

CITY OF PERRIS

MINUTES: City Council, Redevelopment Agency,
PPFA & PPUA
Date of Meeting: 11 March 2003
Time of Meeting: 6:00 p.m.
Place of Meeting: City Council Chamber – City of Perris

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.

6:00 p.m. Meeting Called to Order

2. ROLL CALL:

Council Member Present: Landers, Motte, Rogers, Yarbrough, Busch

Staff Member Present: City Manager Vasquez, Interim City Manager Apodaca, City Attorney Dunn, Finance Director Rogers- Elmore, Community Development Director Gutierrez, Public Services Director Owens, Police Chief Kestell, and City Clerk Rey.

All Present

3. INVOCATION:

Pastor Ruben Bajo Performed Invocation

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Councilmember Landers Led the Pledge

5. PRESENTATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. Approval of meeting minutes for City Council Work Session and Regular City Council meeting of February 11, 2003; Redevelopment Agency meeting minutes of February 11, 2003; and Special City Council meeting of February 13, 2003.

*Meeting Minutes of City Council Work Session & Regular City Council of 02/11/03; RDA Meeting of 02/11/03; & Special City Council of 02/13/03
Approved: 5-0*

B. Approval of meeting minutes for the Special City Council meeting of February 15, 2003.

*Meeting Minutes of Special City Council of 02/15/03
Approved: 4-0
Abstained: Rogers*

M/S/C (MOTTE/LANDERS) To approve the meeting minutes for City Council Work Session and Regular City Council meeting of February 11, 2003; Redevelopment Agency meeting minutes of February 11, 2003; and Special City Council meeting of February 13, 2003.

AYES: Landers, Motte, Rogers, Yarbrough, Busch
NOES: None

*Meeting Minutes of City Council Work Session & Regular City Council of 02/11/03; RDA Meeting of 02/11/03; Special City Council of 02/13/03
Approved: 5-0*

M/S/C (MOTTE/LANDERS) To approve the meeting minutes for Special City Council meeting of February 15, 2003.

AYES: Landers, Motte, Yarbrough, Busch
NOES: None
ABSTAINED: Rogers

*Meeting Minutes for Special City Council of 02/15/03
Approved: 4-0
Abstained: Rogers*

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Busch requested Public Services Director Owens to give a brief presentation on Item A of the Consent Calendar.

Mayor Busch requested Public Services Director Owens to Introduce Item A

A. Authorization to purchase Anaheim Angel tickets for “City of Perris Special Recognition Day” at Edison Field (AKA Angel Stadium).

*City of Perris Special Recognition Day
Approved: 5-0*

Recreation Manager Carter III said the City of Perris Public Services Department contacted the 2002 World Champion Anaheim Angels Marketing/Promotion Department regarding the coordination of a program for the Special Recognition Day for agencies. Staff also met with Parks/Recreation Commission and Mr. Booth for coordination. The minimum requirement was to purchase 1,500 tickets at a 50% reduced rate. The expenditures would be covered through ticket resale. There would be the opportunity and privilege of a Perris student, Hidy Riago, to sing the National Anthem; also, a 45 second video presentation highlighting the focus points of the City of Perris. Mr. Booth was present to answer questions.

Recreation Manager Carter III Presentation

Mr. Scott Booth, Anaheim Angels, said this was a great opportunity to promote the City and build morale. Other benefits were the City would be able to have a batboy; and Mr. Booth invited the Mayor and Council for the pre-game ceremony. The date was May 24, 2003.

Anaheim Angels, Mr. Booth's Presentation

Public Services Director Owens commented that there were commitments from the Perris Pony Baseball and Little League to sell tickets. The batboy selected gets to keep the uniform. Charter buses could be considered and Mr. Booth would provide bus passes.

Public Services Director Owens' Comment Re: Ticket Sales Commitment

B. Approve Settlement Agreement between the City of Perris, JAS Pacific, and Masson & Associates and authorize City Manager to execute the agreement.

*Settlement Agreement –City of Perris, JAS Pacific & Masson & Associates
Approved: 5-0*

C. Approval of Warrants.

*Approval of Warrants
Approved: 5-0*

M/S/C (YARBROUGH/ROGERS) To approve the Consent Calendar.

*Consent Calendar
Approved: 5-0*

AYES: Landers, Motte, Rogers, Yarbrough, Busch

NOES:

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Consideration and discussion to introduce proposed Ordinance Number 1113, (Case No. Development Agreement No. 03-0067) an amendment to an approved development agreement between the City of Perris and KB Home Coastal, Inc. for development of May Ranch Specific Plan.

*Ordinance Number 1113,
Ordinance Amendment 03-0067
Approved: 4-1
Noes: Motte*

To introduce proposed Ordinance Number 1113 entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO AN APPROVED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF PERRIS AND KB HOME COASTAL, INC. FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE MAY RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN LOCATED SOUTH OF RAMONA EXPRESSWAY BETWEEN THE PERRIS VALLEY STORM DRAIN AND RIDER STREET AT THE INTERSECTION OF RAMONA EXPRESSWAY, AND NORTH OF PLACENTIA AVENUE (DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT 03-0067).

Community Development Director Gutierrez indicated that essential terms were summarized and referred to acceleration of improvements. It allowed the City, Barratt American, and KB Home to complete improvements on Rider and improve the overall circulation within the two planned communities. Other items listed were:

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez 's
Presentation*

- 1) \$1,000 per unit was listed at the issuance of building permit;
- 2) one million would be submitted up front;
- 3) acceleration of park improvements to include the Linear Park (basin park) and the fifteen acre active park;
- 4) advance of monies for underground utilities;
- 5) improvements to Morgan Street and Bradley Road.

It was with the understanding that the developer was not in full concurrence with the terms as presented. The Council had the option of denying the agreement or continuing it to date specific; and conclude before March 18th. Staff recommended addressing the applicant in terms of their position regarding the terms.

Mayor Busch called for public comments.

Mr. Mounts, KB Home commented that there was a workshop with Councilmember Yarbrough, Councilmember Motte, and staff to go over the terms of the amendment. Mr. Mounts thought it was agreed that the improvements for Rider, which was accelerated, would be completed by September 1. The developer was obligated to improve the detention basin with the same park improvements and improve the Linear Park to a level that was agreed between the developer and City. In addition, KB Home had agreed to complete the circulation system (Morgan, Bradley, & Evans) and make a financial consideration. The development agreement revisions were: Number 9 was a counter proposal under financial considerations was to pay a \$500 per unit fee for the remaining development in Phases V and VI (1,000 units). Approximately \$8 million of improvements were accelerated. The community park was accelerated by two phases. KB Home had a development agreement and paid considerable consideration for the agreement when it was first executed in 1993. It was agreed to restructure the development agreement fee for the fire station and Rider Street improvements. A ten-year fee of \$1.3 million was accelerated over the next one to two years. In summary, the developer had taken over the obligation to build Rider; complete/accelerate the fifteen-acre community park; build the linear park; detention basin park; and complete circulation. The developer would meet with the Parks Department for design.

*KB Homes, Mr. Mounts’
Comments Re: Development
Agreement*

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION:

Councilmember Rogers asked for more descriptive detail of what was to be done to improve the parks. Would the three different phases of Rider Street be completed by September 1st.

*Councilmember Rogers’
Query Re: Descriptive Detail
of Park Improvements &
Date of Completion*

In response, Mr. Mounts said it was agreed to improve the linear park with a trail, landscape, and improvements that were non-irrigated, and the use of mulch ground cover. The developer would meet with the Parks Department for design.

*KB Home, Mr. Mounts’
Response*

In response to the three phases of Rider Street, City Engineer Motlagh indicated there were two phases. The developer had the responsibility from Evans Road to Ramona Expressway. The goal was to do as much as we could within the existing right-of-way between point A to B by September. There are limited right-of-ways. So, the road would be widen and improved, but sidewalk, curb and gutter would be at a later point in time. The second phase was the \$2 million project, which was the contribution from Barratt, KB and Val Verde School. The project from Evans Road to Perris Boulevard included the channel crossing. That project was a two-year project due to environmental issues and permit process for the channel crossing; and would not occur by September 1st.

*City Engineer Motlagh’s
Response*

Councilmember Rogers commented that the only discrepancy was item two, the fee per unit.

Councilmember Rogers' Comment Re: Per Unit Fee

Mr. Mounts confirmed the fee per unit was the only discrepancy and indicated there were minor clarifications and noted issues required discussion with the City Engineer. The infrastructure phases were revised and the conditions of approval would be in conflict. (Phase III).

KB Home, Mr. Mounts' Response

Councilmember Yarbrough commented that the last counter offer from Mr. Mounts was the \$1,000 per unit at issuance of building permits. The money allowed the City to address critical issues that drove the fee was the TUMF.

Councilmember Yarbrough's Comment Re: \$1,000 Per Unit

In response, Mr. Mounts said the counter proposal was the offer of \$1,000 per unit and \$1 million up front, which was not agreed upon. It appeared that KB Home was the only developer, in that area, asked to pay the fee.

KB Home, Mr. Mounts' Response

Councilmember Landers commented that the issue before Council was the TUMF and indicated he was against it because of the amount of \$6,600. Each development and developer should be treated the same. The drop to \$500 per unit was not agreeable. The money was vital to the City for youth recreational facilities.

Councilmember Landers' Comments Re: Money Per Unit

Mayor Pro Tem Motte voiced agreement with Councilmember Landers' comment. Mayor Pro Tem Motte commented that Chaparral offered \$3,000 into a fund for youth facilities; and the City should remain with that.

Mayor Pro Tem Motte's Comments Re: Money Per Unit

Mayor Busch voiced appreciation of KB Home's efforts, but the accelerations would benefit the project. The developer put money up early, but due to the cost, they may be saving money. Mayor Busch voiced disappointment of the \$500 offered.

Mayor Busch's Comment Re: KB Home Efforts/Benefits

In response, Mr. Mounts said build up of the entire infrastructure now the developer may not recoup money if the market changed. There was a lot of acceleration and was a fair deal. However, acceleration of the park within five years was a huge financial commitment.

KB Home, Mr. Mounts' Response

City Attorney Dunn indicated that staff and Mr. Mounts would have liked more time to go through discussion before it was brought before Council. The Chaparral project improvements were not accelerated. Therefore, that was the reason KB Home was not asked to contribute an amount of \$3,000. Staff tried to come up with something that was equivalent. Since Mr. Mounts can not answer Council's concerns, it was recommended to continue the hearing and adjourn the meeting to March 18th.

City Attorney Dunn's Comments Re: Adjournment to March 18, 2003

Mr. Mounts distributed a revised agreement, which had minor changes in Exhibit B. To complete all of Rider by September 1st was inconsistent with the conditions of approval. Language was provided to deal with the situation. The concept behind Phase V and VI, deferral of payment of the fee, was really the acceleration of improvements. What KB was willing to do was to pay a \$500 fee per unit for the remaining units within the project and payable at building permit. The sports park was accelerating, which was a large financial consideration. Mr. Mounts indicated that the \$1,000 per unit was a surprise and the developer did not hear about this until Monday at 5:00 p.m.

*KB Home, Mr. Mounts’
Comment Re: Revised
Agreement; Improvement
Acceleration; & Per Unit Fee
of \$1,000*

Interim City Manager Apodaca said the \$1,000 per unit was not a total surprise. Following the workshop conducted there was a \$3,000 per unit; and what was put on the table was the \$1,000 per unit, which was a compromise. This was because KB had moved up some improvements. Therefore, considering the improvements, the \$1,000 up front was a combination of all considerations. With the TUMF Fees in the background, it was a very reasonable appropriation. The final issue to resolve was how much up front would it be \$1,000 per unit or \$500.

*Interim City Manager
Apodaca’s Comments Re:
Compromise of \$1000 Per
Unit Fee & Improvement
Acceleration was a
Combination of all
Considerations; Reasonable
Appropriation & Resolution
was the Final Issue*

Mr. Mounts said they were willing to build a \$2.5 million park as quickly as possible.

*KB Home, Mr. Mounts’
Comment Re: \$2.5 Million
Park*

Interim City Manager Apodaca indicated there was a secondary aspect, the amount per unit and the timing, the up front component or when permits were issued.

*Interim City Manager
Apodaca’s Comments Re:
Secondary Aspect*

City Engineer Motlagh pointed out two items that required discussion. One issue was the completion of Rider and the other, for clarification, was the revision of Item #2 of Exhibit B. The revision indicated that KB would widen Rider Street on the south side to the ultimate width, where KB owned property, including curb, gutter and sidewalk. Anything that KB did not own the improvement would be up to the existing right-of-way.

*City Engineer Motlagh’s
Comment Re: Two Items for
Discussion: Completion of
Rider; Revision of Item 2
Exhibit B, Widen Rider*

Mr. Mounts said KB Home would pay the \$1,000 per unit at issuance of building permit.

*KB Home, Mr. Mounts’
Comment Re: \$1000 Per Unit*

M/S/C (YARBROUGH/ROGERS) To introduce Ordinance Number 1113, approving Ordinance Amendment 03-0067, based on the points as presented in testimony; and subject to the Staff finalizing the terms of the agreement. The title of the ordinance was read.

*Ordinance Number 1113,
Ordinance Amendment 03-
0067
Approved: 4-1
Noes: Motte*

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

- B. Consideration and discussion to introduce proposed Ordinance Number 1114, Ordinance Amendment 03-0058, authorizing participation in the ‘Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee Program’ (WRCOG).

Proposed Ordinance Number 1114, TUMF Ordinance Continued/Adjourned to March 18th Approved: 5-0

To introduce proposed Ordinance Number 1114 entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF PERRIS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION UNIFORM MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM BY ASSESSING A DEVELOPMENT FEE CITY WIDE TO ASSIST WITH THE FINANCING OF A REGIONAL ROADWAY SYSTEM FOR THE BENEFIT OF WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY (ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 03-0058).

Community Development Director Gutierrez commented that the proposed ordinance would authorize the City’s participation in the Uniform Transportation Fee and establish said fee to be assessed to the development. The terms of the development agreement were discussed and summarized in the report. The fees were delineated within the ordinance and information (number of units) requested by Council were included. At the workshop, Council indicated that they would like further discussion and Mr. West, of WRCOG, was available for any questions. Staff recommended continuing the item to March 18th.

Community Development Director Gutierrez ‘s Introduction

Mayor Busch called for public comments.

Mr. Hoffman, Supervisor Marion Ashley’s staff, introduced Mr. West of Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and Mr. Henderson who developed the Nexus Study. Two issues specific to the supervisor’s office was how the plan would be administered especially to the local zone (March JPA, City of Moreno Valley & Perris). The plan was in three parts: 1) 48% backbone system/major roads/interchanges; 2) 3% transit component to be administered by Riverside Transit Agency; 3) 48% redistributed to those zones. There were five zones throughout Western County. City’s staff was able to participate in determining the facilities included in the TUMF network and participated in the development of the administration plan. The desire of WRCOG was that the zones determine their own destiny and administer themselves. The supervisor supported the fee and believed it required some fine tuning. Specifically, there should be issues to address low-income housing/affordable as determined by formula to pay a lesser fee. The supervisor had concerns that the commercial fee may have an unintended affect of delaying commercial development and increasing traffic in the short term before it actually decreases traffic. The supervisor was looking into those issues and would continue to work with the cities in development of the plan.

Supervisor Ashley’s Staff, Mr. Hoffman’s Presentation

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION:

Councilmember Rogers commented on the possibility of the ordinance creating tremendous paper work for staff and asked if the City was entitled to an administration fee. In addition, the last report/newsletter indicated that the TUMF Fee only went towards the actual improvements, but not towards the operations and maintenance. Where would the additional money come from for the on going maintenance/operations for the different arterials. In the review of plans there would be staff intensive for credits and cap fee credits, etc. If the cities arbitrarily agreed to give the County close to \$200 million in a twenty year period and the cities were not entitled to a mere ½% or some type of administrative fee for the work.

*Councilmember Rogers’
Comment & Query Re:
Administration Fee*

In response, Mr. West, WRCOG, said the 1% identified in the ordinance was for the administration of the program. There were no provisions in the ordinance to allow a percentage of revenues to go towards each of the cities. The paperwork was discussed and allowed, for cities, to reduce the paperwork with the request for WRCOG to assist in the process. Regarding the operations and maintenance, the law did not allow the monies to be used for that, only for construction of the facilities. The administration fee had not been discussed by the executive committee to transfer any revenue to cities for that administrative work. No other cities had asked for an administrative fee.

*WRCOG, Mr. West’s
Response: Authority at
Executive Level*

Mr. Hoffman commented, for clarification, that the County did not receive any of the money. The money was collected by the cities and the additional burden would not be intense on staff as the cities collected a variety of fees. WRCOG were the administrator of the plan; and contracted with Riverside County Transportation Commission for financial matters.

*WRCOG, Mr. Hoffman’s
Comments Re:
Administration Fee*

Councilmember Rogers asked when the actual improvements would be made for the backbone and secondary.

*Councilmember Rogers’
Query Re: Improvements*

In reply, Mr. West, WRCOG, said a ten-year strategic plan would be developed and projects would be prioritized. The prioritization would occur with representation from cities. At this time, there was no way to know which projects would be built first within ten years. Therefore, answers can not be provided at this time.

*WRCOG, Mr. West’s
Response*

Mr. Hoffman commented that the TUMF Ordinance was separate, but worked with Measure A. Within Measure A there was a list of arterial facilities and mirrored the TUMF backbone network. RCTC fully intended to bond against the measure to advance as many of those facilities as possible to move projects forward. It was critical for cities and their supervisors in establishing priorities for the backbone system and the zone system.

*WRCOG, Mr. Hoffman’s
Comments Re: TUMF
Ordinance & Measure A*

Councilmember Landers commented that the WRCOG's representatives said the TUMF was before Council for approval, but yet they said they were fine-tuning, adjusting rates and amounts. How was the City suppose to approve something that was still fine tuning/distributing of the fees.

Councilmember Landers' Comments Re: TUMF Approval/Fine Tuning

In reply, Mr. Hoffman said the distributing of fees was not being fine-tuned; the distribution of fees and fees were set by the Nexus Study. What was being reviewed was the administrative plan. The City's zone included City of Moreno Valley, March JPA and the County. The fee was developed on a traffic-generated basis. In two years there was to be a review of the plan. The fee was uniform across all of western county.

WRCOG, Mr. Hoffman's Reply: Fee not Fine Tuned; Distribution; Fee set by Nexus Study; Review of the Administrative Plan; Development of Fee; Two Year Review of Plan

Mayor Pro Tem Motte asked if the four entities with the City's zone voted equally. It was confirmed that March JPA did not vote; they were at the table only and collected fees.

Mayor Pro Tem Motte's Query Re: Zone Vote

Councilmember Yarbrough asked how much, to date, of tax payer's money was paid to develop the Nexus Study. The City in good faith supported TUMF with the thought that we would look at a program similar to what Coachella had. The fee was not feasible. The entities Moreno Valley, and Riverside County would pretty much drive whatever they desired and historically they had always done that. The City would be left behind or be the last to receive benefits. The City of Perris had one of the biggest areas to develop with residential, industrial and commercial.

Councilmember Yarbrough's Query & Comment Re: Nexus Study & Support of TUMF

In reply, Mr. West said the exact amount for the Nexus Study was unknown. Money was used from various sources that the jurisdictions provided.

WRCOG, Mr. West's Response

Mr. Hoffman indicated that if an agency decided not to participate in the program, then that agency could not expect to participate in the priorities that the program would build. The Perris area had a great deal of need that would rank high. The City of Perris stood to benefit the most because it was in a zone with only three participants.

WRCOG, Mr. Hoffman's Comment Re: Participation in TUMF

Councilmember Rogers commented that presently there were eleven for the backbone and twelve for the secondary. She asked if Perris had access to the County's and Moreno Valley's proposed improvements. It was confirmed that Perris would have access.

Councilmember Rogers' Query Re: Access to Improvements for Riverside County/Moreno Valley

Mr. Henderson, PBQD Consultants, commented that Ramona Expressway/Cajalco were gold mines, because there was an obligation from WRCOG to fulfill the \$400 million requirement to RCTC at the beginning of this program. The money had to be spent towards the CETAP Corridors. Perris being in the program could go to the table and immediately demand that the first \$400 million be applied to that project.

PBQD Consultants, Mr. Henderson's Comment Re: Ramona Expressway & Cajalco Road

City Attorney Dunn commented there was language in the draft administration plan that said the zones shall approve their transportation improvement plan by consensus and forward their recommendation to the executive committee. It sounded like the zone administration was an advisory board. Would that language be addressed in the next draft.

*City Attorney Dunn's Query
Re: Draft Administration
Plan Language*

In reply, Mr. Hoffman said the zone decisions were rubber stamped at WRCOG executive committee; but the authority was at the executive level. Additional language had been added to the draft.

*WRCOG, Mr. Hoffman's
Response: Authority at
Executive Level*

Mayor Busch commented that there was good discussion and input. It was important for Perris to be at the table and the political climate with the supervisor had changed. The City was ready to move forward.

*Mayor Busch's Comment Re:
Input, Political Climate &
Moving Forward*

M/S/C (MOTTE/YARBROUGH) To continue/adjourn the Public Hearing for proposed Ordinance Number 1114, TUMF Ordinance to March 18th.

*Proposed Ordinance Number
1114, TUMF Ordinance
Continued/Adjourned to
March 18th
Approved: 5-0*

AYES: Landers, Motte, Rogers, Yarbrough, Busch
NOES: None

9. BUSINESS ITEMS: (not requiring a "Public Hearing"): None

NEW BUSINESS: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

10. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

Maria Macias Valeriano commented that Perris make registration mandatory for any convicted alien sex offender. It was her understanding that when a sex offender came from out of the USA, they were not required to register in the USA.

Ms. Valeriano's Comment

Cynthia Clark requested more information on the \$2 million commitment the Mayor signed for Eastern Municipal Water District. She requested to review the minutes from the meeting when it was actually discussed and voted by Council. Ms. Clark would submit her record request to the City Clerk.

Cynthia Clark's Comment

Pastor Ruben Bajo commented on the possibility of implementing a boxing program for the youth.

Pastor Bajo's Comment

Mr. Gowdy voiced support of Pastor Bajo's comment on implementation of a youth boxing program.

Mr. Gowdy's Comment

Mr. Wheeler voiced support of Pastor Bajo's work with the youth and the implementation of a boxing program. Also, if the City allowed Pastor Bajo to use a City facility for one year free of rent, Mr. Wheeler would provide a noted boxer (Oscar De La Jolla; Mohammed Ali; Fernando Vargas) visited the facility to work with the youth free of charge. In addition, this would bring a fair measure of good will from around the country.

Mr. Wheeler's Comment

Mr. Vidal commented that he would not be running for Mayor or Council in November 2003. He thanked his family and friends for their support. Thanked the Mayor and Council for allowing him to speak freely. He thanked the City Clerk and staff for their help over the years. Mr. Vidal enjoyed every minute he had been here.

Mr. Vidal's Comments

Becky Ternage thanked Councilman Yarbrough for the afternoon he gave the children at Park Avenue School, Doctor Suess Reading Day. Mr. Yarbrough was the race car driver. Ms. Ternage thanked others for their participation.

Becky Ternage's Comment

11. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS:

Councilmember Yarbrough commented that he left the KB Development negotiation meeting early due to the attendance of the League of California Cities meeting in the City of Calimesa. Councilmember Yarbrough thanked Ms. Ternage and said it was an honor to be involved.

*Councilmember Yarbrough's
Comments Re: League CA
Cities Meeting*

Councilmember Landers said there was one more Relay for Life Meeting on March 24th at 5:30 p.m. in the Perris Library. He thanked City staff for their support.

*Councilmember Landers'
comment Re: Relay for Life*

12. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Councilmember Rogers reported that the Department of Community Action was to meet on Monday, March 17th at 9:00 a.m. at Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

*Councilmember Rogers'
Report*

Mayor Busch reported that the March Joint Powers Authority approved the EIR and EIS in order to develop at the West March facilities. There was to be activity in the very near future.

Mayor Busch's Report

Mr. Natera, Neighborhood Preservation Officer/Building Inspector, reported on the City of Perris Annual Clean Up Day. This year CR & R facility was opened to the public for dumping and staging areas were placed that expedited the trash collection process. Two hundred tons of trash was collected, which was a 100% increase. Twelve vehicles were towed and information booths were set up at CR & R. The Public Works Department was instrumental in picking up trash. Following the event here was a barbecue to honor all the volunteers and those that participated. Mr. Natera thanked the Free Indeed Church Fellowship; First Baptist Church; Sabbath Family; Tri-Lake Engineering; Riverside County Explorers; Morales Family and the Cona Family for the help and support. Some of the local businesses donated raffle prizes (Tarosco Mexican Restaurant;

*Mr. Natera's Perris' Annual
Clean Up Day Report*

Albertsons; Farmer Boys; Villa Roma; Wal Mart; Ritchie Bros.; Amigos Tres; Sizzlers; Perris Mini Mall and Lowes. Overall, it was a highly successful Clean Up Day.

Con't. Mr. Natera's Perris' Annual Clean Up Day Report

13. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

Interim City Manager Apodaca reported on the City sponsored event Wake Up Perris, which was hosted by the Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce. All the Council Members were present. The City provided a highlight on the Economic Summit and gave updates on projects. Interim City Manager Apodaca thanked the sponsors and staff that helped provide the Perris Clean Up Day. A call was received from the Board of Equalization to make sure the City specified actual uses for the parcels on Redlands and Dale. The two parcels were definitely for public purpose as parks. The land across the street from Redlands would be designated as park related or redevelopment related public purpose and auxiliary parking would be included. The City should hear favorable news within two weeks.

Interim City Manager Apodaca's Report: Economic Summit & Clean Up Day

14. AGENDA ITEMS/MEETING REQUESTS AND REVIEW: None

15. CLOSED SESSION:

A. Conference with Labor Negotiators
Government Code Section 54957.6
Agency Designated Representative: City Attorney
Unrepresented: Interim City Manager

Increase Compensation During Service as Interim City Manager-Final Action Taken on April 8, 2003 Council Meeting

B. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation
Government Code Section 54956.9 (a)
Claim from Jamye McMickell vs. Redevelopment Agency

PERMA Directed to Work Out a Settlement Agreement & Final Settlement Agreement Submitted to Council

City Attorney Dunn reported that Council met in closed session on Item 15.A to confer with labor negotiator regarding compensation for the Interim City Manager and directed an increase in compensation during Mr. Apodaca's service as interim. Final action would be taken at the next Council meeting. The Redevelopment Agency met on Item 15.B to confer with legal counsel regarding a claim from Jamye McMickell verses the Redevelopment Agency. Direction was given to the PERMA representatives to work out a settlement. The final settlement agreement will be brought back.

City Attorney Dunn's Closed Session Report

City Attorney Dunn recommended the Council adjourn to March 18th at a specified time to make it an adjourned regular meeting. The reason was that the development/TUMF fee had to be introduced at a regular meeting rather than a special meeting.

City Attorney Dunn's Recommendation for Adjournment

16. ADJOURNMENT:

M/S/C (LANDERS/BUSCH) To adjourn the Regular City Council meeting to March 18, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.

To adjourn the Regular City Council Meeting to March 18th at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Margaret Rey, City Clerk