The City Council of the City of Davis met in regular and closed session at 6:30 p.m. in the Community Chambers, 23 Russell Blvd., Davis, California. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Asmundson.

Roll Call: Councilmembers Present: Sue Greenwald, Ted Puntillo, Don Saylor, Stephen Souza, Ruth Asmundson

Councilmembers Absent: None

Other Officers Present: City Manager James Antonen, City Attorney Harriet Steiner, Director of Finance Paul Navazio, City Clerk Margaret Roberts

Approval of Agenda
D. Saylor moved, seconded by T. Puntillo, approval of the agenda as submitted. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Greenwald, Puntillo, Saylor, Souza, Asmundson

NOES: None

Consent Calendar
Resolution No. 06-14 - Supporting Yolo County’s Application for Grant Funding Through the Wildlife Conservation Board for Preparation of a Voluntary Oak Woodlands Management Plan to Promote Land Stewardship and Conservation of Oak Woodland Resources.
Approved

Resolution No. 06-15 - Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Consultant Agreement with Foresight Consulting for Rate Study for Sewer Services Charges and Sewer Connection Fees, CIP No. 8119.
Approved

Resolution No. 06-16 - Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into Agreement with the Area 4 Agency on Aging for Yolo County Information and Assistance Services for Funding Cycle July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2010, with the Initial Contract Period being Fiscal Year 2006-07 in the Amount of $34,614.
Approved

Ordinance 2239 - Amending Section 22.08.310 of the Municipal Code of the City of Davis Relating to No Parking on Valencia Avenue.
Adopted (introduced 1/17/06)

Ordinances Modifying the Municipal Code of the City of Davis Relating to the Intersection of Shasta Drive and Hampton Drive:
Ordinance 2240 - Amending Section 22.07.030 Relating to Stop Intersection Designation.
Adopted (introduced 01/17/06)

Ordinance 2241 - Amending Section 22.07.020 Relating to Through Street Designation.
Adopted (introduced 1/17/06)

Commission Minutes:
Informational
Mr. Navazio explained that the two resolutions will be deferred to the next Council meeting after the language for the ballot measure is decided upon. There was a PowerPoint presentation given. The current tax is due to expire in June. The committee reviewed trends in the demand for parks and maintenance. The information was put into a range of tax rate increases. If you included the additional park space and increase in maintenance costs, the tax would be approximately $79 per parcel.

The subcommittee recommended retaining the tax at the current level. Staff recommends that an inflator be included making the tax $59 per parcel.

T. Puntillo believes that a tax increase would not be supported by the voters. The last time an increase was attempted was in 2001, which failed. If this tax was not sunsetting now, would a measure be placed on the ballot to increase the tax? There are some people who are against renewing the tax.

S. Souza stated that it is easier to explain a straight renewal rather than trying to explain why an increase is needed. The more complicated the matter, the harder it is to get people to agree. If this tax does not pass there will have to be major cuts, including programs.

S. Greenwald stated that she has concerns about the commercial and industrial rates. This is a vulnerable area of this tax and she would like to see some wording done so that large businesses pay a larger tax. It appears that the city is taxing the little guy and giving the big businesses a break.

D. Saylor stated that he was disappointed with the tax in 1997. There is currently a $49 tax that does not pay for existing park services. It is the Council’s place to provide services for the community. There is a staff analysis that includes the cost to maintain the parks and the fact that there is more acreage. The staff has cut corners and the city is near a breaking point. Three-fourths of park maintenance was covered when the initial tax was passed and now it is one-fourth. There must be a true package to the voters that will pay for the service being provided. He would like the tax to be at the $79 rate. Is there a way to take a sample poll?

Mr. Mike Harrington stated that when he was on the council he worked on this tax. Don Saylor’s comments were well-said. The projects need to be funded by the people and he believes that this tax is sellable to the public. He feels that this is a bargain and he strongly supports a $59 tax.

R. Asmundson stated that parks are what make Davis a community. It is important to maintain them properly. When the tax came to the city in 1996, it was $49 and several years later the city is at a twenty-five percent recovery rate. Just to keep up with inflation would make the tax $59. A forty-nine dollar parcel tax is thirteen cents per day, $74 parcel tax is thirty cents per day and $59 parcel tax is fifteen cents per day. The parks need to be maintained or the quality of life will diminish in Davis. She hopes that the Council will come to some type of agreement. Is there a way to do a short telephone poll to determine what the citizens would be willing to pay? H. Steiner stated that the city is legally authorized to take such a poll.
S. Souza stated that an easy poll could be done, but to do a scientific poll would take a much longer period of time. There is a ten million dollar parks budget and this tax is only a portion of that budget. He believes that the city needs to find a better way to solve this problem and there are other means that are far more appropriate.

T. Puntiilo stated that he campaigned on finding another way to provide services. A thirty percent increase would be hard to explain. He is for $49 for six years.

D. Saylor stated that the general fund is backfilling the park budget and it is cannibalizing the rest of the city services. The absence of this tax is causing a deficit in this area. He is looking at a need to fund this so as to not dig into the general fund.

S. Souza asked if the park tax funds are put into the general fund. P. Navazio stated that it is restricted and accounted for as a special fund. S. Souza is for $49 for six years with no inflator.

S. Greenwald stated that the subcommittee is in touch with the voters. The current tax needs to be extended. She would like to see a higher tax on the industrial and eliminate the maximum square foot. She supports the recommendation of the subcommittee.

D. Saylor stated that he vowed to the voters not to bring something to them that does not cover the cost of services being provided.

P. Navazio stated that prior to the meeting there was a revised ordinance handed out. There were a few words left out on page 11 that clarifies the sunset clause.

S. Sousa moved, seconded by T. Puntiilo, introduction of the ordinance with the corrections presented tonight at the recommendation of the subcommittee.

S. Greenwald amended the motion to eliminate the maximum of 10,000 square foot clause and remove the maximum of 30 employees, without a second the motion died.

D. Saylor made a substitute motion, seconded by S. Souza to include an escalator of three percent. S. Greenwald asked for the amounts that the escalator would provide the city. D. Saylor withdrew his motion.

D. Saylor stated that the community expects tremendous service without paying for it and the community is reluctant to pass a tax to support the services. S. Souza stated that the city is on its way to being fiscally sound. T. Puntiilo stated that he took the conservative road in order to not lose the tax and suggested doing a more comprehensive review in 2008. S. Greenwald stated that she cannot promise that the city is on the road to being fiscally sound but for the time being the city needs this tax to provide services. We all benefit from living in a great city.

R. Asmundson hopes that the citizens understand that there needs to be a balance.

The original motion passed by the following vote:
AYES: Souza, Greenwald, Puntiilo, Asmundson
NOES Saylor

The item will be back for second reading at the February 7, 2006 meeting.

The council took a break at 7:34 p.m. prior to the workshop.
Workshop

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned in honor of Mr. Eric Roqual and Mr. Charles MacDonald.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Roberts, CMC
City Clerk
MINUTES OF THE CITY OF DAVIS REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF JANUARY 24, 2006

The Davis Redevelopment Agency of the City of Davis met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. in the Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, California. The meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Asmundson.

Roll Call. Present: Sue Greenwald, Ted Puntillo, Don Saylor, Stephen Souza, Ruth Asmundson

Absent: None

Other Officers Present: Executive Director James Antonen, RDA Counsel Harriet Steiner, Clerk of the Board Margaret Roberts

Approval of Agenda
D. Saylor moved, seconded by T. Puntillo, approval of the agenda as submitted. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Greenwald, Puntillo, Saylor, Souza, Asmundson.
NOES: None.

Public Comments None

Consent Calendar
RDA Resolution 1181 of the City of Davis Redevelopment Agency Board Approving the Application for Grant Funds for the California Cultural and Historical Endowment (CCHE) Under the California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks and Coastal Protection Act of 2002.

S. Souza moved, seconded by T. Puntillo, approval of the consent calendar as submitted. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Greenwald, Puntillo, Saylor, Souza, Asmundson
NOES: None

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Margaret Roberts, CMC
Clerk of the Board