were doing RDD, meaning random digit dial, if it was the community at large, which we often do on most clients. We do an annual survey of RDD, looking at the community at large.

This is looking at your electorate, and it has to be a sufficient number of sample size. So for example, to test the entire United States, a typical survey will be between 1000 and 1500. So you can see N of 300 for a community of your size, it's certainly large enough.

So you have to have a large enough sample, and it has to be representative of the community of the target population. And there are other dimensions in there. This, you know, statistical margin of error, you have to acknowledge what that is.

We've, as I mentioned, clearly, we have this going on goal model, which actually in terms of practical outcomes, you know, we just don't miss, we're within one to 2% of reality, that's not because we're wonderful or great or anything else, it's because we follow the scientific method. And we've found this practical application, which increases the outcome, the validity, not the mathematical validity, but the practical validity of the outcome. So we're very kind.

And you know what, I'll bet, correct me if I'm wrong. But when you look at these findings, I bet they're not a surprise to any city council member, you know, your community really well. And it's probably no surprise that you have happy campers, and they're not aware there's a big problem.

And there is a little bit of controversy on city council. It all makes sense. So good horse sense helps as well.

But that's not the scientific method. That's worse sense, which I use a lot.

[Speaker 7] (1:55:00 - 1:55:25)
I understand the sampling and random digit dialing, I guess. I'm not sure that that's necessarily sufficient. If the questions were constructed in a way that were designed to elicit a specific result, that was still satisfied all of the things that you had said, would you still consider that a scientific study?

[Speaker 1] (1:55:26 - 1:57:14)
That's true. And a good example of that, by the way, is that last question, which I explained as a directional question about the trust in city government and elected officials. You could be more right.

I mean, and that's the advantage of getting a firm that's been in the industry all years, like we have for three decades. Bottom line is most of these questions have been tested over and over and over. Not with respect to Clinton, obviously, but respect to predicting.

And so the whole issue, and the only reason it justifies a city to spend money or a county or a special district is that the accuracy of the findings. Now, if you were to talk, I am going to mention one name, if you were to talk to the city manager of San Pablo, he would say to you, we're batting a thousand percent. And by the way, he came from Pittsburgh and it was true in Hercules, it's true in Pittsburgh, it's true in San Pablo.

We haven't, and understand my definition of success. Success in our case is not that you get what you want, that you can put the tax measure in a ballot and it passes. Our measure of success is do we predict it accurately?

And if we say it's a go, you can take it to the bank. And if we say it's a no-go, you can take that to the bank. Unfortunately, I'm not here to bias anything.

It's not in my interest to bias any outcomes. And if you look at the findings here, I have to believe you would say, well, this isn't what I would like to see. This isn't what the city wanted necessarily, I hope not.

[Speaker 7] (1:57:14 - 1:58:01)

I think that diverges from the question that I asked. I think that diverges from the question that I asked. The repeated description of the scientific method and the scientific study, would you agree that that has the potential to create like a felicious appeal to authority thinking that this is doing one thing when it's not actually doing that?

I mean, if you look at the construction of the questions, you know, in one of the early questions, I don't recall the number, but the phrasing of the question talks about something to the effect of, if you do not approve of this, then Clayton will have to, what does it say? Or no, let go of one, lose one police officer. I forget that.

I forget exactly what the word is.

[Speaker 19] (1:58:01 - 1:58:03)
Okay, here we go.

[Speaker 7] (1:58:05 - 1:58:35)
Yeah, the city will be forced to lay off at least one police officer. So this, you know, when you look at the phrasing of this question, the will be is a command phrase. At least one implies that there could be more than one.

But then when you look at the lights question, it talks about the result being more permissive. It says, well, if you don't do this, then we may have to turn off lights.

[Speaker 1] (1:58:36 - 1:58:40)
So to answer your question, the phrasing of the question, the phrasing of the, wait, hold on a second.

[Speaker 7] (1:58:41 - 1:59:10)
That's not my question. Can I get to my actual question? Let me get to my actual question.

Those two questions are presented in a different framework and it doesn't seem like they're done consistently. So when we have the materials that refer to this as a scientific method, I don't think that's accurate. And, you know, I'm not necessarily disagreeing with the results, but it doesn't, I'm not sure why we phrased it in that way.

[Speaker 1] (1:59:10 - 2:01:23)
Let me provide the context. Obviously what you're looking at on the screen is the short version, but what was really asked in 9.0, I'm now going to read several arguments that might be offered either for or against supporting one of the three initiatives presently under consideration in order to allow city officials to balance the city's annual budget going forward, thus avoid having to make cutbacks to the services presently being provided to Clayton residents.

After I read each one, please tell me if you heard the statement from a trusted source, would

you be more likely to support or more likely to oppose such a funding measure? Or would you say the argument would have no impact on your decision of how to vote or is the statement not believable? So that's the context that these questions were asked in.

And then the first one, which you mentioned without these funds, the city will be forced to lay off at least one police officer, thus reducing response times and negatively impacting the level of public safety in Clayton in numerous other ways. So each of those questions then were asked, were they more likely to support, oppose or not believable? So it is absolutely consistent.

You are correct. We could have, I would never do this, but you could create language which would bias the outcome. But these aren't them.

These are accurate. And where it came from was a discussion with your city manager regarding, well, okay, it's a fair question. What's going to happen if you can't balance your budget?

What's going to happen if you don't get additional funding? These are two of the outcomes, potential outcomes that could happen. And every one of these questions in this statement fits that criteria.

So again, you may not share and you're welcome not to, but these are legitimate questions and they are yielding realistic outcomes.

[Speaker 7] (2:01:27 - 2:01:51)
Yeah, I don't disagree with that. I guess, I think you may have missed the question in that the phrasing of the question is different and inconsistent across the survey, but I can move on from that. On one of them, when the series of questions that tested the magnitude, the magnitude question, they went from 400 to 300 to 200.

I think those were asked in that work.

[Speaker 1] (2:01:53 - 2:01:56)
It's going to be this one there.

[Speaker 7] (2:01:57 - 2:02:14)
But okay. So in your presentation, you asserted that the preceding questions did not influence the results of the following questions. How do you come to that conclusion?

[Speaker 1] (2:02:15 - 2:02:19)
I'm not sure. Could you be more specific on what your concern is?

[Speaker 7] (2:02:20 - 2:02:32)
In other words, the respondents were first asked the question regarding a $400 level and then

you recorded the response. And then they were then asked the $300 level and you recorded their response.

[Speaker 19] (2:02:32 - 2:02:32)
Correct.

[Speaker 7] (2:02:33 - 2:02:33)
Okay.

[Speaker 1] (2:02:34 - 2:02:38)
So when in your verbal presentation just now, that's called threshold willingness to pay.

[Speaker 7] (2:02:39 - 2:02:56)
Yes, I understand. In your presentation just now verbally, you asserted that being asked at a higher level first than descending order wouldn't, doesn't, the prior questions doesn't affect the results of the subsequent questions. Did I interpret you correctly?

[Speaker 1] (2:02:57 - 2:03:22)
Well, I can tell you, you wouldn't start at $5 and then say, well, what about 10? What about 20? You wouldn't start at 200 and say, what about 300?

What about 400? You always want to start at the top and go down. Again, that's been tested over time by many firms.

And if you go the other direction, you're not going to get a valid outcome.

[Speaker 7] (2:03:23 - 2:03:45)
But that, that wasn't my question. My question was, how do you, what, how do you support that conclusion? Did I, I think I interpreted you correctly.

So I guess that's the first question, if I understood you correctly. In your assertion that the preceding questions don't affect the results of the subsequent questions. I think that's what you were saying.

[Speaker 1] (2:03:46 - 2:06:01)
Could you put my up on screen? Thank you. The, so you're saying the preference for dealing with fiscal challenges and you're saying, see, because remember we asked concepts here.

Would you be wanting to increase local taxes or no cutbacks, no new taxes, and then depends on the amount. And that, by the way, was voluntary. We don't say, because if we said it depends on the amount, let me tell you, all of the respondents would go, well, yeah, it depends on the amount.

So we don't do that. We just ask, would you agree to an increase in tax to realize this outcome and to address this crisis, this serious problem? And that's 35% did.

And then some of those people said, well, yeah, but it depends on the amount. So, and, and your question then is, well, doesn't, does this impact the next question? You know, I'm not sure, I'm sure how to answer that.

It could, I suppose. I don't think it does, but I suppose it could. I'm not going to, I'm not going to make some huge statement.

Oh yeah, absolutely. It doesn't, it could, but even if it does, what it doesn't do is change the validity of the responses. So, you know, a lot of people and a lot of government agencies actually underestimate the level of sophistication of their electorate.

Voters aren't stupid. They're around a long time. So when you ask this kind of a question, they're not surprised.

They'll answer it honestly. And then it comes as no surprise to tell you, okay, well, now we're going to ask you about the three different forms of taxes. In this case, it's a partial tax, flat tax, $400 a year.

Would you be willing to pay that? Yes or no? So I don't, I don't think that there's no, there's no way to answer your question definitively, but I don't think that the prior questions impact in any negative way or, or impact or reduce the level of validity of the outcome.

I just don't think it does.

[Speaker 7] (2:06:07 - 2:06:26)
My last question is, is regarding, I'm trying to find the question number. Sorry. It's the one that asked about the one that immediately followed the issues of, no, there's the issues of concern questions.

I don't remember what number that was. The second question maybe.

[Speaker 1] (2:06:27 - 2:06:42)
Oh, okay. Sure. Hold on.

It's an open-ended question. Right. Oh, sorry.

Okay. Here it is. Yeah.

[Speaker 7] (2:06:44 - 2:07:07)
Yeah, we can see it. That's the one. Um, you, when you presented this question, you said that

these don't pertain to Clayton and they're more a media effect than that.

It's just what people, yes, that's what I said. Yeah. How do you, how do you draw?

[Speaker 1] (2:07:13 - 2:11:51)
Typically after we ask this question, this is an open-ended question. And typically we ask after this, we get a series of concerns that we test and we ask the respondent to rank order these. So, um, and the reason we didn't, and this is very unusual in Clayton that we didn't ask that second question, but there's a reason I didn't ask that question.

And then I'll go back to this question. The reason I didn't ask the second question is in, uh, you have a very competent, and I know you know this, uh, city manager. Uh, you know, she, you know, went from Sacramento to San Pablo to you.

She's, she's incredibly competent and what we are wonderful in-depth discussion, which you will verify we have, uh, that where I said, you know, what are the issues to the best of your knowledge? I know you're relatively new to Clayton, but what are the issues inside the community? Because small community talks and you've got, you know, you've got, uh, I know you monitor, uh, uh, the soft, uh, you know, the social media next door, for example.

And, uh, so what, what are your concerns? What, what, what, and she said, you know, truth is I don't hear many. Uh, I'm guessing they're pretty happy campers and they're not, you know, I can't sit here and say, well, we have a concern with public safety because we've got a good police department and we don't have a lot of crime here.

We went through all of the elements on the typical questions we would ask and ask to rank order. And there just weren't any, uh, that rose to that level of justification to create that question. So when I asked what I, but, but I certainly wanted to ask this open-ended question and look, I'm a media person.

I've been a newspaper reporter, editor, uh, you know, I've been a guy on the West coast for the largest PR agency in the world. I know, and I professor at three universities and mass media, uh, and persuasion and what have you. And when I looked at this, I've never seen this before.

When I looked at the outcome and created the chart, I'm sitting there looking at it going, wow, I happen to do a lot of studies in California and elsewhere about concerns, what's going on and how concerned the community is. And guess what routinely the number one concern on the, on the public agenda today, the national and state public agenda today is homelessness. That's no surprise.

You know, that's true. The second one is crime. The third one is affordable housing.

Once in a while, affordable housing overcomes crime, but not very often. Usually it's homeless,

homelessness, crime, affordable housing, and then public safety. And I know I already had empirical evidence in your community that said that I have your, your community isn't concerned about public safety.

They want a good police department and guess what? They have a good police department. Thanks to city officials.

So I'm sitting there looking at this and going, you know what this is? And remember, uh, in fact, I, uh, uh, wrote an award-winning paper, uh, that, uh, on, uh, on, uh, mass media effects. And that is one of my two special political communication, uh, marketing and mass media effects in my, actually my three areas.

And I'm looking at this going, you know, this is a media effect. This is what they're hearing on TV, seeing on TV, watching on TV. It's what they're talking about, uh, you know, at the grocery store or whatever.

This is a media effect. And so when I, when I said that to you and I did, you're right. Uh, that was anecdotal.

That was not empirical. I wasn't trying to defend that. Well, sort of empirical, but I wasn't trying to defend the position.

I was just saying my interpretation of this is this has nothing to do with anything that's going on in Clayton. This is a media effect, uh, what people are seeing on me and talking about, uh, on social media. And that's, you know, even more than the mass media these days.

Uh, so that's the best answer I can give you is that that's my interpretation of these findings, but I don't have any theoretical paradigm to support it other than, and I think all of you will agree, this is what you're seeing on television and hearing on social media, probably what you're chatting about among your friends. And I could be wrong, but I don't think so. And that, and I wouldn't have brought it out and made that statement if I wasn't pretty sure I'm right.

I mean, that's, that would be reckless and I don't ever want to be reckless. That's not what you're paying me to do.

[Speaker 7] (2:11:54 - 2:11:55)
Okay. Thank you.

[Speaker 1] (2:11:55 - 2:11:57)
I hope that answer, that's the best answer we got.

[Speaker 3] (2:12:00 - 2:12:03)
Any other? Council Member? Thank you.

[Speaker 5] (2:12:03 - 2:12:35)
Yes, please. I guess I, I agree with the first question relative to the quality of life and everybody knows that because if you talk to anybody on the street, you're going to know that, uh, that's one of the primary reasons why people moved into the, into the community. But my question is, then the next one is the number one item when I talk to people are police service.

92% it comes through on your, uh, on your survey.

[Speaker 1] (2:12:35 - 2:12:42)
Could you show my screen please? Thank you. Go ahead.

Police services.

[Speaker 5] (2:12:43 - 2:12:44)
May I ask my question?

[Speaker 1] (2:12:45 - 2:12:46)
Please.

[Speaker 5] (2:12:46 - 2:12:46)
Yeah, I watched you.

[Speaker 1] (2:12:46 - 2:12:52)
I just want to be able to have everybody look at the, what you're referring to. All right.

[Speaker 5] (2:12:53 - 2:13:31)
Okay. 92% of the people, uh, came through with police services as being the major, the major reason, one of the major reasons why they like living in the community. My question is, why was the questionnaire constructed such that the only one that was absolute to reduce or to eliminate would be one police officer and not why wasn't something else considered more absolute?

For example, city administration costs. Why wasn't that included in there?

[Speaker 1] (2:13:33 - 2:15:28)
That is a very fair question. Again, this comes out of the discussion that I had with your, uh, city manager. And the question I said, what are the consequences of not being, being able to address your fiscal challenges?

And more importantly, what are the ones that the average voter would respond to, would react to? And let me tell you, they're going to react in general quality of life is, is, uh, everybody has that question, right? That's not news.

Now, police services are always thought about public safety, but I can tell you, your constituents, all constituents care about police services. It's one of those things. And when you start cutting back on officers, uh, that's going to be a major effect of whether or not I'm, uh, you know, I, I'm going to say, you know, do I, am I happy with them?

Am I not? You, you are right. There's a whole host of others, administrative costs, but that gets into some very subtle areas that, that the interpretation of that, or the understanding of that among the average voter would be less than the ones we chose.

So yes, these were chosen. You're right. And I, and I wanted to, that would tell me a whole lot on whether or not I can recommend to city council to move forward today with a funding measure.

Uh, the subtle ones take a lot of discussion and a lot of explanation and they still aren't necessarily understood. Um, that's just human nature. So yeah, we could have added other ones.

You're right, but I'm not sure how to necessarily interpret that because it's going to be, I wanted to make sure whatever we ask would be easy to interpret. That would be understood by, uh, by your electorate. And it would be, then the responses would be understood by me.

[Speaker 6] (2:15:30 - 2:17:17)
If I could, um, jump in just to, I think, clarify a couple of things. So if, if you look at figures, you know, A, B, C, and through that series, um, where the arguments are put forward, um, the, the argument related to police, the argument related to, um, uh, overall city level of city services, which is figure eight C and the, um, question about, uh, the, um, force into bankruptcy. So, uh, figure eight F, those are all stated as absolute.

A couple of the other questions are stated as more permissive. So it wasn't just that the police was the only place where there was an absolute stated. Um, there were, um, arguments that were tested that were both absolute in their language, as well as those that were there, some that were tested that were, um, potentially permissive in their language, but it wasn't only that question on police that was, was, um, framed that way.

Um, so, uh, I just wanted to, because I think that was part of your question. And so if you look at how eight C and eight F, um, if you look at the presentation slides, um, and actually eight E yeah, it's on the screen, they can, they can see it. Um, there's a little bit of a disconnect between what we see in the room and what shows out on the zoom screen.

So, um, your, your slide presentation is still up. So they they've got that. I apologize for that little bit of disconnect, but, um, so it wasn't only that question that was framed that way.

[Speaker 5] (2:17:17 - 2:17:44)

One final question. And then I'll, I'll back out of here because we're getting deep into anyway, uh, under the item park and recreation, uh, 88% satisfied. Does that include the landscaping function?

No, no, no. Yet. When I talk to people, the two most important things to them, police services and landscaping.

So I don't know why that it was addressed in there.

[Speaker 6] (2:17:44 - 2:17:51)
That was, that's more a me question than a Dr. Manrock's question. So noted.

[Speaker 3] (2:17:52 - 2:17:56)
Thanks Council Member Diaz. Any other questions for Dr. Manrock?

[Speaker 1] (2:17:56 - 2:18:07)
I just want to thank you for pointing that out, Rena. I was trying to remain in the context of that question, Siri, shame on me. Thank you for bringing that up.

[Speaker 3] (2:18:08 - 2:18:14)
Are there other questions from the council? If not, uh, Janet, are there any hands raised for public comment on this item?

[Speaker 14] (2:18:17 - 2:18:28)
Mayor Clovin, I have one hand that just went up out of 17 attendees. James, as I promote you to panelists, if you can please unmute your microphone, you will have three minutes to speak.

[Speaker 6] (2:18:31 - 2:18:40)
Dr. Manrock, can you stop sharing your screen for a few moments while we do our public comment? Thank you.

[Speaker 12] (2:18:41 - 2:21:15)
Hi there. I'm Jim Killer and I want to first say I have a lot of experience with statistics. I thought, you know, I was, I was very doubtful coming into this, that this would prove any value.

I can say I'm very impressed with the way this study was performed and understanding the sample size. And now, so it's not about just the questions, it's really getting a feel for how the population of Clayton would respond to an increase in taxes and also looking at how they view the services. So I thought it was a very good construction of questions and, uh, and to get a good sense of feel from, um, from issues that were higher priority versus lower priority.

So I really think what you can do is I feel you can trust what he's saying. It's a no-go. So what the council really needs to determine is do we even go forward with doing additional research

on this issue?

Uh, and, um, and if you do determine that you want to do additional research, in essence, you're not going, you're not going to go forward with a, with a raise in taxes to the public, uh, for this, for 2022, then you have to determine if you're going to go 2024. And if you are going, I really think it's about Clayton's motto, which is do it right. And, and basically, uh, the, to me, that means putting the right time in, getting the right people involved in the community, and then making the proper decision to go forward.

And, and again, it's getting the right people involved. That means it can't be the council. You need to get people involved in the community, which we're small, and we just don't do a very good job when it comes to, uh, these types of issues, because we haven't been around the issues.

It's not that we don't make good decisions. This is the first time where we've had to really confront the issue in the community like this, which has many facets, because there's a lot of different directions that this could go in. And so, again, I'm not saying I support or against attacks.

I'm just saying you got to do it right and spend the right time. And again, the first decision is, this is pretty clear. It's going to be very tough to get any form of tax through, whether it's 2022 or 2024.

So again, I appreciate the work that the council members are doing. Again, to this, the survey, I thought was very good. I think it was worth the money.

And, um, and again, I feel for the community because I do believe there's a real issue out there.

[Speaker 3] (2:21:19 - 2:21:26)
Thank you, James. Appreciate your comments. Janet, are there any hands out there again for questions or a public comment on this item?

[Speaker 14] (2:21:27 - 2:21:36)
I do. I have a couple of hands that just went up. The first hand is Gary.

Gary, as a panelist, if you can please unmute your microphone, you will have three minutes to speak.

[Speaker 10] (2:21:44 - 2:21:45)
Good evening. Can you hear me okay?

[Speaker 3] (2:21:46 - 2:21:47)
Gary, welcome.

[Speaker 10] (2:21:49 - 2:24:35)
Thank you, Mayor and City Council. Anyhow, great presentation by the doctor. I think you summed up everything correctly.

I'm just going to go over some quick notes here. I know I've got less than two and a half minutes. They're going to be a little bit scattered, but I think one of the things that came out of the survey, we all could have predicted that for those of us that have lived here for over 30 years, I was really surprised that the City Council didn't get involved with these questions because you live here.

Rena, you don't live here. You don't know the city as well as the citizens do, nor the council, or the council, excuse me. You know, they don't break it, don't fix it.

I got it, but we've been kicking the can down the road. I think the problem really happened when I read it in the Pioneer, and you talked about a $629,000 deficit. Those weren't actual expenses, Rena, nor were they Mr. Cloven, Ms. Tillman, Mr. Wolfe, and Ms. Swartz. Those were a wish list. You itemized those on your wish list to give us that deficit, which was $250,000 for a lieutenant, city engineer $50,000, etc., etc. So really, this survey was misrepresented to the public because what I read in the Pioneer, we're going to have this budget deficit, doctor, and I'm not sure you even knew about this, but we're only short about $100,000.

Not one time did I hear the council, Mr. Cloven, I didn't hear you mention it either. We never explored Plan B, and there was not one question in there on Plan B on how we could cut expenses or how we could bring other revenue in to the city, and that's pretty upsetting to me that this survey was geared towards, I think, a lot of scare tactics. You're going to lose a police officer, your light's going to go off, you're going to file bankruptcy, but not one question about a Plan B.

How could we create more income, or how could we go ahead and make some cuts to go ahead and get through this small deficit, which is $100,000, not $600,000, that was represented through the Pioneer through interviews with a few of the council members. So I think that the questions that were in there, in my opinion, they were skewed. Questions like, what's a trusted source, doctor?

Is that my mom? Is that my dad? Or is that my dentist?

What is a trusted source? Is it the local newspaper? I'm not sure what that question even meant.

So I think that because the city manager didn't know the issues, she didn't involve our city council, which has lived here a long time, we wasted $30,000 to get an outcome that we all could have predicted. Thank you, and good night.

[Speaker 3] (2:24:38 - 2:24:43)
Thank you, Gary. Janet, you have another hand raised for this public comment.

[Speaker 14] (2:24:44 - 2:24:50)
I do. Roy, as I promote you to panelist, if you can please unmute your microphone, you will have three minutes to speak.

[Speaker 3] (2:25:18 - 2:25:26)
Hi. Can you hear me? Greetings, Roy.

Welcome. Greetings. You're on, Roy.

Yes, I can.

[Speaker 9] (2:25:26 - 2:28:26)
Yeah. Okay, good. Yeah.

Thank you. Yeah. I'm just going to react to the survey and the work that was done.

And I think the last gentleman had some good points. And I'm not going to address them though, because he did. And I concur with a number of things that he was just saying.

I'm just going to look at this at the survey and what was done in the survey. I've done a lot of surveys. That's my background, one of the areas of my background and expertise.

And let me ask you, the questions as they were seen in your presentation, were those the questions that were asked of the respondents for the sample question? Okay. And feel free to respond after these two minutes.

And I take it they were, maybe. And hopefully not, because there were so many double-barreled questions in there. And so if you say one thing, and then it's like so many things are being asked.

And the other part of those questions, they're so verbose. And so for my respondent, it's confusion that's taking place. One, and two is in terms of data analysis and summary interpretation, how in the heck are you going to interpret that?

And what reliability is in that interpretation? And what is the validity of that interpretation? So that's a question, right?

And one of the areas that I didn't see in the survey that was being asked, is I would like to see, or let me just ask, backing up. Was there a review cycle on this survey? And including by staff, by council, by whom, on the city, by Clayton altogether?

What was the review cycle? And what was the outcome of that? Because if there was a review cycle, there should have been some things that could have cleaned up what we have here, in my opinion.

And okay, so what was that review cycle? And how did that take place? And what was the outcome of it?

The other is that one of those things that seems to me is that you walk around the town and you talk about credibility and trustworthiness. I think there was some, that was broached in the survey, trustworthiness and credibility. I didn't see anything.

There was one question about that, but questions could have been really economic. It could have been one question and put it on the scale of whatever, one to five microscale, like you did, and then get data. But if I were to read that questionnaire, if one reads it, it is confusing.

There's so much going on in those questions that in terms of- It's three minutes is up, Roy, if you can hear me.

[Speaker 3] (2:28:27 - 2:28:35)
Can you wind it down, Roy? Your time is done. Pardon me?

Your three minutes is up, Roy, and we appreciate your comments.

[Speaker 9] (2:28:35 - 2:28:54)
Thank you very much. One last thing. So with respect to behavior, I would have liked a question that dealt with credibility, trustworthiness in the council, in the city itself.

We've got so many budget issues. Roy, thank you for your time, Roy.

[Speaker 3] (2:28:56 - 2:28:59)
Roy, your time is up. It's three minutes are up, Roy. Thank you.

[Speaker 9] (2:29:00 - 2:29:01)
Thank you very much.

[Speaker 3] (2:29:07 - 2:29:10)
Janet, are there any other hands on this public comment on this item?

[Speaker 14] (2:29:11 - 2:29:18)
I do have another hand raised. Frank, as I promote you to panelist, if you can please unmute your microphone, you will have three minutes to speak.

[Speaker 13] (2:29:27 - 2:29:28)
Good evening, council.

[Speaker 3] (2:29:30 - 2:29:30)
Greetings, Frank.

[Speaker 13] (2:29:34 - 2:31:30)
A good presentation by the good doctor. The one issue that looks like it was glossed over, maybe because it wasn't the intent of the survey, but it stands out to me and that's that, do you trust your city officials, your elected officials completely? I guess that's the way you would ask the question, but I find that that number 44% that don't.

The doctor interpreted is we've had a lot of three, two votes. I think obviously he's not from here, but just as I spend time around town, the amount of distrust of this present council is probably higher than even the prior councils where I used to have to appear and speak. Two of you rose to the position you've had in a less than honorable fashion and folks don't trust you.

Then you come to us and you want a tax increase. I noticed in some prior meetings, how much pushing there was against one particular council member or by others that we must stand on a unified message. In other words, don't do any due diligence.

Don't look into things. Don't question anything. We're the government, we know what's best.

Would have been nice to have a little bit more data on that, but I think three of you know that there's a high level of distrust and how we got here has to do with what's taken place in the last two years with the normal protocol of who is supposed to ascend to the position of mayor. I hope that at some point, the three of you find some way to do something about it because that's something that's going to remain part of Clayton's history forever. And we are very divided and we don't trust you.

I certainly don't. So just something that you guys should pay attention to. Thank you.

[Speaker 3] (2:31:31 - 2:31:36)
Frank, I appreciate that. Any other hands, Janet, for this item?

[Speaker 14] (2:31:39 - 2:31:42)
Mayor Clovin, I do not have any other hands raised on this item.

[Speaker 3] (2:31:42 - 2:31:49)
Thanks, Janet. And with that, we'll close public comment on this item and bring it back to the Council for discussion.

[Speaker 5] (2:31:53 - 2:32:15)

Only one thing that I have, and I'd like to make sure that this study, the one that's in our package, I know it's on the city website now for the meeting tonight, but I think that the entire survey and the results should be listed and put on the city website so the entire population can see it and read it.

[Speaker 8] (2:32:16 - 2:33:55)
Will do. Go ahead. Thank you.

Thank you. Well, you know, I appreciate, Doctor, I appreciate the survey. I think we actually spent the money in the right way.

Now we know what we know. And yes, we could have predicted where we were going on this, but I'm encouraged by some of the some of the figures that are here that we're getting closer to where we need to be. And that while 2022 may not be the time to put this on the ballot, we certainly have some work cut out for us with regard to letting the people know and how serious this is because we can talk about a plan B, but the reality is there isn't one.

This is a fiscal problem that's going to go on year after year after year, and we're just going to get deeper in the hole. And I think once people hear that and understand it, whether that be the 2024 ballot, hopefully that's going to be the case, that they will acquiesce to that and bring us back to where we need to be as a premier small city. If that's what we're going to be, we're going to need to pay for that and people are going to have to understand it.

That's where I'm coming from. I think that now we know what we know. I would challenge that this was money well spent and I appreciate the efforts.

That's my comment for now.

[Speaker 3] (2:33:56 - 2:34:00)
Thank you, Council Member Wolf. Any other comments from council?

[Speaker 8] (2:34:05 - 2:34:12)
One more thing. Thank God for the ARPA funding. I don't know where we would be without it at this point.

Thank you.

[Speaker 3] (2:34:14 - 2:34:15)
Vice Mayor Tillman?

[Speaker 4] (2:34:16 - 2:40:07)
Yeah, a couple of comments. One, thank you, Doctor. For me, it was very helpful to see a lot of the insight that was in here.

There was a lot of telling information to some of the comments that some of our public speakers made. Thank you, for weighing in. I like the idea of getting the community involved.

I will say that that's something that I've been pounding the table for as well as others that are here to have more engagement. I think Jeff's been doing that since he joined as well. That has to happen.

How that happens, we'll have to figure that out. I do think that some more community input would be great. A couple of issues that came up in some of the other comments as far as credibility of the council and questions being skewed, etc., and that we should have been asked. I actually appreciate not being involved so that people couldn't say that we skewed the data. So, thank you, City Manager Schwartz. People will probably crucify you for that, but I appreciate it because to the doctor's point, there's a lot of distrust that's in the community right now.

Yes, you totally picked up on that. No one's saying that due diligence doesn't have to be done. In fact, I would think all of us here insist that that has to happen no matter what we're doing.

But for us to be unified in a message, which is what I requested when this came up, I think that that makes the most sense. It doesn't make any sense to go out into the community, ask for their input in moving us forward without us being unified. It doesn't mean that we don't have to do work.

It doesn't mean we don't have to do it again. It doesn't mean we don't have to work together. But we actually do need to have a unified message on how to move this city forward in the best way.

That can be many layers. But to insinuate that there's some malfeasance happening or nefarious things happening if we want to have a 5-0 vote is absurd to me. I also think it was money well spent.

A couple other things that I wanted to point out that you brought up earlier. I also don't think that we have to always be in sync with our votes. But when it comes to our city finances, I think that we should.

We all want to have a balanced budget. We all want to get us there. I'm glad that you actually clarified the question about why the question was asked about the police officers and why that was almost a worst case scenario.

I had my papers ready. I was about to show them. So thank you for pointing out that those other questions were in there too.

But I think that this means that we have to actually get creative in this next budget cycle that we're going to have. I know we have a meeting on the 23rd. I had asked Raina a couple of

weeks ago, maybe a couple of months ago now, weeks, months, they're all blending together, about our finances.

And I think I mentioned this last meeting. But I do think that we have to look into that, whether we do that at our next budget and audit committee meeting. We need to look at how our investments are.

So we aren't just sitting here doing nothing. It's time to make some changes. They can't just be sitting in CDs.

So if that's something that we can bring forward to our next budget and audit committee meeting for us to discuss, that'd be great. I'm pretty adamant that we need to see benchmarks for any investments that we have. And there needs to be some changes there.

So in terms of a plan B, there are changes we can make. It doesn't have to be as dire. We can have more revenue coming in with our investments instead of being as passive as we are.

That's one point. The other is I'm inclined to wait. I think that to Mr. Hood's point about the wish list, the article most definitely said it was. I think we were pretty clear in all of our conversations here it was a wish list. And the reason why is because we have constant turnover. We all talked about this in meetings.

It's kind of been a revolving door with our staff because they are the most underpaid staff in the county. That needs to change. And so it was within these conversations of how can we address this so that we can keep our staff here.

We can retain the staff. We can acquire staff. It's about retention and recruiting.

And that's key. Those were things that we all decided should have been a priority. So yes, we needed to have a wish list to figure out how to get us there because it's not just going to grow on trees.

That's how come we had a wish list. Not to just be frivolous with money. There was a plan in place, an active dialogue to figure out how to do that.

So I don't think that that was in vain. I think that that's something we still need to consider. Obviously, it's not going to happen now in June with this next budget that's coming up.

But it's still something that we should keep on our radar and how we can get there. And I think that we have to just start planning conversations, which means more meetings, and perhaps consider an ad hoc committee to discuss this. Putting this on the ballot in 2024, I think would be a great way to go, is inviting the citizens to join us on that and developing a plan.

I think that's about where my head is, is that most definitely we wait. This was not in vain in my mind at all. It was money well spent.

I know that people are angry that we actually did spend it. But doctor, thank you very much for all of your input and interpretation of the results. I greatly appreciate it.

And I know that the residents that are listening right now do as well. They might not like how it came out or how it went down. But I appreciate the fact that we were not involved so that people can't say that we influenced any of this outcome.

So thank you.

[Speaker 3] (2:40:08 - 2:40:09)
Thank you, Vice Mayor Tillman.

[Speaker 7] (2:40:10 - 2:41:05)
Council Member Nguyen. I will just share one comment that I had with our city manager on question 13, where it says, do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Claims elected officials are completely trustworthy.

I think we had a difference of viewpoint on this one, where I think she may have lamented that the number of disagree was so high. And I lamented that it was so low. I don't think that if anyone asked me if anyone is completely trustworthy, I'm 100% going to say no.

And so the fact that we only got 44%, that's subject to how you want to interpret that. But I would hope that an informed citizenry would answer no all the time.

[Speaker 3] (2:41:10 - 2:45:00)
Thanks. You know, I had mentioned previously that the reason for my wanting to have the survey in the first place was to get the pulse of our community, to find out what the sweet spot was. The alternative that was being floated out there was, hey, we need a minimum amount.

Let's say what that minimum amount is and put a parcel tax out there. And we can convince our citizens that that's the amount we need, because we're intelligent and we're committed. It's clear from your survey that we were highly optimistic in that thought process, and that the data is pretty clear that even at the minimum amount, $200 a parcel, it wasn't going to pass.

In the current mindset of our citizens, that surprised me. It didn't surprise the former mayor that I spoke to, who when he asked me, he said, well, if this survey comes back with an absolute no-go, what would you do? I'm listening to the survey.

I'm listening to the data as it's been presented to us. And it's pretty clear that we have an uninformed citizen residence base at this point. They don't know what we all know as council

members of what our challenges are and what we've known for two, three, four, many years as we've tried to trim, trim, trim and trim the budget to make a balance every year.

And they don't know how the effort that's taken on half of prior city councils. We're burdened as a council right now with trying to figure out going forward how to fix that and make that happen in two years. You asked the question about is the council completely trustworthy?

I concur with your semantics on that, Jeff. Thank you. But clearly there's a large population do not think we are trustworthy.

Curiously, when you look at the demographics of that drill down, the people, the vast majority who answered that have more of a progressive and liberal bent percentage wise versus conservative. So I found that kind of fascinating, just fascinating when you drill down into the data. It's clear we're not the ones who are going to be the trusted source to put out the message at this point.

So how do we fix that? These are conversations that we'll have to have in the future. I am the one that I'm a full proponent of a community advisory community of intelligent, dedicated professionals who have finance backgrounds in Clayton and get them together and let them be the ones who cogitate from all nonpartisan group of people to come up with an idea and let them be the voice and with support from us.

We can come in and but I want them to come from the citizens advisory committee to help get the word out and have us support them as much as possible fiscally as they need to in the next couple of years. But that's in the future. Doctor, I found your work fascinating, completely worthwhile, and I appreciate the effort.

I think it was money well spent. It saved us from spending more money on a venture that would not have passed in 2022. And that's what I learned from this.

It shows us where we need to put our put our effort to make sure that does do so in 2024. And that's my comments.

[Speaker 6] (2:45:02 - 2:46:25)
So, Mayor and Council, what at this point, I would like to get make sure that I'm clear on direction regarding whether or not to pursue a ballot measure for November 2022. I think I know the answer, but I always want to be clear. And then clearly, there are a number of conversations to be had both through the budget process for FY23 and beyond in terms of some of the specifics of Plan B and what do we do in the meantime and what are those real costs and really digging into those numbers, as well as coming back with some options related to an information campaign and a potential, is it an ad hoc?

Is it a community advisory committee? What are the options for those structures? So, that I feel

like I have sufficient direction on.

I know I need to come back with budget options and actions, as well as options on what the engagement strategy and information strategy is going to be and what the options are for that. And so, I don't think I need additional voted clarity on that, but I would obviously be happy to answer any other questions. But I'd like to get a very clear picture on go, no-go November 2022.

[Speaker 3] (2:46:25 - 2:46:47)
Is there any council member here who desires to do a go for this year in 2022 on the November ballot? I mean, I must ask the question. If you do, raise your hand or speak clearly.

No. We need to put it to a vote. Do we need to put it to a vote?

Is there an action item, or do we just need to give you direction at this point?

[Speaker 6] (2:46:48 - 2:46:57)
The item is to provide direction. Obviously, the clearest would be a motion to second into voting. And that might be your best path.

[Speaker 3] (2:46:57 - 2:47:05)
Is there a motion on the table for direction for this year in 2022, putting a ballot item on the ballot?

[Speaker 4] (2:47:05 - 2:47:10)
I'll make a motion that we no-go a ballot measure for November 2022.

[Speaker 3] (2:47:13 - 2:47:18)
Is there a second? I'll second that. Janet, will you call the roll, please?

[Speaker 14] (2:47:18 - 2:47:19)
Council Member Diaz.

[Speaker 5] (2:47:20 - 2:47:23)
I don't understand the motion. I'd like to hear it again.

[Speaker 4] (2:47:25 - 2:47:25)
My motion.

[Speaker 5] (2:47:25 - 2:47:27)
Before I vote. Sure.

[Speaker 4] (2:47:28 - 2:47:31)
The motion is that we're a no-go for putting a ballot measure.

[Speaker 3] (2:47:31 - 2:47:31)
No.

[Speaker 4] (2:47:32 - 2:47:33)
A no-go. Correct.

[Speaker 3] (2:47:33 - 2:47:38)
There is will not be put in the ballot in November this year. I support that. Okay.

[Speaker 14] (2:47:39 - 2:47:40)
Council Member Wynne.

[Speaker 3] (2:47:40 - 2:47:41)
Aye.

[Speaker 14] (2:47:41 - 2:47:42)
Council Member Wolff.

[Speaker 6] (2:47:42 - 2:47:43)
Yes.

[Speaker 14] (2:47:43 - 2:47:44)
Vice Mayor Tillman.

[Speaker 6] (2:47:44 - 2:47:44)
Aye.

[Speaker 14] (2:47:44 - 2:47:45)
Mayor Cloven.

[Speaker 6] (2:47:46 - 2:48:09)
Aye. I appreciate the clarity that that gives me the direction, as well as, as I mentioned, what I already also took his direction on the budget process, as well as an engagement and information process. Is there any other direction related to the survey results or pulling this information forward that I need to take back that I see some?

[Speaker 4] (2:48:11 - 2:48:36)
It's there's nothing else you need to take back. I would just like you to clarify that without this happening, you would have already had a balanced budget, correct? Oh, yes.

You said something earlier that almost made it sound like this was going to be a plan B. Now I'll go do a balanced budget. We all know, but in case someone in the audience glean that, I just

want to clarify that, you know, you know what you're doing and you plan to have a balanced budget regardless.

[Speaker 6] (2:48:36 - 2:48:49)
I absolutely, as I have said before, plan to bring forward a balanced budget. So yes, that is the plan B is what's that longer term strategy look like.

[Speaker 3] (2:48:49 - 2:48:49)
Thank you.

[Speaker 6] (2:48:50 - 2:48:50)
Perfect.

[Speaker 3] (2:48:51 - 2:48:57)
And just to reiterate, Council Member Diaz's request to have this data available for the public as well.

[Speaker 6] (2:48:57 - 2:49:02)
Yes, certainly. It's already on as part of the agenda, but we'll pull it up to the main page of the website.

[Speaker 5] (2:49:02 - 2:49:14)
Thank you. One other final question. Since we're not going to do anything for the 22 November ballot, what about all those meetings you have us holding for?

[Speaker 6] (2:49:15 - 2:49:31)
Oh, that is really related now to the budget process and also the housing elements going to happen in there. So we will need at least two of those meetings. We may need all three.

So thank you in advance for continuing to hold those.

[Speaker 3] (2:49:33 - 2:49:45)
Excellent. Any other questions or statements on item 9A? Doctor, you were tremendous and we appreciate your being here and appreciate your efforts.

Thank you.

[Speaker 1] (2:49:46 - 2:49:48)
My honor. My pleasure. Thank you.

[Speaker 6] (2:49:49 - 2:49:51)
Thank you, Doctor Manos.

[Speaker 3] (2:49:51 - 2:50:10)
With that, item 9A is closed and you. All right, we'll move on in our agenda to item 10, which is closed session for which we have none. And then we'll move on to item number 11, council items for future meetings.

Are there any items to be brought up?

[Speaker 5] (2:50:11 - 2:50:20)
I just want to reiterate the tree issue, Mitchell Canyon. And I'd like closure on that. Mitchell Canyon and Clayton Road.

Thank you.

[Speaker 3] (2:50:20 - 2:50:37)
Thank you. Any other items for future meetings with that? I've never 11.

Council items is closed. We'll move on to adjournment. It is now 957 or 52.

Meeting is closed.