

# City of Claremont Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee (PSCAC) AGENDA

*"We are a vibrant, livable, and inclusive community dedicated to quality services, safety, financial strength, sustainability, preservation, and progress with equal representation for our community."*

**Alexander Hughes Community Center - Padua Room**  
1700 Danbury Road, Claremont, CA 91711  
Wednesday, April 17, 2019 @ 6:00 p.m.



## COMMITTEE MEMBERS

**MATTHEW MAGILKE**  
CHAIR

**HAROLD GAULT**  
VICE CHAIR

**DAVID BURGDORF**

**RICHARD CHUTE**

**JOHN JOCELYN**

**AUNDRE JOHNSON**

**JIM KEITH**

**ANTHONY NELIPOVICH**

**BETH PFAU**

**KATHARINE ROSACKER**

**JOYCE SAUTER**

**SALLY SEVEN**

**JESS SWICK**

**EX OFFICIO: FRANK BEDOYA**

**\*\*PUBLIC COMMENT WILL BE TAKEN ON EACH ITEM\*\***

1. Approval of Minutes from 12/5/2018 - Attachment
2. Update on Study for Retrofitting Existing Police Station and City Yard Administration Building – Presentation
3. City Manager Update – Presentation
4. Adjournment

**Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee  
MINUTES  
Wednesday, December 5, 2018  
6:00 P.M., Hughes Center – Padua room**

**Present:** Richard Chute, David Burgdorf, Harold Gault, John Jocelyn, Aundre Johnson, Matthew Jones, Jim Keith, Matthew Magilke, Anthony Nelipovich, Beth Pfau, Katharine Rosacker, Joyce Sauter, Sally Seven, Jess Swick

City Manager Tara Schultz, Assistant City Manager Colin Tudor, Chief Shelly Vander Veen, Captain Aaron Fate, Finance Director Adam Pirrie, Management Analyst John Costa; Assistant to the City Manager Jamie Harvey, Sr. Administrative Assistant Lisa Amaya;

**Not Present:** John Watkins and Ex-Officio Frank Bedoya

Chair Magilke called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

1. POLICE STATION CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Committee Member Johnson referenced page 3 of the minutes and asked for clarification on what the consultant would consider a major seismic event on the Richter scale. After some discussion, City Manager Schultz stated staff will confirm the magnitude that was mentioned, and the minutes will be amended to reflect that.

**Chair Magilke moved to approve the Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee meeting minutes of December 5, 2018, as amended; and carried on a unanimous vote.**

2. UPDATE ON HISTORICAL INFORMATION

Chief Vander Veen gave a PowerPoint presentation. She stated staff has been studying the public safety facility for 15 years and agenda reports, minutes, etc. are available to the public online. However, in response to requests from Committee Members and the community, staff sees the value of gathering the information in one place for anyone to review and to provide a summary document.

Chief Vander Veen introduced resident Dr. Sandra Emerson, who volunteered to review all the information in order to prepare a timeline and summary document. If Committee Members have any specific questions, they can reach out to Chief Vander Veen, who will relay their message to Dr. Emerson. Additionally, staff is developing a website specifically dedicated to the PSF project and it is expected to launch at the end of the year. Chief Vander Veen offered to answer any questions.

Committee Member Seven commented on California Title 24 for essential services and said she didn't believe they had seen the actual language before and thought it would be helpful to have that information.

Chair Magilke invited public comment.

Ludd Trozpek asked if the fit test drawings that were used for Measure PS would be included in the historical section. He said they weren't well distributed to the public for review.

Chief Vander Veen responded the drawings will be available on the website.

Chair Magilke invited Committee Members' comments.

Committee Member Seven commented on the challenging job of having all the documents complete and accessible. She shared that it was difficult to find a fault map that was included in the previous Committee's packet because of the volume of material they had received. She suggested having an index to help navigate through all the documents.

Chief Vander Veen responded to questions related to whether the City had copies of all the minutes and documents from previous committees (since 2002) for the current Committee to review; the timeframe for when the historical information and summary document will be available, and if it will be cross referenced.

Dr. Emerson suggested the Committee prioritize what information they'd like in the summary and said she will get the timeline out as quickly as possible. City Manager Schultz noted that staff will pass on the Committee's comments/questions to Dr. Emerson.

There were no further requests to speak.

### 3. UPDATE ON MODULAR BUILDINGS

Chief Vander Veen gave a PowerPoint presentation. She stated the modular buildings will be relocated to the Police Department by the end of December and said it's important to understand the buildings are 25 years old and are a temporary solution. The modular buildings do not resolve existing issues and will be used while safety improvements are made to the station.

City Manager Schultz added that staff is actively pursuing funding to do both seismic and safety improvements.

Chair Magilke asked if the Committee was going forward with the \$1.5M recommendation, if they were looking at obtaining grants, and if the City would go forward without knowing if they can build on top of the existing facility.

City Manager Schultz stated staff is moving forward and is actively looking for funding for safety improvements (\$200-400K recommendation) but looking for money for seismic improvements as well. She added that if staff has the ability to make seismic improvements from money we can get from State or Federal sources, they'll move forward to ensure the safety of people in the building.

Chair Magilke invited the Committee Members' comments.

Chief Vander Veen and City Manager Schultz responded to a question of whether the City would be using their own workforce for some of the improvements, such as securing furniture to make them earthquake safe, in order to cut costs.

Chief Vander Veen commented that disturbing the asbestos during the safety improvements is cause for concern and part of the reason it will cost \$200,000 - \$400,000.

City Manager Schultz added the City contracts out for services when needed; however, we are using Community Services staff to help with the site preparation for the modulars. Staff is trying to find ways to cut costs by using City employees but doesn't have all the expertise required.

Chief Vander Veen responded to the Committee Members' questions related to when the modular buildings would be operational, how long they would be utilized, and who or what would be relocated in the temporary buildings. Additionally, she responded that each modular is 960 square feet.

There were no further requests to speak.

#### 4. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION ON DIRECTION

City Manager Schultz gave a PowerPoint presentation. The Committee will have an opportunity tonight for open discussion on what their end goals are for the station. City Manager Schultz has been working on bios for Committee Members and noted a few are missing. She asked that the bios be submitted to her as soon as possible.

City Manager Schultz asked the Committee to think about what direction they're headed in because it will help staff focus their efforts. Once that has been determined, they can discuss what it is they would like to accomplish at future meetings.

Chair Magilke shared that no matter what the Committee's efforts are, one-third of the residents will cast a "No" vote. The Committee will have to make some big changes in order to get that last 9% of the residents to change their minds. He asked for open discussion on what Committee Members believed it would take to get a "Yes" vote.

Committee Member Nelipovich believed it was incumbent upon City administration to make it clear to residents that they are not playing one tax payer against the other. It's also important that the City convince the taxpayers they are making a good investment.

Committee Member Jocelyn commented on residents' tax bills and believed it comes down to taxes. As a taxpayer he needs to see that: 1) it's cost effective, 2) would like to be assured that he isn't paying more than his fair share as a new Claremont homeowner, and 3) would like the financing to be equitable. Mostly, he would like to know that the funds are being used wisely - treat the funds as taxpayers' money and be cognizant of that. Ensure taxpayers are getting the best value for their money.

Mr. Chute expressed his appreciation for these open discussions and meetings with the public. It's important for the Committee to hear each other's voices to get a sense of where they want to go together on this project. He echoed the comments expressed earlier with persuading the public of the need of the station, its value, and taxpayers' funds. He believed the cost of the building isn't really the problem, but that the Committee and the public need to know why it would cost \$50M or \$25M for a new station. Having historical information on the building would be helpful as would a source document that the public could reference. He would like to see an architectural firm compile the information that exists and then look at what

the Committee wants to do with the station in terms of what tools officers will need over the next 30-50 years. Policing is changing and a new station will need to be flexible for the future. He reiterated that a source document could be used to persuade the community the dollar amount the Committee decides on is the right figure, and its reassurance that their money is being spent wisely. He commented on his background and projects he worked on.

Committee Member Keith believed it would take up too much time to start over with a new architect and have them review the entire history. He believed they're a lot closer to a possible solution than that. He commented on 1) moving expeditiously to find ways to keep the Police Department employees safe, and 2) for the long term, he believed they should look at the station as laid out for the SC proposal. The architects that worked on that plan had a lot of credibility and Chief Vander Veen spent a lot of hours working with them to come up with the proximities they are looking at. He suggested the Committee look at sizes of the rooms, furniture, etc. to possibly reduce them to cut costs. He supported going forward to evaluate whether they can truly save the existing station and only focusing on two sites: the existing station and the City Yard site. Lastly, when they go to the voters with a financing mechanism, he believed it should be shared equally. He hopes this Committee will step up when residents question why or how they came up with their proposal. They'll have a better chance of passing a measure if residents know the reasoning behind their decision.

Committee Member Johnson questioned the status of the studies the Committee approved. City Manager Schultz responded it's the next item on their agenda, but that she wanted to have this discussion first.

Committee Member Pfau echoed earlier comments about not wasting time conducting more studies. She would like to look at the information that is currently available in order to assess what is appropriate and relevant at this point. However, she would like to: 1) see a floor plan, 2) questioned how long it would take to compile the information, but said it should be done anyway, for the future of this project, 3) requested the slide comparison on Measure SC and PS to review the differences; and 4) and would like to look at alternative options for financing. She noted the lack of grants that would be available to build a new station and she believed it's important to be transparent and build trust with the community. She is unsure whether they can come up with a recommendation on how to move forward. Lastly, she reiterated the Committee should look at what they have without spending more time and money than they need to.

Chair Magilke believed voters would not pass a \$25M measure. It comes down to the marginal voters and there's a lot of mistrust in the City (Measure PS and Measure W). In order to turn things around, the City will have to do something concrete to gain back the trust of the voters and show they are good stewards with taxpayers' money. He believed the City Yard site is one area that the City can do this.

Chair Magilke distributed and commented on two handouts he put together for the Committee and staff to review. The first handout related to the 17-year lease contract for the City Yard building and uses for the building as stated in the October 22, 2002 City Council Agenda. He believed the City could reduce sanitation fees in their efforts to garner votes for a new bond measure for a new station. The second handout listed possible ways to fund a station for \$23.5M, based on annual savings per household if the sanitation rate was cut by \$500,000 per year. The chart also listed a different set of figures if the Colleges contributed \$3.75M up

front. He based his costs on a \$20M station because he doesn't believe voters will approve a \$25M station.

There was discussion on whether it was a possibility to charge the Colleges a different rate per square foot; doing something to gain the trust of the voters, such as tightening the City's "belt;" and whether there was a sunset clause for the fees that were levied for the City Yard.

Committee Member Jocelyn said he would like the City to provide information on whether they can offset the sanitation's fees, and he would like to see the responses to Chair Magilke's points.

Chair Magilke stated he would support a new station if the City reduces its sanitation fees. He proposed having the City cut the fees now to show voters they're going to save \$500K going forward and that taking this action will hopefully get the support they need for a bond for a new station.

Finance Director Pirrie responded he would have to take a closer look at Chair Magilke's analysis. But on the face value, he expressed concern that the analysis assumes the City's expenditures won't increase and we'll have \$400-500k in savings. He commented on increases in contract services and the sanitation budget.

Committee Member Jocelyn asked if the City specifically passed the fees to fund the City Yard building and if they will get to keep the fees once the building is paid off.

Finance Director Pirrie and Assistant City Manager Tudor responded they would have to look into the history to verify those comments. Assistant City Manager Tudor explained how the fees are set and confirmed that the debt service will end, but to keep in mind that other costs will increase. He said other dynamics are involved and going back to the trust issue, City staff wants to ensure these aren't static and said it's simply not a matter of changing one thing for another.

Committee Member Nelipovich noted the Committee understands the "trust" factor and added that if the City can give back the fee increase, they should, and then raise whatever they need to later. It's a matter of perception.

Referring to Committee Member Jocelyn's comments, City Manager Schultz said no one knows if that was actually said and noted that staff will need to research the fee increases and address it. She doesn't want that perception out there if it's an inaccurate statement.

Committee Member Jocelyn said that is the perception of the fee increase and asked if the City will divert that money somewhere else. He said it's a matter of how the City handles its finances overall, not just for this project, and said staff needs to be transparent.

There was further discussion on the perception that's out in the community, on who owns the City Yard building, and if the sanitation lease payments could go toward funding another building, such as the Police station. City Manager Schultz said it would need to be researched.

Committee Member Chute asked for clarification on fees charged for sanitation services and believed it would be a mistake to trade a reduction in sanitation fees in exchange for a vote

on a new police station. He believed the sanitation fees are a separate issue and they should focus on a station.

Chair Magilke disagreed, stating it comes down to trust and if the City isn't a good steward of sanitation funds, how can they be trusted with funding for a new station?

There was discussion on the legalities of refunding fees that haven't been utilized and if a special tax could be imposed for certain services; if the utility tax could be refunded and a new tax imposed; having the Colleges contribute funds; and past changes in legislature requiring a two-thirds majority voter approval, such as the levy of a special tax measure.

Committee Member Chute reminded the Committee that a reduction in revenue may mean cuts to City services. He commented on the structural deficit and the Committee tasked with addressing that issue.

Chair Magilke and Committee Members Jocelyn and Pfau expressed their support for having the City "tighten its belt" in addition to raising taxes. Chair Magilke disagreed with the earlier comment that services would have to be cut and noted the biggest increase in costs was at City Hall.

Committee Member Jones commented on getting back to focusing the direction of the Committee. He echoed Committee Member Jocelyn's comments about using taxpayers' money transparently. He shared that his background is in marketing and part of the reason he's on the Committee. He believed Measure SC should have passed; however, he voted against it because of the funding mechanism. Sharing his observations as a new resident, he believed the previous committee approached the issue with bad messaging in the beginning, which spiraled out of control; and comments he heard from the public were related to the unfair funding mechanism that pitted new residents against longtime residents, residents against businesses and against the Colleges. It was a vicious campaign and he stated he wasn't alone in feeling like it was a personal attack if he didn't support the measure. Committee Member Jones didn't support retrofitting the station, even if it's a cheaper option. He supported having all the information available for the public, a different funding mechanism, and taking a different approach with newer residents. In terms of using money transparently, he believed it's the Committee's task to go out and talk to the community. He commented on voter fatigue and said that it works both ways. Since the majority of the population voted for the previous measure, he believed it comes down to having the right message.

Committee Member Rosacker shared that she was surprised the previous measure didn't pass. Agreed, there's a lot of hope here too. She believed they have a lot of power as voters and is encouraged that the information is being gathered for her own use, as well as for others. In talking to her peers, she agrees that the message needs to be very clear about what's been considered in the past and what this Committee is considering.

Committee Member Sauter shared some of the concerns she's heard from the various meetings she attends such as: 1) having the Committee look at the pros and cons of contracting out with the Sheriff's Department, 2) she commented on material that was provided to the previous Committee in 2016 on a study regarding a lawsuit on the non-profit status of Harvard University and Yale University; 3) some residents supported the parcel tax; 4) some residents opposed a \$50M station; and 5) some residents asked about having some

sort of subsidy for residents' on fixed incomes. She commented on speaking with architects on creative ways to build a station.

Chair Magilke reminded Committee Member Sauter that a police station would have to be built to meet essential services standards.

Committee Member Sauter commented on using modular buildings as a temporary solution while a new station is built or the existing one retrofitted. She commented on Montclair's station and Montclair's tax base.

Chair Magilke invited public comment.

Unidentified speaker commented that the Committee needs to address the unfunded liability issues to get a measure passed. He stated no one wants to contract out with the Sheriff's Department, but it's the City's responsibility to determine what the costs would be. In response to a question from a Committee Member, he said he wouldn't support paying for anything that wouldn't last 40 years, such as radios, furniture, and equipment.

Parker Emerson, resident, said that after hearing the Committee's discussion, it sounds like most of the members are considering moving forward. As a resident who voted for both measures, he believed residents simply need an explanation on the Department's needs and that the Committee should have detailed answers in order to respond to residents' previous questions and concerns with both measures. One of the concerns they can address is what it would cost, including service costs, to contract with the Sheriff's Department. He said it's critical for them to come together to promote their solution and to explain what they considered and why. He commented on the importance of educating the public on the differences between the parcel tax option versus the G.O. Bond and how funding mechanisms work. He charged the Committee with defining the needs of the police station, determining how to fund it, and offering explanations to residents on why they are rejecting other alternatives.

Doug Lyon, resident, noted the Committee had varying opinions on which direction they'd like to go, but that they needed to come together somehow for a clear direction forward. With the first two bond measures, three topics were singled out that presented some challenges for most residents: 1) the facility, 2) the location, and 3) the funding mechanism. He believed the topics need to be addressed, researched, and discussed and suggested thinking outside the box and giving some consideration to forming three sub-committees, one for each topic. They would work independently and on their own efforts, without staff and Brown Act requirements, to gather information to present to the Committee so that it can then be assembled into a complete, coherent package.

Jack Blair, resident, said he disagreed with a comment he heard earlier about a "rumor" that if a resident voted against the \$50M measure, they were harassed. If that's true, he said he wanted to challenge it and said that didn't happen to him and he was at the forefront of opposing that proposal. He believed the residents have a Police Department that they can feel comfortable with no matter how they voted. With regard to contracting with the Sheriff's Department, he said he's been through that and can speak from experience that it's not a contract the City would want to agree to and once they do, it's difficult to get out of. Lastly, he expressed his thanks to the City administration for obtaining the portables from CUSD. He said that's the biggest thing that's happened so far and he's glad to see they're doing something.

There were no further requests to speak.

City Manager Schultz asked if the Committee had a specific direction for staff, or focus on anything in particular. The point of the open conversation was to get a sense of which direction the Committee wanted to go, and with all the discussion, she asked for clarification.

Chair Magilke commented on the Committee's last recommendation to the City Council to look at the current location and the City Yard option. He asked if everyone was still on board with looking at those options.

Committee Member Sauter was opposed to the City Yard option and said they have the report from 2016.

City Manager Schultz stated that the two studies are the next item on agenda, but right now she's looking to see if the Committee had a narrower focus before moving on. She said the original goal was to draft what they might consider a recommendation to the City Council. The financing mechanism would be the next item for consideration; however, it wouldn't be discussed tonight.

City Manager Schultz reiterated the Committee's requests and issues they shared tonight and said staff will work on getting the history out for the public to view, and research the sanitation fees. She asked if they had a starting point to work with, or any questions staff could resolve. Her hope is that with the new City Council, herself included, that the Committee will give them the opportunity to show they are being transparent. She suggested giving some consideration to establishing a Committee, if the measure passes, to look at how the funds are being spent.

Chair Magilke believed it was important to research the costs of contracting with the Sheriff's Department, even if they don't want that option, because there was enough pushback from the community on that issue. City Manager Schultz said that option has not been investigated and Chair Magilke responded the public wants to know why it hasn't been researched. Committee Member Nelipovich said this issue has been expressed through all the measures and believed staff has to make a good faith effort to try to get those answers. City Manager Schultz said if the Committee is still interested in exploring options, staff could do that.

City Manager Schultz believed the conversation on the funding mechanism could be a separate conversation and asked for input on what the Committee would like to focus on tonight.

Committee Member Pfau liked the idea of narrowing their focus down to three areas as suggested earlier. Given that the Committee hadn't been given an opportunity to hear each other's views until tonight, she wanted to know if there was an opportunity for the Committee to see where they're at.

Chair Magilke invited Committee Members' comments on what they would vote for on: 1) the cost of the building voters would approve, 2) the location, and 3) the financing mechanism – Parcel Tax or G.O. Bond. Additionally, he asked what they thought the 10% of the voters they need would vote for.

Committee Member Nelipovich reminded the Committee they haven't discussed item #5 yet or heard any comments from the experts who could give insight.

Committee Member Jocelyn commented on researching the Sheriff's Department as a matter of due diligence, even though that's an option he wouldn't want personally.

Committee Member Keith stated it was premature to vote now because the financing mechanism will be discussed later, believed it's important that residents know about the fee refund, and said he's not in favor of one thing or another at this point. He suggested starting with comparing what the Department has now with what was in the SC proposal, so they'll have the information necessary to explain the Department's needs to residents. He'd also like to see that in the City documents.

City Manager Schultz responded it's similar to Committee Member Chute's program idea. There was further discussion on having a program plan available, so the Committee has a better understanding of what they're working with before moving forward.

City Manager Schultz suggested the Committee focus on the building and location for now. The financing mechanism will be discussed later because they don't know the costs and what they're financing yet. Staff can go back to the architect with the Committee's request and ask if it's possible for them to develop a program based on the previous measure.

There was discussion on how they could move forward with the building before knowing what residents would be willing to pay for; on whether an exact dollar amount is needed; that a dollar amount hasn't been presented yet; that the Committee should focus on material/information that has already been distributed; and that having the information online would be beneficial.

City Manager Schultz listed the top concerns from the survey: The Colleges' contribution, funding mechanism, transparency, design needs, reduce cost and size, and contracting with the Sheriff's Department.

Chair Magilke confirmed the Committee would like to go forward with renovating the current building (\$15k). City Manager Schultz responded they would need to split the two items. Staff will move forward with gathering information on the sanitation fees and reach out to the architect to find out if he can make a presentation on what we currently have and what we would get with a new station.

5. SCOPE OF ADDITIONAL STUDY FOR RETROFITTING EXISTING POLICE STATION AND CITY YARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

City Manager Schultz and Assistant City Manager Tudor gave a PowerPoint presentation. City Manager Schultz noted that City Council authorized staff to move forward with an RFP for occupant safety improvements, which will be brought back to PSCAC on whether they want to move forward. Assistant City Manager Tudor commented on the approach staff will take with the two studies (retrofit and reuse) and said staff's intent is to go through the questions with the Committee that the studies will answer and draft scope details. There is no specific recommendation tonight.

***Committee Member Nelipovich made a motion to authorize City staff to spend \$30K to move forward with both evaluations based on the premise that if either study is found undesirable, no further expense will be allocated to that study.***

After some discussion, Committee Member Nelipovich withdrew his motion.

***Committee Member Jocelyn made a motion to vote on recommending that the City Council appropriate \$15k on the current police station retrofit option; seconded by Committee Member Johnson; and carried on a roll call vote as follows:***

***AYES: Committee Members: Nelipovich, Chute, Burgdorf, Jocelyn, Magilke, Johnson, Pfau, Seven, Rosacker, and Swick***

***NOES: Committee members: Jones, Keith, Gault, and Sauter***

Committee Member Keith stated he supports the \$15k recommendation, but believed they need to insist on something more than just a concept, such as designs and proof that the building would pass seismic standards. What would it cost to design to save the existing station? Additionally, he said he was opposed to building on top of an old, rigid building and would rather have a separate building. They need to know whether it's a nice idea or reality.

City Manager Schultz responded that's not included in the \$15k and that would be a significant cost.

Committee Member Jones stated the majority of residents are posing the question of whether the station can be retrofitted. He doesn't believe the public understands the concept of putting stilts on the existing building and echoed Committee Member Keith's comments. He opposed the retrofitting aspect.

Committee Member Jocelyn stated it's a matter of spending \$15K in order to get more data to make a more informed decision and believed the recommendation is warranted.

Committee Member Seven commented on minutes from a previous Ad Hoc Committee (2016) that stated improvements can be made; however, they will not bring the building to current essential services standards.

Committee Member Jocelyn believed the prior engineer had a conflict of interest.

Committee Member Johnson noted they recently had an earthquake, at their first meeting, and the building is still standing.

Committee Member Keith stated there's no proof of any conflict of interest and believed having that statement thrown out to the public would be detrimental. He said it's possible for professionals to differ. Committee Member Keith believed the public would vote down a building on stilts just as they did when the recommendation was to build a station in the pits (Monte Vista). However, he will support a study on whether the building can be saved.

Committee Member Nelipovich stated there's no change to what the Committee agreed to last time.

Committee Member Jocelyn explained his earlier statement on the conflict of interest and the perception. He believed it's prudent to explore a \$15k option.

Assistant City Manager Tudor explained that the study on retrofit can be done, but not the rest of the conceptual design; it needs further research. However, they will have preliminary details, not the details that Committee Member Keith is looking for.

City Manager Schultz stated there was no guarantee to the previous architect that he was going to get the job. He did the space study and the intent was that it would go to bid. She cautioned on making conflict of interest accusations.

Committee Member Chute requested having the engineers address the risk to the second-floor structure should there be an earthquake and the lower structure be substantially damaged.

Assistant City Manager Tudor highlighted the PowerPoint presentation for Path 5 and responded to questions related to whether a study could also be done for flooding; what the costs in the agenda report entail; if it's possible for the Committee to get copies of a 60-page report from 2014-16; and he commented on the previous proposals. Additionally, City Manager Schultz and Chief Vander Veen responded to questions related to whether there's enough square footage at the City Yard location for what they need, and whether they would have to fill the pit to acquire more land.

***Committee Member Nelipovich moved to approve the \$15K expenditure for the City Yard study; seconded by Committee Member Jocelyn; and carried on a roll call vote as follows:***

***AYES: Committee Members: Jones, Keith, Nelipovich, Chute, Burgdorf, Jocelyn, Magilke, Sauter, Johnson, Pfau, Seven, and Rosacker***

***NOES: Committee Members: Gault and Swick***

Committee Member Chute expressed his support for exploring this option.

Chair Magilke shared that it's the Committee's charge to look at other options. He didn't understand why the City Council pushed it back to them, but it's their responsibility to look at this option.

Chair Magilke adjourned the meeting at 9:11 p.m.

---

Matt Magilke, Chair

ATTEST:

---

Lisa Amaya, Sr. Administrative Assistant