

Volunteer Citizen Based Charter Committee

Meeting 4 – Tuesday, April 29, 2014

Minutes

The meeting came to order at 5:30 p.m. in the EDA board room, with Committee members Dennis Baxter, Gary Walbourne, Hillel Cohn, Michael Craft, Hardy Brown, Phil Savage, Tom Pierce and Gloria Harrison Present. Committee member Casey Dailey was absent. Also in attendance were City Attorney Gary Saenz, City Manager Allen Parker, Facilitator Bill Mathis and City Clerk Gigi Hanna.

Committee chairman Phil Savage called the meeting to order, Clerk Hanna read the roll call and the group recited the pledge of allegiance.

Chair Savage restated the committee's function and obligation to the City Council is to consider any and all possibilities for Charter change and making recommendations to the body by May 19. He said that the committee has made no decisions about what it will recommend to council, despite some concerns expressed to him and others that the committee would be focusing on Charter Section 186.

Additionally, Savage advised Steve Tracy, the fire labor group representative who passed out a document entitled *San Bernardino City Charter Section 186 A Fire Department Perspective*, and was prepared to give a presentation, that he would prefer that the presentation be specifically agendaized for the May 6 meeting to give Tracy sufficient time for his presentation, the committee time to review his report, and the community clear notice that the presentation would take place. The Committee asked that the item will be placed on the May 6 agenda and the Chair also invited those who were in attendance to speak on the topic that they could speak during Public Comment as well. (Tracy's document is attached).

Three people requested to speak at Public Comment:

James Smith, of San Bernardino, said many of have been here for previous ballot measures and the track record hasn't been all that good. As a city we just went through a recall election where the city moved forward and the perception out there of what is happening in the city is positive. He said it was his strong feeling that what this committee needs to do is a campaign to recall the Charter and start from scratch with a basic three or four page Charter, given the timeline.

Kenneth Konoir, a firefighter/paramedic with the SBFDD for about eight years, said Committee member Walbourne had seen the information he'd put out on social media and invited him to speak to the committee. He said he was there to introduce the committee to the Fire Department employee perspective on Section 186. He said San Bernardino City doesn't exist in a vacuum;

the city competes with local cities, such as Redlands and Rialto, for qualified public safety employees. He said that was the very issue city policymakers were addressing in 1939 when they added Section 181a, for police, and in 1959, when Section 186 was added, to address attrition of fire personnel. He said that one of the points of Section 186 was to remove the politics from the issue of salary, to base pay on research and facts rather than someone's opinion or political agenda. He asked the committee to keep an open mind when reviewing the information and develop questions for the fire department employee group for next week, so that the group can answer all of the issues in the proper context and the city doesn't end up spending a lot of time and money to end up back where we were 60 years ago.

Steve Tracy, executive board member of the San Bernardino Professional Firefighters Association, said they had planned to do their presentation that night and questioned whether it was allowed under Action Item #3. He said he wanted to respond to the City Manager's comment at the April 22 meeting that the fire union had not come to the table or been cooperating with the city in negotiations. He said his group wants to help the city get through the fiscal crisis, that members are concerned and care about the citizens of the city and are willing able and ready to work with the city, but the process has to be transparent, fair and equitable.

Action Item #1: Approval of the minutes for meeting three.

The committee unanimously approved the minutes of meeting three.

Action Item #2: Follow-up on Committee Requests to City Manager from 4/22 meeting.

One speaker asked to speak on item 2:

Scott Olson said that if members of the public are going to speak on an agenda item, they should have the advantage of knowing where the committee members stood on an agenda item before speaking, but with the public comments listed before the items, they cannot do that. He also said that the idea of switching from odd-numbered election year to even to save money may sound great on paper, but that local candidates will get lost at the end of a ballot full of federal, state, and county races. The benefit of odd numbered years is you get to interact with residents of your city about those issues related to San Bernardino – you don't have to worry about who is running for president, taking precedent over what you want the voters to consider, he said. He said there is potential to lose even more interest in local elections by such a move and said that if (the elections of) 2013 showed you anything, it is that you have the ability to get citizens involved.

City Manager Parker passed out a packet of information addressing committee requests for information at the previous meeting: *Fire Department Incident Counts*; *Section 186 Salary Survey Comparison Cities (2006-Current)*; *Summary of Charter City Provisions Establishing Employee Salaries and Benefits*; *10-year Attrition Report for Police and Fire Sworn Staff*; *10-*

year History of Salaries for General Fund Departments (Budgeted vs. Actual); Calendar Year 2013 description of Fire and Police Safety Overtime (Documents attached).

Action Item #3: Input from department heads, city commissioners, employee groups, and City Manager on Charter changes that will most help the City financially.

- **Regarding Human Resources and Police Officers Association mutually agreeable language modifications in Charter Section 186:**

Parker said that as late as this afternoon, there had been no agreement as to specific language. The situation is complicated he said because the City is in mediation in the group, and there is a gag order from mediator. At the same time, the City is in in contract negotiations/collective bargaining procedure, making it difficult for the POA to accede to a language change without understanding what else is on the table in negotiation and mediation. He said he may have mutually agreeable language prepared for the next Charter committee meeting, but there may be no proposal from police and he said he was reluctant to unilaterally give the committee his opinion on the matter.

- **Regarding clean-up language concerning the school district:**

Saenz said the school district is no longer governed by the city although Charter language would indicate otherwise. The committee's concern regarding that sections specifically, Article 11, indicates that the school district is governed by the council and the city are outdated and inappropriate. That's the info to that section, but there are a number of sections also outdated, including section 40 (1) hospitals, pest houses and slaughter and provide for their removal and discontinuance. They are numerous, a section regarding the ex officio assessor and tax collector, at certain times (sales and property taxes) to be collected by the city clerk, the chief of police will act as property tax collector. A number of sections are outdated and obsolete, but I don't believe this committee has enough time to study those and place them on the November ballot. He said he'd go through them and provide a report on them, but it is something the committee should consider in the later category.

The entire section on the school district could probably be wiped out completely, Saenz said. Savage said that it was previously thought that the section would be easy to get rid of, but wanted to know if the school district had any reason that it should not be removed. A call to school district officials seeking input had not been returned by the time of the meeting.

Michael Craft asked if the city had any ability to receive a report from the school district listing the graduation rate, trends, etc., because he would want that information and wonder why the city didn't have an input since it owns the building, could we have a report from the school district to the mayor and council? Committee member Brown said you could request the information, but cannot demand it.

Pierce said the clean-up language for the school board is in the committee's "now" bucket and asked if the information from the school district could be provided prior to the May 19 deadline. Savage said that taking the clause in or out of the Charter does not meet the committee's criteria of saving money and questioned whether it should be placed in the "later" bucket for consideration.

Saenz agreed to generate a list of all the antiquated language in the Charter to present to the committee.

- **Regarding Civil Service clean-up language to Section 254:**

Parker passed out a document with the current language of Section 254, and options for two proposed changes to the language to the section. (Document attached), as forwarded to him by Civil Service. In the Charter today, the language does not allow an employee to be terminated or reduced in rank without a hearing before the appeals board, which can take as long as six months, with the employee receiving pay, even if the decision is ultimately upheld, Parker said

Option One removes the language from Section 254; Option two revises the language.

Pierce asked the difference between the two options and asked which option dealt with the previously stated problem in Section 254. Craft said he preferred Option 1 because it sets forth that steps the city and the employee must take, and asked what the Civil Service board response was to the proposals.

Rebekah Kramer, chief examiner for Civil Service, said the Civil Service board had not had a chance to go through the Charter to make specific recommendations for change, but that either option presented essentially say the same thing, although Option Two is more abbreviated. Brown said it was important for employees to understand fully what was happening before being terminated or disciplined. Kramer said she was in absolute agreement.

Walbourne asked Parker how much the change to that Charter section would save, but he said he could not quantify it at this time.

- **Regarding the issue of elections,** Clerk Hanna said it is unclear that a move to even-year elections would save any more money than has already been saved with efficiencies put in place over the past three years at the County Registrar of Voters level.

The issue may be more about increasing voter turnout than saving money, she said.

By scheduling local elections that have had traditionally low turnout on the same date as statewide primaries or general elections with their much higher voter turnout, there is reason to believe that the number of local ballots cast could almost immediately increase to levels nearly on par with these broader elections, *although there is likely to be some voter roll-off for voting in local elections*, according to several studies published on the subject. (Report attached)

Hanna said the researchers also named some potential consequences of moving to even year elections:

- On-cycle local elections might mean that more citizens with only limited knowledge of and interest in local elections would vote in local contests;
- Coupling of local elections with national or statewide contests would also lead to longer, more complex ballots that might increase voter confusion.
- On-cycle contests could draw attention away from local politics.
- Coupling local elections with national contests could lead to partisan politics playing a larger role in local elections.

Locally, an issue to consider is whether the County Board of Supervisors would allow the city to consolidate with its even-year elections, she said. The city must ask permission to consolidate with the County on even-year elections, and the County Board of Supervisors could refuse, which it did recently, when a special district asked to do the same. The issue, according to the County Registrar of Voters, is having a ballot so complex it goes to a three-card ballot, something the county has been trying to avoid (It takes ballots to be printed from 1.2 million pieces to 1.8 million pieces).

Additionally, she had found no studies regarding the effect of even-year elections on local candidates' races or bond measures—which was requested by the committee. Based on these factors, Hanna said she could not recommend language changes regarding even or odd year elections without further study.

She said the idea of keeping the primary municipal election in the same year as the general, something she thought might address the issue of voter fatigue, would require moving the primary election from November to earlier in the year in order to meet the state election code requirements. This could happen, but the matter would take more study and Hanna suggested that this, too, be considered later.

Hanna said she'd asked the City Attorney's office to draft potential Charter language that would have the City of San Bernardino follow the Elections Code for initiatives, referendum and recalls. She said the need for alignment between the city documents and the state election code became painfully clear during the recall campaign last year, when the language in the Charter, the Election Code and the Municipal Code made it impossible to meet the requirements of all. The result was a costly court case wherein the city's outside legal counsel lost, largely based on its interpretation of the unclear Charter language. The city's legal bill for that was more than \$200,000.

The language in the Charter is already based on the California Elections Code, of 1966. While the Elections Code has been updated many times since then, the City Charter has not. Hanna said it would behoove the city to include the state election Code language used by other Charter Cities, specifically the City of Anaheim, for the same purpose.

She passed out the recommended language change for Section 120, which would need to be amended, and Sections 121 and 121 would need to be repealed:

Section 120. Initiative, Referendum and Recall.

There are hereby reserved to the electors of the City the powers of the initiative and referendum and of the recall of municipal elective officers. The provisions of the Elections Code of the State of California, as the same now exist or hereafter may be amended, governing the initiative and referendum and the recall of municipal officers, shall apply to the use thereof in the City so far as such provisions of the Elections Code are not in conflict with the provisions of this Charter.

She said the, under the proposed language, the City would be replacing three sections in the current Charter with ambiguous language about initiatives, referendum and recalls with a paragraph that essentially says the city will follow the state's election code.

Chair Savage asked for a motion to broaden the language on the committee's topics list section regarding elections to include consideration of the language change for Section 120. Dennis Baxter made the motion, seconded by Craft and the motion passed unanimously.

Action Item #4: Entertain additional specific proposals from Committee members for Charter review

A memo provided to the committee by member Brown was read into the record by his grandson:

As a continuation of last meeting where we set our agenda topics for priority setting, I have the following thoughts. But before I give those I want to thank you as a committee, Councilman Rikke Van Johnson and the public for your patience and understanding of my speech disability as a result of ALS better known as Lou Gehrig Disease. That is why I am taking the time to study our agenda and reducing my thoughts to paper. I also want to thank my son and grandson for assisting me to and during the meetings.

While thinking of people with a disability I have identified some things the city will need to address so people with disabilities can move about the city with minimum help. Many sidewalks in our city need sloping for wheel or power chair access and the restroom across the hallway needs modification. I mention the disable because our elected policy makers need as much independency and not be locked in by a Charter that ties their hand such as section 186. I want to address in reverse order than we have them listed on the agenda because of my limited speaking ability.

6. Another reason for repealing Section 186 is it does not give equal opportunity of salary consideration to all city employees, in my opinion. And, if we have a problem with recruiting people in our public safety positions, I would like to hear

that from our HR staff and the reasons as to why. This is not the function of any employee association. While they can act in an advisory role to the city it is the responsibility of HR to give the evidence, from my experience as a recruitment manager at Kaiser. Let me ask you a question as a taxpayer; are you willing to give all employees this section 186 provision? I know that Mr. Parker is to give us some language to amend section 186 that has been negotiated between him and the association but is that fair to all of the other employee groups that would like to do the same for their members. It is our responsibility to provide some guidance to the council and citizens in the city.

We just went through an election that the voters said they wanted a change in our direction and 186 was a part of that change at least from the people I have interacted with. Not to amend or change but repeal.

In my humble opinion other service such as well-lit streets, trash being removed from our streets, timely trimmed trees, clean parks for families and children to play, library's for research, a positive image that keeps and attract other businesses are equally important to reducing and combating crime. This is only possible if our elected officials can act in their decision making capacity without a Charter tying their hands.

The city of Los Angeles recently was starring a \$10 million dollar law suit in its face because of its failure to comply or making an effort to meet its legal obligation under Disability federal law. This is another example of why our Charter must not contain automatic-pilot salary guarantees without negotiation.

From my personal, education and professional work experience as a Human Resource Manager for 25 years, a school board trustee for 12 years, a volunteer of 4 year on the county civil service commission, nine years on the school district classified personnel commission, a city police commissioner, plus a discrimination law certificate from the University of Southern California School of Law and a certificate on California Merit System gives me a broad understanding of these issues.

5. In addition I have also managed a few city and statewide elections in this city and am familiar with voter turn-out during odd and even years. That is why I am in favor of even years for election.

4. Based on last week's presentation I see value to transferring the sewer collection and rate setting over to the water board.

3. Unless I misunderstood the information of last week presented to us on the civil service board the commissioners through adopting new policies and procedures can correct the problems that were presented.

2. The Charter view committee should be an on-going established committee, since changes to the Charter is regulated by laws established in our state constitution.

When I served on the school board I do not recall any impact on its decision came from the city.

One last thing that I want to bring as a cost saving item to the city, over the past 15 years I have had to use 911 for medical emergency care. Each time they would send a fire engine with three or four fire fighters that do nothing as related to performing care to me as a patient. It was so noticeable last time that one of the Medical Emergency Technician in the ambulance commented to the other, why are they here to get in the way. I even had the Tech tell my wife of his concern. I do not know if this is something that goes with 186 in the Charter or some cost saving item the council should look into with their policy.

Again I want to thank you for being patience and understanding with my situation as a member.

Hardy Brown

Savage asked if other members had specific proposals for review and Craft submitted a proposal for Continuous Charter Review, which was included in the Committee Members' packets:

The Mayor and City Council shall appoint a volunteer based committee in January of odd- numbered years to review and suggest revisions to the Charter for the City of San Bernardino. The purpose of assembling the committee in January of an odd numbered year is to allow the committee sufficient time to consider the whole Charter, create recommendations to the Mayor and Common Council, and allow the Mayor and Common Council the opportunity to discuss/debate the proposals and vote on them for the even number year November ballot.

The committee shall be comprised of one person representing each ward of the city; while the mayor shall appoint two citizens to the San Bernardino City Charter Committee.

Upon the first meeting of the committee, a chairperson will be elected by the committee. The chairperson will not vote, except in the event of a tie vote. The chair will guide the group's discussions and keep them on topic and on schedule.

The committee will comply with all open meeting laws for the State of California. They also will utilize Robert's Rules of Order as they conduct their meetings.

Savage said he appreciated the language and it is on the bucket list and will be discussed.

Savage said, under Topic One, Priority Six, Discussion of Section 186, there is language saying we should deal with allowing cross-training of police and fire. That issue goes way beyond 186 and he asked that they segregate that out of the discussion of 186.

Savage suggested adding the following items to the topics list for discussion and the committee concurred:

- Interpretation language that enables the Council rather than restrict it in using its discretion, to be listed as priority Item 1A.
- The two petitions filed with the city regarding citizen-led initiatives for Charter change; one using a similar formulas as the one in Section 186 to determine employee benefits; and the other to add anti-corruption language to the Charter, listed as priority items 29 and 30.
- A proposal for private economic zones, received from Upland Attorney Brian G. Hannemann. (Document attached)
- A proposal that pension increases only be allowed after a vote of the people.

Savage passed out a document entitled *San Bernardino Charter Reform Principle & Objectives 4/29/2014* (Document attached) and said it should be on the committee's topics list as part of the now bucket. He said that previous Charter committees had worked without guidelines for specific direction and he thought the committee could recommend to the Council that these are the principles the committee wishes to follow, to get the council to approve that and put it in front of the public, as a sort of plebiscite, to see if the public thinks it makes sense. He said he feels the structure of the city's government is its biggest issue and needs to be revised, with the city moving toward a strong manager/council form of government. He said his document is based on the Anaheim Charter Review Guidelines (passed out at the first meeting), modified for San Bernardino.

Walbourne said that the Charters they had reviewed, specifically the Anaheim and the Riverside Charters, had a weak mayor and suggested that changing from the city's strong mayor to a council/manager form of government would save the city the mayor's salary. Craft said that what

he likes in the Anaheim and Riverside Charters are that the responsibilities of the City Manager, Mayor and City Attorney are clearly stated and is something San Bernardino needs to do. He also expressed his concern that the committee hadn't yet made a decision about what to recommend to the council. He doesn't need to pile more onto the now bucket and move forward.

Savage said he appreciated the thought, but would suggest that the last item be placed in the now bucket so that the committee can get something to the public, then we would have a lot more certainty from the public about the way the committee should be going in the future. He suggested that the group get topics on the list and prioritize them later.

There was discussion among the committee members about the shortness of time left before they are due to make a presentation and the lack of decisions made yet, although there is expectation from the community that they do so. There was agreement that the committee could take actions on issues besides Section 186, which the committee had already agreed they would not vote on until the employee groups had a chance to make their presentations, on May 6.

Baxter asked if there was any sense among the group about the need to dump the entire Charter. Mathis said there was a certain way to move forward, and that is to put a motion on the table. Brown suggested not lessening the power of the mayor because in the times of crisis, people will call on the mayor, not the city manager, for answers.

Parker said if the group decides to throw out the Charter, that there would need to be a replacement Charter in place to avoid anarchy. He said there were some issues to consider if the city were to go to a general law city, including the loss of utility users tax.

5. Discuss and deal with “now” vs. “later” categorization and priority of consideration of Charter change topics amongst the “now” category.

Savage suggested adding the following items to the topics list for discussion and the committee concurred:

- Broaden Topic 2 to include simplifying the language regarding recall, referendum and initiative and keep it in the Now bucket.
- Put Topic 1, Priority 6 (Section 186) over to the May 6 meeting for consideration. The motion was made by Craft, seconded by Baxter, and passed unanimously.
- Add language to deal with combining the fire department and police department training and add to Topic 1, priority 6 (Section 186).
- Add the interpretation language from the City Attorney office that enables the Council rather than restrict it in using its discretion, to be listed as priority Item 1A, and prioritize it in the Now bucket.

- The two petitions filed with the city regarding citizen-led initiatives for Charter change; one using a similar formulas as the one in Section 186 to determine employee benefits; and the other to add anti-corruption language to the Charter, listed as priority items 29 and 30.
- A proposal for private economic zones, received from Upland Attorney Brian G. Hannemann (Document attached), to be listed as priority item 31.
- Pension increases can only take place via vote of the people, to be listed as priority item 32.

6. Discussion and consideration of the Charter discussion topics in order of their priorities

One person asked to speak during public comment for this item.

Scott Olson: The recall and everything connected with it was political. For the committee to come up with Section 186 as the number one item on its priority list puts the committee in danger of being accused of being political. The committee cannot substantiate or document that the City will save money (in altering Section 186) because you have no idea what the police and fire unions are going to do when it comes to negotiations. The city could very easily find itself negotiated into higher salaries and lose money; At least 186 there is a benchmark. Why in the middle of mediation and bankruptcy would the committee get into such a political mess when it is not the stated goal of any here? The last Charter changes on the ballot were political in nature. All revolved around giving the mayor more power, by giving him the ability to appoint the city attorney, clerk and treasurer. He said the proposed suggested change to the referendum, recall and initiative language in the Charter is preferable because it is basic clean-up and shows the public that Charter change is not political.

The committee voted to:

- Endorse removing the language from the Charter regarding the school district. The motion was made by Cohn, seconded by Baxter and passed unanimously. (Topic 17, Priority 1).
- Approve the language submitted by the City Attorney to enable rather than restrict the council in its interpretation of the Charter. The motion was made by Cohn, seconded by Craft and passed unanimously. It was added to the topic list as Item 1A.
- Recommend ongoing review by the city Charter committee and make it a city council policy to have ongoing Charter review. The motion was made by Baxter, seconded by Walbourne and passed unanimously

- Accept Option 2 of the proposed revision to Civil Service language in concept (Topic 27, priority 3). The motion was made by Walbourne, seconded by Baxter and passed unanimously.
- Defer consideration of Topic 28, priority 4 (Water Department), to a future meeting. The motion was made by Cohn, seconded by Baxter and passed unanimously.
- Accept the proposed language change on Charter Section 120, and elimination of sections 121 and 122. The proposed language was added to Topic 2, Priority 5 (Elections). The motion was made by Pierce, seconded by Harrison and passed unanimously.
- Defer discussion of Section 186 until the May 6 meeting. The motion was made by Craft, seconded by Baxter and passed unanimously.
- To recommend the principles passed out by Phil Savage be adopted by the Council as a policy to be applied for future Charter review. The motion was made by Harrison, seconded by Baxter.

There was extensive discussion of this item before the vote: Savage reintroduced the subject of his handout and asked whether the committee agreed that the city should be moving toward a manager/council form of government, Item One on his list of principles. Pierce said he was not comfortable making a recommendation to the council about the form of government without having studied the issue more extensively. Harrison said she agreed with the principles and suggested the committee adopt Items 2-7, removing Item One. She read items 2-7:

2. **Flexibility.** To the greatest degree possible, the City Manager & Council should have the flexibility to make decisions and to govern the City under the Charter. Removing excessive limitations on that flexibility should be opportunities to improve governance.
3. **Economy.** The Charter should be as economical in wording as possible while keeping the meaning and legal parameters clear.
4. **Future Orientation.** The Charter should be worded so as to apply to future City administrations, not just to deal with current issues.
5. **Contemporary Standards.** Language, such as gender neutrality, should be in conformance with contemporary standards.
6. **Transparency.** The Charter should be clear to the well-informed layperson, not excessively legalistic. The Charter is to be a way that the public can understand how the City operates, and the powers and limitations of those who govern it.
7. **Charter Reform Process.** The Charter Review Committee working to advise the City Council should utilize the following principles:
 - 7.1 Input from those working within the City family should be sought out as those who work in city government have a unique perspective on the Charter.
 - 7.2 San Bernardino's Charter should be uniquely adapted for this City and its needs.
 - 7.3 Charters of other Cities should be reviewed and taken into account. Other cities have weighed, considered and analyzed many of the same issues as those confronting San Bernardino.
 - 7.4 The Committee should seek wide and diverse input and evoke debate and welcome disagreement in its deliberations; however, it should attempt to obtain wide consensus for its recommendations. Charter changes should be able to draw wider support from the community than is normally required to win an election.
 - 7.5 Ongoing, frequent, regular reviews of San Bernardino's Charter should be made to the end that it will be, and continue to be an effective, well written, and well organized document.

The City Manager suggested that the language under Item 2 (Flexibility), be altered to include "...the Mayor, City Manager and Council should ...". Harrison agreed and amended her original motion to include the change: To recommend principles 2-7 be adopted by the Council, with the addition of the word "Mayor" be added to Item 2, as a policy to be applied for future Charter review. It was seconded by Baxter and passed unanimously.

Committee members asked the City Manager to make a recommendation about the city manager/council form of government.

Parker said that Charter Section 40 of the Charter (Powers of Mayor and Common Council), gives ultimate authority to the council, with a weak mayor/weak manager form of government because all the power ultimately is vested in the city council. Ultimately, the question comes down to personalities, rather than the form of government. A city manager form of government does not guarantee a better form of government, he said, adding that he didn't think he should comment on which form is the best form of government.

He said taking that issue to the council would likely be a highly political discussion that could divert the conversation of the city's needs over the next few years and be very divisive at this time.

Savage said the issue will stay in the committee's later bucket until after the initial report to the council.

Parker said the issues the committee sees now are a result of a dysfunctional Charter and a dysfunctional finance system. He said that the city would be receiving two past-due audits in the coming weeks, which would delineate where funds were spent. The city is behind on audits, which would normally be completed in a matter of a few months. He said the budget hearing process in the past has also been far shorter than is normal. He expects several sessions in the coming month to address the budget with the council and to create a budget based on its priorities, but backed up with line-item budgeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m. The next meeting is set for 5:30 p.m. Tuesday, May 06, 2014 in the EDA board room.