

CITY OF PERRIS

MINUTES: City Council, Redevelopment Agency,
Perris Public Finance Authority &
Perris Public Utilities Authority
Date of Meeting: 24 February 2004
Time of Meeting: 6:00 p.m.
Place of Meeting: City Council Chambers

1. **CALL TO ORDER:**

The Honorable Mayor Busch called the Joint City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Perris Public Finance Authority and Perris Public Utilities Authority Meeting to order.

6:05 p.m. Called to Order

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Council Members Present: Rogers, Yarbrough, Landers, Motte and Busch

All Councilmembers present.

Staff Members Present: City Manager Apodaca, City Attorney Dunn, Community Development Director Gutierrez, City Engineer Motlagh, Public Services Director Owens, Police Chief Kestell and City Clerk Rey.

Staff Members Present.

3. **INVOCATION:**

Councilmember Yarbrough led the invocation.

Councilmember Yarbrough led the invocation.

4. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Councilmember Rogers led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Councilmember Rogers led the Pledge.

5. **PRESENTATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: None**

No Presentations

6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

- A. Approval of the minutes of the Joint Meeting of the City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Perris Public Finance Authority and the Perris Public Utilities Authority held February 10, 2004.

*Approval of the minutes of the Joint Meeting of the City Council, RDA, PPFA and the PPUA held February 10, 2004.
Approved: 5-0*

M/S/C: (Motte/Landers) to approve the minutes of the Joint Meeting of the City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Perris Public Finance Authority and the Perris Public Utilities Authority held February 10, 2004.

AYES: Motte, Rogers, Yarbrough, Landers, Busch

NOES:

7. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

No Public Comment

- A. To approve initiation of annual proceedings for City's Maintenance Districts (FY 2004/2005) and to adopt proposed Resolution Numbers 3190, 3191 and 3192.

Approval of initiation of annual proceedings for City's Maintenance Districts (FY 2004/2005) and adoption of Resolution Numbers 3190, 3191 and 3192.

Approved: 5-0

The proposed Resolution Number 3190 regarding ordering preparation of the Engineer's Report, Maintenance District No. 84-1 (Streetlights and Traffic Signals) is entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, INITIATING PROCEEDINGS TO LEVY AND COLLECT ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004/2005 IN THE CITY OF PERRIS FLOOD CONTROL MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NUMBER 1 PURSUANT TO THE BENEFIT ASSESSMENT ACT OF 1982; APPOINTING THE ENGINEER OF WORK, AND ORDERING PREPARATION OF AN ENGINEER'S REPORT.

Adoption of Resolution Number 3190 ordering preparation of the Engineer's Report, Maintenance District No. 84-1 (Streetlights and Traffic Signals)

The proposed Resolution Number 3191 ordering preparation of the Engineer's Report, Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 is entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, INITIATING PROCEEDINGS TO LEVY AND COLLECT ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004/2005 IN THE CITY OF PERRIS LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NUMBER 1 PURSUANT TO THE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972; APPOINTING THE ENGINEER OF WORK, AND ORDERING PREPARATION OF AN ENGINEER'S REPORT.

Adoption of Resolution Number 3191 ordering preparation of the Engineer's Report, Landscape Maintenance District No. 1

The proposed Resolution Number 3192 ordering preparation of the Engineer's Report, Flood Control Maintenance District No. 1 is entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, INITIATING PROCEEDINGS TO LEVY AND COLLECT ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004/2005 IN THE CITY OF PERRIS MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NUMBER 84-1 PURSUANT TO THE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972; APPOINTING THE ENGINEER OF WORK, AND ORDERING PREPARATION OF AN ENGINEER'S REPORT.

Adoption of Resolution Number 3192 ordering preparation of the Engineer's Report, Flood Control Maintenance District No. 1

- B. To review and approve amended and restated Joint Powers Agreement of the Public Entity Risk Management (PERMA) and to adopt proposed Resolution Numbers 3193 and 3194 entitled:

Approval of Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement of the Public Entity Risk Management PERMA and adoption of Resolutions 3193 and 3194

Approved: 5-0

The proposed Resolution Number 3193 is entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TO AUTHORIZE THE AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 19(c) OF THE AMENDED AND RESTATED JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT ("JPA") OF THE PUBLIC ENTITY RISK MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY ("PERMA") TO INCREASE THE NOTICE

Adoption of Resolution Number 3193 to authorize the amendment of Article 19(c) of the Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) of the Public

REQUIRED FOR A MEMBER'S WITHDRAWAL FROM A COVERAGE PROGRAM FROM NINETY (90) DAYS TO SIX MONTHS AND VESTING WITH THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THE AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AN EARLY-WITHDRAWAL CHARGE TO A MEMBER THAT DOES NOT PROVIDE THE REQUIRED SIX (6) MONTH NOTICE.

Entity Risk Management Authority (PERMA)

The proposed Resolution Number 3194 is entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TO AUTHORIZE THE AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES 8(D), 10, 11 AND 22 OF THE AMENDED AND RESTATED JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT ("JPA") OF THE PUBLIC ENTITY RISK MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY ("PERMA") TO CONFORM THE JPA TO THE BYLAWS AND CURRENT PRACTICE.

Adoption of Resolution Number 3194 to authorize the amendment of Articles 8(d), 10, 11 and 22 of the Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement of the Public Entity Risk Management Authority (PERMA)

C. To receive and file the Fiscal Year 03 State Homeland Security Grant.

Receive and file the Fiscal Year 03 State Homeland Security Grant.

D. To approve the Economic Development Marketing Plan Agreements for the City of Perris pursuant to the marketing plan concept approved at the City Council meeting of February 10, 2004 and authorize the City Manager to execute the contracts.

Approval of the Economic Development Marketing Plan Agreements and authorization for the City Manager to execute the contracts.

M/S/C: (Yarbrough/Landers) to approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

Approval of the Consent Calendar as presented. Approved: 5-0

AYES: Rogers, Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Busch
NOES:

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Consideration and discussion to introduce proposed Ordinance Amendment 03-0442 to amend Section 19.61 of the Municipal Code pertaining to the term of Conditional Use Permits.

Introduction of Ordinance Number 1126 amending Section 19.61 of the Municipal Code pertaining to the term of Conditional Use Permits. Approved: 5-0

The proposed Ordinance Number 1126 is entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AMENDING CHAPTER 19.61 PERTAINING TO THE TERM OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS.

Introduction of Ordinance Number 1126

Introduced by: Olivia Gutierrez, Community Development Director

Director Gutierrez explained that this was an Ordinance Amendment initiated by the City Council, approved by the Planning Commission and that it was now being brought back to the Council for final action. Major provisions of the proposed Ordinance Amendment would include: Each Conditional Use Permit lawfully obtained would remain in effect of the life of the business, subject to any conditions of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or City Council; the Community Development Department would monitor compliance with required Conditions of Approval and conduct an Administrative Compliance Review every five years after approval; the Planning

Director Gutierrez explained the major provisions of the proposed Ordinance Amendment.

Commission or City Council could initiate an Administrative Compliance Review at any time, through the Community Development Department; and the City retains ability to revoke Conditional Use Permits through the revocation process when deemed appropriate. Staff recommended that the proposed Ordinance Amendment be approved as recommended by the City's Planning Commission.

ADDITIONAL STAFF INPUT:

City Attorney Dunn commented that there was a technical correction on the number of the Ordinance. The number on the Agenda Item does not follow the sequential numbering of the City's Ordinances and the actual number would need to be clarified.

City Attorney Dunn explained that there was a technical correction on the number of the Ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

No Public Comment

COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Mayor Busch asked if this Ordinance would put the City in conformity with other Cities in the area.

Mayor Busch asked if this would put us in conformity with other Cities.

Director Gutierrez responded that this would put the City in line with what other Cities do.

Director Gutierrez responded yes.

Councilmember Motte asked when the ability to revoke Conditional Use Permits could be used and stated that he understood that the City would retain the ability to revoke through the revocation process.

Councilmember Motte asked when the ability to revoke Conditional Use Permits could be used.

Director Gutierrez stated that an example in the City of Perris was the Worm Farm. They were out of compliance with the conditions of approval and it became such a public nuisance that the Council examined them for a potential revocation. They later came into full compliance and phased out the Use.

Director Gutierrez gave an example of a business that was out of compliance and examined for a potential revocation.

Councilmember Rogers thought that this was a timely issue in light of the City's Marketing Plan to stimulate its economic development. This Ordinance should line up so that the City could attract businesses.

Councilmember Rogers thought that this was a timely issue in light of the City's marketing plan.

Councilmember Yarbrough thought that it was important that the City was consistent with other Cities in the area and that this would send the message that the City of Perris was business friendly. He asked if the Conditional Use Permits were transferable or site specific.

Councilmember Yarbrough thought that it was important to be consistent with other Cities and asked if the Conditional Use Permits were transferable or site specific.

Director Gutierrez explained that entitlement went with the land and would not transfer from one site to another but if a new owner took over the land he may take over the Conditional Use Permit as well.

Director Gutierrez responded that it was site specific.

Councilmember Yarbrough asked if Section 5 gave the Community Development Director the authority to maintain the integrity of the Conditional Use Permit with minor modifications and would like to

Councilmember Yarbrough would like to strike the language regarding the Planning

strike the language from the Ordinance regarding the Planning Commission's ability to initiate an administrative compliance review.

Commission's ability to initiate an administrative compliance review from the Ordinance.

Councilmember Landers agreed with Councilmember Yarbrough.

Councilmember Landers agreed with Councilmember Yarbrough.

Mayor Busch asked if striking that from the Ordinance would also remove Item B of the revocation process because that was almost the same thing.

Mayor Busch asked if that would also remove Item B of the revocation process.

Councilmember Yarbrough would also like to change the language under Item B in the revocation process to be consistent with the other change.

Councilmember Yarbrough would also like to change the language under Item B.

Mayor Busch asked City Attorney Dunn if the Planning Commissions in other communities were given the authority to do these things.

Mayor Busch asked if other Planning Commissions had the authority to do these things.

City Attorney Dunn responded that Items A and B under Section 4 came from the Ordinances used in other Cities. The way these were written, the Planning Commission could direct Staff to set a Public Hearing for a revocation. The fact that a revocation was so rare could be used as an argument against this item. The highlighted areas in Section 5 were added by the Planning Commission to build in flexibility, but the Council could delete both this item as well.

City Attorney Dunn responded that Items A and B under Section 4 came from the Ordinances used in other Cities; however revocation was so rare, it could be used as an argument against the item.

Mayor Busch commented that he saw the two items as being interconnected and would like to strike both actions.

Mayor Busch saw both items as being interconnected.

Councilmember Motte asked if the new rules would apply to anyone who already had a Conditional Use Permit.

Councilmember Motte asked if the new rules would apply to Conditional Use Permits already in use.

Director Gutierrez responded that it would apply.

Director Gutierrez responded yes.

Councilmember Rogers commented that they could be grand-fathered in.

Councilmember Rogers commented that they could be grand-fathered in.

Mayor Busch asked if there would be a significant savings of time for Staff by not doing annual reviews and if the owners of the Conditional Use Permits had been paying an administrative fee every year.

Mayor Busch asked about savings of time for Staff and administrative fees.

Director Gutierrez responded that there would be a significant amount of time saved and that extensions of the Conditional Use Permits were about \$250 per year.

Director Gutierrez responded that there would be a significant amount of time saved and that extension on the Permits were about \$250 per year.

Councilmember Landers would like to see this item brought back to the Council after the changes were made.

Councilmember Landers would like to see this item brought back after the changes are made.

Director Gutierrez explained that it could be brought back with the changes at the Second Reading of the Ordinance.

Director Gutierrez explained that the changes could be made before the second reading of the Ordinance.

M/S/C: (Rogers/Yarbrough) to adopt the Ordinance as read by City Attorney Dunn with the changes on page 2 of 5 to paragraph B and on page 3 of 5 to eliminate the Planning Commission authority.

To adopt the Ordinance with changes to paragraph B on page 2 and eliminating the Planning Commission authority on page 3. Approved: 5-0

AYES: Rogers, Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Busch
NOES:

9. BUSINESS ITEMS: (not requiring a “Public Hearing”):

- A. Consideration and discussion regarding the Community Outreach for Clean Up Day April 17, 2004.

Receive and file information.

Introduced by: Olivia Gutierrez, Community Development Director

Director Gutierrez introduced Tony Romero, the City’s Neighborhood Preservation Manager, to give the presentation.

Director Gutierrez introduced Tony Romero, the City’s Neighborhood Preservation Manager.

Mr. Romero announced that the Neighborhood Preservation Division was preparing for the annual Community Clean-Up Day. This would be a five-hour event to be held on April 17, 2004. Volunteers were needed to help with the clean-up projects and the number of volunteers would dictate the number of projects that would be done. The volunteers would receive a free event T-shirt and lunch at the Perris Valley Regional Chili Cook-Off at the American Legion. The Event objectives are to bring the City and citizens together to help improve the appearance of the City by removal of litter and debris; to increase public awareness for keeping Perris litter free; to promote the Divisions Clean-Up Trailer that can be used for clean-up throughout the year; to offer a day of free litter disposal for residents at CR&R’s facility on the day of the event; and the promote the free towing and disposal of inoperative or wrecked vehicles which is offered year round.

Mr. Romero announced the event schedule and explained the Event objectives.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

No public comment.

COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Councilmember Landers commented that this event used to be called Community Pride Week and the City Attorney as well as the City Engineer used to participate.

Councilmember Landers said that this event used to be called Community Pride Week and the City Attorney as well as the City Engineer used to participate.

Councilmember Yarbrough asked about the budget for the Community Clean-Up Trailer and thought that giving presentations to organizations regarding the Trailer and its use would be effective.

Councilmember Yarbrough asked about the budget for the trailer.

Director Gutierrez responded that the trailer was obtained with funds from beverage recycling grants that the City had received and did not affect the General Fund budget.

Director Gutierrez responded that the trailer was obtained with funds from beverage recycling grants that the City had received.

Councilmember Rogers commented that this was a project that was very special to the late Dr. Marvin Brown and that she was sure the Church would participate.

Councilmember Rogers commented that this project was very special to the late Dr. Marvin Brown.

Mayor Busch stated that he would like to promote the free towing and disposal of inoperative or wrecked vehicles by announcing it on Channel 3 and would also like to ask the community if there were sites they would like to recommend for clean-up.

Mayor Busch would like to announce the free towing and disposal of inoperative vehicles on Channel 3.

No Action was required on this matter.

No Action was required on this matter.

B. Consideration and discussion regarding the General Plan Community Outreach April 3, 2004.

Receive and file information.

Introduced by: Olivia Gutierrez, Community Development Director

Director Gutierrez stated that the General Plan Update was winding up in terms of the studies and analysis for the six general plan elements. A General Plan Community Outreach had been scheduled for April 3, 2004 to present the information to the community and to obtain their input. Prior to sending out notices, staff would like Council input and comment.

Director Gutierrez announced that a General Plan Community Outreach had been scheduled for April 3, 2004.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

No public comment.

COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Councilmember Motte commented that it was hard to get people to come to these and asked how the City is advertising this event.

Councilmember Motte asked about advertising for the event.

Director Gutierrez responded that it would be in the newspapers and that MWD and the City's Water Company would be sending out fliers and that fliers would also be sent to the Elementary Schools.

Director Gutierrez explained the advertising planned.

Councilmember Yarbrough was glad to see the Community Outreach brought back and to have the opportunity to share the General Plan with the community. He suggested using a mail out to residents and to all the schools.

Councilmember Yarbrough suggested using a mail-out to residents and to all the schools.

Mayor Busch asked if this was the only Outreach scheduled and if it would be announced on Channel 3. He suggested doing an advertisement that would attract attention.

Mayor Busch suggested announcing the Outreach on Channel 3.

Councilmember Yarbrough thought that the Community Outreach was being put back into effect on a schedule and not just a one-time thing.

Councilmember Yarbrough thought the Community Outreach was being put back into effect.

City Manager Apodaca explained that the first version of the Community Outreach would be the General Plan Update and then subsequent Community Outreach programs would be implemented depending on the specific purpose.

City Manager Apodaca explained that subsequent programs would be implemented depending on the specific purpose.

C. Consideration and discussion regarding Clayton Road Update.

Introduced by: Habib Motlagh, City Engineer

City Engineer Motlagh explained that this item had been before the Council several times and that this was a road that was partially in the City and partially in the County of Riverside. The City had asked the County to consider helping fund this project. He introduced Mr. Rick Hoffman, who worked for Supervisor Marion Ashley to explain the County's position.

City Engineer Motlagh explained that the City had asked the County to help fund this project and introduced Mr. Rick Hoffman to explain the County's position.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the County had pursued different avenues for funding this project including RCTC and the County Transportation Department. This road was not in the County maintained road system but they were willing to work with the City and would continue to look for funds.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the County would work with the City and continue to look for funds.

Wally Rice, Legislative Assistant to Marion Ashley, stated that the County would want to look at right-of-way easements before starting this project.

Wally Rice, Legislative Assistant to Marion Ashley, commented on right-of-way easements.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

No public comment.

COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Councilmember Yarbrough stated that this project was at the top of Measure A in 1988 and that Clayton Road was a by-pass for Highway 74. He asked City Engineer Motlagh what the City had in its budget to get started and if the City could just pave its side. He thought that this project was a priority and should not be put on the back burner any longer.

Councilmember Yarbrough stated that Clayton Road was a by-pass for Highway 74 and asked about the City's budget for the project.

City Engineer Motlagh responded that the City had in excess of \$300,000 for three projects; Clayton Road, Mapes Road and San Jacinto. He believed that Clayton Road, at this point, would require at least \$200,000 from each agency just to cover minimum standards. He also stated that it would take a minimum of twenty-four feet of pavement to meet the fire department standards and that the City would not be able to make it by just paving its side. There may also have been prescriptive rights since the road had been used by the general public and there may be some utilities there that would help with the right-of-way issue.

City Engineer Motlagh responded that the City had in excess of \$300,000 for three projects and that he believed it would require \$200,000 from each agency for Clayton Road. The City would not be able to meet fire department standards by just paving its side.

Councilmember Landers stated that a pioneer family lives on Clayton Road and that this road was used when there was a problem on Highway 74.

Councilmember Landers stated that this road was used when there was a problem on Highway 74.

Councilmember Rogers asked if there was any discretionary funding from another project that might be used and stated that this road was the only method of transportation between Elsinore and Perris if there was an accident on Highway 74.

Councilmember Rogers stated that this is the only method of transportation between Elsinore and Perris.

Legislative Assistant, Wally Rice responded that the County would continue to try and identify funds and would investigate the right-of-way issues.

Legislative Assistant, Wally Rice responded that the County would continue to try and identify funds.

Mayor Busch asked if the County could do the all the right-of-way issues for Clayton Road and stated that what disappointed him was that the County stated that the City could not do the project unless it met County standards. He felt that this was unfair to the citizens who live on the road.

Mayor Busch stated that what disappointed him was that the County stated that the City could not do the project unless it met County standards.

Mr. Hoffman explained that in order to bring the road to County standards, the cost of the project would be increased for everyone. He stated that it was not part of the County's maintained road system and therefore the County had no liability for the road. However once the County worked on the road, to whatever standard, the County would accept liability and responsibility for the road. If the County accepted less than the stated standard, they assume more responsibility and risk because it had been done to a lesser standard than stated in the Road System.

Mr. Hoffman explained that once the County worked on the road, it would accept liability and responsibility for the road.

Councilmember Motte asked if there were any developments out there and if the property owners could form an Assessment District to pay for the road.

Councilmember Motte asked about forming an Assessment District.

City Engineer Motlagh responded that as far as an assessment, the property owners on the City's side would probably not be able to afford it. The County's side had bigger properties and that may have been a different issue. There are no developments scheduled for that area.

City Engineer Motlagh responded that the property owner's on the City's side would probably not be able to afford an assessment and that no new developments were scheduled for that area.

Mayor Busch asked if the County could dedicate their portion of the road to the City.

Mayor Busch asked if the County could dedicate their portion to the City.

City Engineer Motlagh responded that he was sure the County would be happy to give the City their right-of-way so that they would not have any responsibility for maintenance and in that case the City could build to its own standards.

City Engineer Motlagh responded that in this case the City could build to its own standards.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the Transportation Director had offered to do that through any instrument appropriate.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the Transportation Director would do that.

Mayor Busch stated that he could see that the City may have right-of-way issues as well and asked Mr. Hoffman if the County would continue to try to come up with ideas to put this project together.

Mayor Busch asked for the County to continue to work on ideas for the project.

Mr. Hoffman stated that his understanding was that the City owned most of the right-of-way on its side and assured the Council that the County is open to suggestions on this project.

Mr. Hoffman assured that Council that the County was always open to suggestions.

No Action was required on this matter.

No Action was required on this matter.

- D. Consideration and discussion regarding the update of the 800 after hours City of Perris Number.

Introduced by: Habib Motlagh, City Engineer

City Manager Apodaca asked that this item be tabled until a future date.

City Manager Apodaca asked that this item be tabled to a future date.

- E. Consideration and discussion to enter into an agreement with “Signs of Support” to place commercial ads, in support of local youth, on the tailgates of City owned trucks.

Approval of an agreement with “Signs of Support” to place commercial ads, in support of local youth, on the tailgates of City owned trucks.

Approved: 3-2

Noes: Rogers, Landers

Introduced by: Michael McDermott, Real Property Analyst

Mr. McDermott introduced Mr. Tom Missett to give the presentation on the program.

Mr. McDermott introduced Mr. Tom Missett to give the presentation.

Mr. Missett explained that this program was approved by the Council in September 2003 but that there had been a misunderstanding concerning fees. Signs of Support was a marketing business that works with cities to increase program funding by advertising local businesses on the tailgates of City owned trucks. The ad would contain the City seal, the slogan “We support Perris youth’ along with the advertisers names and/or logo. All proposed signs must state the support of local youth and required City approval prior to being placed on a vehicle. The City would receive 50% of all fees charged by Signs of Support.

Mr. Missett explained the program and the misunderstanding concerning the fees.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

No public comment.

COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Councilmember Rogers asked how the current posted fee schedule applies to the City of Perris and if the agreement was a Memorandum of Understanding. She also inquired about the City’s half of the money being considered a contribution from Signs of Support.

Councilmember Rogers asked about the current posted fee schedule and if the agreement was a M.O.U.

Mr. Missett explained that there would be a negotiated price of \$175 per sign for twelve signs. The rate on the fee schedule was the suggested rate for the full display sign but most clients paid between \$100 and \$200 per month. He stated that Signs of Support would have a licensing agreement with the City and explained that the contribution was not considered a charitable contribution.

Mr. Missett explained that those were suggested rates but that most clients pay between \$100 and \$200.

Councilmember Rogers thought that in light of the fact that the City was implementing its own Marketing Program, it should be able to do this on its own and keep 100% of the money for the youth.

Councilmember Rogers thought the City should be able to do this and keep 100% for the youth.

Mr. Missett explained that the problem is a first amendment consideration that the City could not regulate what would go on the trucks. The third party would eliminate this consideration.

Mr. Missett explained that the City could not regulate what would go on the trucks.

Councilmember Rogers explained that the City had a 501(c)3, non-profit organization, for recreation programs for the youth. She stated that The Board of Directors had the same discretion regarding advertising and asked Attorney Dunn if this organization could be used to market in our own community and receive 100% of the profit for the youth of the City.

Councilmember Rogers asked if the City's non-profit organization could be used to advertise and received 100% of the profits for the youth.

City Attorney Dunn responded that it would depend on how it was set up.

City Attorney Dunn responded that it would depend on how it was set up.

Mr. Missett explained that Signs of Support would maintain the project and send the City a check each month eliminating the City's monitoring of the project.

Mr. Missett explained that Signs of Support would maintain the project.

Councilmember Landers commented that he was not interested in the project.

Councilmember Landers was not interested in the project.

Councilmember Motte was in favor of the program and commented that it would pay for a lot of youth to play baseball or soccer.

Councilmember Motte was in favor of the program.

Councilmember Yarbrough asked if the City had a legally binding contract with Signs of Support.

Councilmember Yarbrough asked if the City had a contract.

Mr. Missett responded that a contract was drawn up but was returned because of an error.

Mr. Missett responded that it had been returned because of an error.

Councilmember Motte asked if the City could start the program on a trial basis.

Councilmember Motte asked about a trial basis.

Mr. Missett explained that the City would have a thirty day at-will cancellation clause in the contract.

Mr. Missett explained that there would be a cancellation clause in the contract.

Mayor Busch understood that most advertisers were not paying \$300 and felt that half of something was worth more than half of nothing. He felt that the thirty-day clause would give the City a chance to try the program out to see if this would be something it would want to continue. He would support giving it a try.

Mayor Busch would support giving the program a try.

M/S/C (Motte/Busch) to give the program a trial run and put the money into a non-profit organization.

To approve the program on a trial basis and put the money into a non-profit organization.

AYES: Yarbrough, Motte, Busch
NOES: Rogers, Landers

Approved: 3-2

10. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

Yolanda Williams, 2003 Parade Committee President, expressed the gratitude of the parade committee for the City of Perris' \$6000

Yolanda Williams, 2003 Parade Committee President, expressed the gratitude of the parade

financial contribution. Thanks to Shelly Yarbrough's very successful fundraising, several major local businesses joined the City and the Rotary Club of Perris in sponsoring the 2003 parade. As a result, the parade posted a surplus of \$5,840.84. The parade committee wished to return \$4000 of that surplus to the City and would use the remainder as seed money for the 2004 parade.

committee for the \$6000 financial contribution from the City of Perris.

Shelley Yarbrough, incoming president, stated that the committee would probably come back to the Council for another contribution and announced that the committee met the first Tuesday of every month, year round.

Shelly Yarbrough announced that the parade committee meets the first Tuesday of every month, year round.

Dave Stuart, Operations Manager for the Chamber of Commerce, announced Chamber events.

Dave Stuart announced Chamber of Commerce events.

Terry Slavin, a citizen of Perris, voiced his concern regarding liberal marriage laws.

Terry Slavin voiced his concern regarding liberal marriage laws.

City Attorney Dunn responded that this was not in the City's jurisdiction.

City Attorney Dunn responded that this was not in the City's jurisdiction.

11. CITY COMMUNICATIONS: (Committee Reports, Agenda Items, Meeting Requests and Review, etc.

Councilmember Yarbrough announced that the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency had settled a multi-million dollar litigation with Lockheed completing the K-Rat issue in what is required as far as property. He also requested an Agenda Item for an alternate position consideration with WRCOG in respect to the multi-species representation.

Councilmember Yarbrough announced that the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency had settled a multi-million dollar litigation and requested an Agenda Item regarding a reappointment with WRCOG.

Councilmember Rogers announced that the Afro-American History Parade would be on Saturday, February 28, 2004 and that she, along with law enforcement and religious leaders had represented the City at the Faith and Justice Summit.

Councilmember Rogers announced the Afro-American History Parade and commented on the representation for the City at the Faith and Justice Summit.

Mayor Busch announced that Cal-Trans had hosted a ground-breaking ceremony for the 60/91/215 Interchange at the Mission Inn in Riverside and that the League of Cities would have their division meeting at the Palm Springs Air Museum. He had attended a meeting hosted by RCTC at which former California Transportation Commission Chairman, Bob Wolfe had given a presentation regarding the Perris Valley Line.

Mayor Busch made announcements regarding the ground-breaking ceremony for the 60/91/215 Interchange, the division meeting of the League of Cities and a presentation regarding the Perris Valley Line.

12. CITY MANAGERS REPORT:

City Manager Apodaca stated that Council had approved to receive and file a \$33000 grant to supply equipment and other materials for the City's EOC Center and introduced Robert Turner, Coordinator for the Center, to give a presentation on the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan.

City Manager Apodaca introduced Mr. Robert Turner to present the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan.

Mr. Turner explained that the update for the Plan had been completed to bring it current as far as the location of the EOC and the Police Department. The first round of Standardized Emergency Management Systems (SEMS) Training had been completed for the Department Heads. A second round was scheduled in March for Relief Personnel. He would like to get SEMS training set up as a workshop for the Council. All the equipment at the EOC Center had been tested and was functional and the squad truck from the fire department should be ready soon for use as a mobile EOC. The Homeland Security Grant would be used to outfit the EOC Trailer and that would be parked in the Sheriff's Department parking lot. Weekly articles were published in the Perris Progress regarding disaster preparedness.

City Manager Apodaca announced that there would be a City-Wide Parcel Tax Proposal Workshop at the Council meeting of March 9, 2004 and two workshop sessions at the second meeting in March; one session on the CTAP Corridor and at the second, the Police Department would present its annual report. He also announced that Walmart had volunteered supplies for the Clean-Up Day program and 'D' Street construction would start on March 15, 2004.

Chief Kestell announced that the grand opening of the store-front Police Station at 3553 Perris Boulevard would be at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 26, 2004.

13. CLOSED SESSION: None

No Closed Session

14. ADJOURNMENT:

By unanimous consent the Joint City Council, Redevelopment Agency, PPFA and PPUA Meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

8:25 p.m. Joint City Council, RDA, PPFA & PPUA Adjourned

Respectfully Submitted,

Margaret Rey, City Clerk

