MINUTES OF
A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS, CALIFORNIA
MONDAY, JUNE 08, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills was called to order by Mayor Pieper at 7:03p.m. via teleconference.

2. ROLL CALL

Councilmembers participating via teleconference:
Mayor Pieper, Dieringer, Black, Mirsch, and Wilson.
Councilmembers Absent: None.
Others participating via teleconference:
Elaine Jeng, P.E., City Manager.
Meredith Elguira, Planning & Community Services Director.
Yohana Coronel, City Clerk.
Michael Jenkins, City Attorney.
Terry Shea, Finance Director.
Roger Hawkins.
Alfred Visco.

3. OPEN AGENDA

Roger Hawkins commented via email on the safety measures at the three gates. He stated that the City's, June 2nd, Blue Newsletter arrived at his residence after the special meeting took place, therefore he was not able to submit his comments. He suggested that the City partner with the RHCA to alert the residents of such meetings via dwellingLIVE. In 2019, a break-in at a resident's home prompted the Association to hire Covered Six to prepare a security assessment report to provide insight as to how to mitigate risk and increase security in the community. After the report, many residents requested hosting a presentation with Covered Six to ask questions. The Board denied the request and stated they would instead rely on the Association staff for security advice, which these staff are not qualified nor licensed to do. It is his opinion that the Council should not deprive the residents of the benefit of a "no cost" advice offered by Covered Six. The City should be looking towards experts, like Covered Six, with respect to security and not rely on the current gate staff that according to the Association, "are not trained security officers…" It is best if the City prepares before violence erupts, not afterwards.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Matters which may be acted upon by the City Council in a single motion. Any Councilmember may request removal of any item from the Consent Calendar causing it to be considered under Council Actions.

A. MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 09, 2020, REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 23, 2020, SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 30, 2020, JOINT STUDY SESSION WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL APRIL 13, 2020, REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 27, 2020 AND REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 11, 2020.
RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

B. PAYMENT OF BILLS.
RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

C. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF ON-CALL INDUSTRIAL HYGIENISTS TO SET UP COVID-19 DEEP CLEANING PROTOCOLS AND MONITOR DISINFECTING EFFORTS.
RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

D. APPROVE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH RINCON TO UPDATE THE GENERAL PLAN'S SAFETY ELEMENT.
RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

E. APPROVE A CONTRACT WITH DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TRACKING SOFTWARE.
RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

Mayor Pro Tem Dieringer requested to pull consent item 4A and 4C.

Councilmember Black moved that the City Council approve consent items 4B, 4D and 4E as presented. Mayor Pro Tem Dieringer seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote as follows:

AYES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Mayor, Pieper, Dieringer, Mirsch, Black, and Wilson.
NOES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.
ABSENT:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.
ABSTAIN:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.

Item 4A

Mayor Pro Tem Dieringer asked for consent item 4A to be brought back for the next Council meeting in order to make corrections with the City Manager.

Item 4C

Mayor Pro Tem Dieringer suggested approving the vendor that cost less and that staff search for an alternate vendor. Once the alternate has been found, the item can be brought back to the Council.

Councilmember Black commented that the item was completely unnecessary. The initial study from the New England Journal was not peer reviewed and was inaccurate. He mentioned that the editors are in trouble because they published that the virus could live for days on a surface and, as it turns out, it is only a matter of minutes. Regular cleaning applications can be used to wipe down surfaces, no special cleaning is needed.

Councilmember Mirsch stated that she understood why the City was trying to be preemptive about the issue and have a vendor on call and welcomed more discussion.

Mayor Pieper commented that he understood the City would like to have a vendor on standby just in case City Hall has a COVID-19 case and needs to be sanitized.

City Manager Jeng stated that there were levels of concern the City was trying to address. The first is making people aware that additional cleaning measures are being taken, in addition to social distancing and masking. If there is a COVID case, the City needs to have provisions in place in order to ensure that the public and employees are safe to return to City Hall. If City Hall hires cleaners to come in after the fact, it is difficult to demonstrate that City Hall has been sanitized to a standard. Determining that standard is the reason why she is recommending hiring a hygienist. A hygienist would set up cleaning protocols and monitor disinfecting efforts.

Mayor Pieper asked which vendor was most cost effective.

City Manager Jeng replied Ellis Environmental.

Councilmember Black inquired what the $18,000.00 was for.

City Manager Jeng answered that the cost covered establishing cleaning standards and inspection of the facility after the cleaning is done. This proposal does not include the physical cleaning; that element is covered by a third party.

Mayor Pieper suggested finding a vendor that conducts the actual cleaning and discussing the item at a later time.

Councilmember Black moved that the City Council identify a cleaning service that can provide cleaning services if the office requires sanitization. Councilmember Mirsch seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Pieper, Dieringer, Black, Mirsch, and Wilson.
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

5. COMMISSION ITEMS

NONE.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 1253 ADOPTING THE 2020/2021 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET AND RESOLUTION NO. 1254 ESTABLISHING THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS GANN LIMIT FOR THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS.

Finance Director Terry Shea reported that on May 26, 2020 the City Council held a Budget Workshop to review the Draft Proposed Fiscal Year 2020/21 Budget approved by the City Council Finance/Budget/Audit committee on May 18, 2020. The Proposed FY 2020/21 Budget Highlights were reviewed in detail with changes from the FY 2019/20 Budget Highlights. City Council reviewed and approved the General Fund FY 2020/21 draft proposed budget and Other Funds. The budget serves as the City's roadmap for allocating resources. The budget is a resource allocation plan for providing city services and achieving the priorities and goals that serve the residents and the public. There are few steps the City follows for this process and they are as follows:

1. January 13, 2020 – City Council received, reviewed and approved the FY 2020/21 budget calendar.
2. March 23, 2020 – City Council received and reviewed the FY 2020/21 mid-year budget report and approved the recommended budget adjustments.
3. April 27, 2020 – City Council Finance/Budget/Audit Committee reviewed Financial and Investment Policies; and reviewed and discussed the Schedule of Fees and Charges.
4. May 11, 2020 – City Council reviewed and approved Financial and Investment Policies, Schedule of Fees and Charges, and a three-year capital improvement plan.
5. May 18, 2020 - City Council Finance/Budget/Audit Committee reviewed the FY 2020/21 staff proposed budget.
6. May 26, 2020 – City Council Budget Workshop to review the Finance/Audit Committee's approval of the FY 2020/21 staff proposed budget.
7. June 8, 2020 City Council to hold a public hearing regarding adoption of the FY 2020/21 budget, and approval of the GANN Limit.

Projecting revenues for FY 2020/21 using conservative revenue forecasting, staff anticipates the continued resurgence of property values and is projecting a 4% increase in Property Taxes. Staff is projecting a decrease in building permit and other fees of over 50% of the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Budget. Total projected revenues are down \$274,150 from the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Budget, but include a projected amount of \$56,250 in Prop A Exchange Revenues for a net decrease of \$217,900. The proposed expenditures are projected to be \$42,118 higher than the Fiscal Year

2019/20 Adjusted Budget, as a result of a one-time expense for the Housing Element and the upcoming election.

He proceeded to provide highlights of the General Fund. The FY 2020/21 budget projects $2,060,400 in revenues in relation to $2,385,718 in expenditures resulting in a deficit of $325,318 before transfers and a deficit of $478,845 after transfers. Salaries are budgeted to include up to a 5% salary increase of $25,014 including an estimated cost of living adjustment (COLA), of 1.9% ($11,737) and a 3.10% ($13,277) for Exceptional Performance Salary Bonus Pool in accordance with the approved Personnel Manual. City Administration increased by $67,800, including $28,700 for salaries and benefits and $30,000 for the cost of the upcoming election. Finance increased by $3,433, which includes an increase of 1.95% to the RAMS Contract. Planning & Development had an overall decrease of $4,400, which includes an increase of $ 91,400 in Special Project Study and Consultants for the required updates to the Housing Element, offset by decreases of $45,000 for LA County Building Inspection and $61,000 for Storm Water Management. Law Enforcement had a projected increase of 5% in the LA County Sheriff's contract which is being offset by an increase in the costs being charged to the COPS Fund and a decrease in Wild Life Management and Pest Control of $11,500, for an overall decrease to the General Fund of $5,415. In Non-Department Fund there is a decrease of $7,300 for Insurance expenditures. City Properties had a decrease of $12,000 for Repairs and Maintenance expenditures.

Other Funds include the Community Facilities Funds which the City will be giving $5,000.00 each to Caballeros, the Tennis Club and the Women's Club. The General Fund will transfer $11,000 to the Community Facilities Fund in FY 2020/21. The Refuse Fund includes a transfer to the General Fund of ($24,000). This transfer includes ($12,000) for the administration of refuse services and ($12,000) to cover staff time and costs associated with administering the storm water management program. Also, the City will be providing its residents a reprieve from the annual Refuse Collection COLA it imposes annually on July 1st. This will equate to a $193.64 savings for each residence in its annual rate and cost the City $132,643. Also, the City changed the FY 2020/21 Cash Reserve Policy from $66,200 to the annual General Fund subsidy less the cash available at June 30, 2020; the projected transfer is $57,528. The Traffic Safety Fund includes $20,000 for other work outside of the annual striping. The General Fund will be budgeting a transfer of $24,000 to the Traffic Safety Fund in FY 2020/21. The COPS Fund revenues are projected to increase by $15,000 to $155,000. 2019/20 Program Expenditures will increase to $164,898 to cover the 2020/21 LA County Sheriff's Department increase of 5.00% for Law Enforcement Services and will cover the 275 supplemental hours for Traffic Enforcement estimated to be $25,800 in FY 2020/21. The Utility Fund includes $85,000 for the design of the Sewer Mainline along Portuguese Bend Road. The General Fund will not transfer monies to the Utility Fund. The Capital Projects Fund will budget $50,000 for Tennis Court Improvements, $7,000 for the City Hall ADA Design and $32,000 for Acacia removal. The General Fund will be transferring $89,000 to the Capital Projects Fund in FY 2020/21.

The Transit Funds for Proposition A will have an exchange of $75,000 and for Proposition C a gifting of $60,000. For Measure M and Measure R there are no proposed expenditures or gifting as the City is accumulating these funds for the future parking lot project. For the Measure W Fund the City is projecting income of $110,000 and proposing an expenditure for Storm Water Management of $38,750. There is a new Measure A Fund for which the City is projecting income of $26,100 with no proposed expenditures for Fiscal Year 2020/21. He concluded by stating that the overall financial position of the City's General Fund remains strong with a projected year-end Unassigned Fund Balance of $4,854,000.00 at June 30, 2021. The City is looking at a net deficit of $759,000.00 if everything is spent from the proposed budget, which includes all the funds.

Finance Director Shea proceeded to share the appropriations loan. The base year for the appropriations limit was $256,941.00. California's per capital income went up 3.7% this year and the population in LA County went down .11%; when you take those two percentage changes and multiply it by the prior year, it will provide a new limit of $1,784,681.00. The City's proposed expenditures are below that figure by about $250,000.00.

Mayor Pieper opened the item for public comment.

Alfred Visco commented, via email, that it was his understanding that there was approximately \$4.8 million in unassigned fund balance as of 6/30/21. He suggested that a study should be conducted to determine what should be done with said funds (insurance reductions, rainy day fund, wildfire mitigation or have it returned to the taxpayers). He raised the same issue with the Association, which predicted approximately \$5.8 million in undesignated fund balance as of 6/30/21. He concluded by asking if the City was self-insured.

Mayor Pieper replied that that City is not self-insured and that the amount that the City currently has would not survive a major lawsuit. A lot of the money being spent is for upcoming capital improvement projects that have been put off for a long time and that are finally making their way through, for example, the ADA project. He stated that the City likes to proceed with caution because when there is downturn, like the present, the City does not have to change their fees and will still be able to give back some money, like with the trash subsidy and annual contributions to the community clubs (Women's Club, Tennis Club and the Caballeros).

Councilmember Black added that it is not easy returning money to the taxpayer, and that is why the City absorbs the trash increase every year. Gifting of public funds is a major concern that the Council must contend with; however, the Council is open to hearing any other suggestions as to how best use the unassigned funds.

Councilmember Mirsch moved that the City Council approve the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Budget for all the City's Funds and the Annual Appropriations Limit as presented. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote as follows:

AYES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Mayor Pieper, Dieringer, Mirsch, Black, and Wilson.
NOES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.
ABSENT:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.
ABSTAIN:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. CONSIDER AND APPROVE AN AGREEMENT WITH RACE TELECOMMUNICATION INC. TO PROVIDE BROADBAND SERVICES THROUGH THE SOUTHBAY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SBCCOG) FIBER NETWORK PROJECT.

City Manager Jeng reported that in August 2019 the City Council committed to joining the Southbay Council of Governments (SBCCOG) Fiber Network and authorized her to submit a letter of commitment. The Southbay Fiber Network is a set of fiber lines built in the Southbay to serve agencies like the City of Rolling Hills. The SBCCOG had selected American Dark Fiber as its vendor. The system is built by a team led by American Dark Fiber (ADF). The ADF team includes HP Communications to manage new construction and Race Telecommunication Inc. to provide customer service. The item was brought before the Council to request that the City agree to approve an agreement with Race Telecommunications Inc. to provide broadband services to the City through the SBCCOG Fiber Network Project. The cost for 1 gigabit (Gb) of service is \$1,000.00 per month for a term of three years.

Mayor Pieper opened the item for public comment. Hearing none he returned to the discussion.

Councilmember Mirsch moved that the City Council approve an agreement with Race Telecommunications Inc. to provide broadband services for a minimum period of three years. Mayor Pro Tem Dieringer seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote as follows:

AYES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Mayor, Pieper, Dieringer, Mirsch, Black, and Wilson.
NOES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.
ABSENT:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.
ABSTAIN:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None.

8. NEW BUSINESS

NONE.

9. MATTERS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL AND MEETING ATTENDANCE REPORTS

A. CONSIDER PLACING CENTERLINE STRIPING ON LOWER BLACKWATER CANYON ROAD BETWEEN PORTUGUESE BEND ROAD AND WILLIAMSBURG LANE.

City Manager Jeng conveyed her understanding from the last meeting was that there were some concerns that the contractor did not fulfill their obligations of the striping project. She proceeded to explain how public projects are conducted. The City puts out a scope of work and then an inspector is hired to make sure the contractor performs that scope of work. Staff does not present the project to the Council for acceptance until the contractor produces everything listed under the scope of work. The centerline striping along Lower Blackwater Canyon, between Portuguese Bend Road and Williamsburg Lane, was not part of this project's scope of work and therefore the contractor did not place the centerline. This work was based on an assessment by the Traffic Engineer.

Councilmember Black inquired if the entire Council was aware of that omission because he was not. It was his belief that there should be a centerline down the whole street, not just on Williamsburg Lane. He recalled Councilmember Wilson raising the same concerns.

City Manager Jeng replied that all bidders had responded to the same scope of work. She confirmed that the scope of work in the bid did not call for a centerline. She added that bids are based on a list of quantities that are included and listed in the plans that were advertised. She further explained that Councilmember Wilson had asked about striping on Crest Road East and whether it was different striping; his concern was not about a lack of striping.

Councilmember Wilson commented that he had noticed that the recent striping was different and recalled having more double yellow lines on the street prior to this striping. He asked who was the Traffic Engineer that monitored the project.

City Manager Jeng replied that Charles Abbot & Associates was used as the Traffic Engineer.

Mayor Pieper pointed out that there were two topics being discussed. Crest Road West, which has not been worked on, and has a centerline and double yellow lines the entire way. It was his opinion that unless the current striping on Crest Road West is legally needed, it is a negative to him compared to the dotted yellow lines and a sub divider on Crest Road East. To him, the dotted yellow lines felt more country and conveyed a small city feel. He preferred the new striping on Crest Road East, so long as it is legal.

Councilmember Black disagreed and felt that no one should be allowed to pass on Crest Road. There are too many curves, the speed limit is too low and there are blind driveways. Double yellow lines signify no passing on the road and broken lines signify that passing is allowed. Councilmember Wilson concurred.

Councilmember Mirsch commented that maybe the previous striping had been done as an extra precaution, even though it may not have been legally required. She agreed that there should be a double yellow line on Crest Road East. Since the striping responsibility now falls under the responsibilities of the RHCA, she suggested requesting their thoughts on the matter.

Mayor Pieper stated that he had spoken to residents on Middleridge. He asked them if they wanted striping and they all replied no because it did not feel right. It was his understanding that the City put out a scope of work, the contractor delivered, and that the matter was done. If the Council wanted to change the scope of work, then a discussion needs to occur like the one the Council is having now. He added that he would be talking to the RHCA President the following day and that he would be happy to bring up the subject matter. However, he stressed that whatever decision the Council makes, it should be consistent for all the striping within the City.

Councilmember Mirsch asked if Crest Road East and Lower Blackwater could be considered as separate items.

City Attorney Jenkins suggested that the Council make a motion to clarify what they would like to do. The Council has not approved the lease amendment with RHCA, so technically the City is still responsible for striping.

Mayor Pieper suggested that once the Association takes over the striping, the City should provide the specifications of what they would like to see.

Mayor Pro Tem Dieringer asked counsel if the Council is permitted to discuss other streets besides Lower Blackwater Canyon, given the agenda item description.

City Attorney Jenkins replied that the Council can only discuss the streets that are listed on the agenda.

Councilmember Black requested to agendize Crest Road for the next City Council meeting and proposed to have double yellow lines placed on Crest Road East and West.

Mayor Pieper asked City Manager Jeng to reach out to the engineer and request pictures of the road before it was striped.

City Manager Jeng replied that she did not have pictures of previous conditions but she did have an inventory done by the Traffic Engineer that can be reviewed.

Mayor Pieper indicated that the agreement with the Association would be moved to a later time. Between now and the next meeting the Council will agendize striping for Crest Road East, Lower Blackwater, Williamsburg, Middleridge South and North and figure out what striping was there before and what striping is there now.

Mayor Pro Tem Dieringer asked if Republic Services still offers a free, once a year, greenwaste dumpster for residents. Additionally, she asked for clarification about what direction staff was given regarding the ADA improvements at City Hall.

City Manager Jeng replied that residents are offered a 40-yard, roll-off bin once a year, free of charge.

Mayor Pieper replied that the Council had chosen the cheapest and the most expensive layout and directed the City Manager to get pricing for both in order to determine how to best proceed and whether it is worth moving the restrooms.

Councilmember Mirsch inquired about the School Resource Officers (SRO) and whether they were armed. She recalled that when the Council agreed to fund the SRO, it was with an understanding that they would be armed. It was her understanding that the City is currently reviewing the SRO's next contract and wanted to know if the Regional Law members on the Council were made aware of the issue and had verified that the SRO's are armed.

City Manager Jeng reported that the School District recognized that in the beginning of the school year, they had issues with the security company securing permits from the State to be able to allow the SRO's to carry firearms. That issue has since been resolved. She added that the SRO's have changed their duties since the school's closures due to COVID. The School District has decided not to bill participating cities for half of March, April and May. Going forward the Superintendent is asking for a 3-year term, with the same cost and terms as the existing MOU. The new MOU is currently being discussed.

10. MATTERS FROM STAFF

NONE.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business before the City Council, Mayor Pieper adjourned the meeting at 8:09 p.m. to a regular meeting of the City Council scheduled for Monday, July 13, 2020 beginning at 7:00p.m. via teleconference.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Jeng, P.E.
Acting City Clerk

Approved,

Jeff Pieper
Mayor