



West Cities Police Communications Center Joint Powers Authority

MINUTES OF THE WEST CITIES POLICE COMMUNICATIONS CENTER SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS March 9, 2010

CALL TO ORDER

A Special Meeting of the West-Comm Board of Directors was called to order at 4:40 pm on Tuesday, March 9, 2010, in the training room of the Seal Beach Police Department, 911 Seal Beach Boulevard, Seal Beach, California, by Chairperson Todd Seymore.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT:

Board of Directors:

Chairperson – Todd Seymore, City of Cypress
Board Member – Marilyn Poe, City of Los Alamitos
Board Member – David Sloan, City of Seal Beach

Administrative Oversight Staff:

John Bahorski, City Manager, City of Cypress
Jeffrey Stewart, City Manager, City of Los Alamitos
David Carmany, City Manager, City of Seal Beach

Technical Operations Committee:

Mark Yokoyama, Chief of Police, City of Cypress
Todd Mattern, Chief of Police, City of Los Alamitos
Jeff Kirkpatrick, Chief of Police, City of Seal Beach

Treasurer:

Richard Storey, Director Personnel & Finance, City of Cypress

Secretary:

Lisa Barr, Dispatch Administrator, West-Comm

General Counsel:

Michael Morguess, General Counsel, Colantuono & Levin

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 17, 2009, was tabled due to the change in the Board of Directors representative for Seal Beach and the absence of Ms. Poe at the November 17, 2009 meeting. Ms. Barr will contact Mr. Levitt for a written approval of the minutes.

Mr. Seymore requested to make a statement. In reference to comments that were made at the last JPA Board Meeting, Mr. Seymore apologized for his comment and indicated that this was not in his character.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

No member of the public was present for Oral Communications.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

BOARD ITEMS AND REPORTS

NEW BUSINESS

Agenda Item #1 – Treasurer's Reports

Mr. Richard Storey presented the Quarterly Financial Reports for the period ending December 31, 2009. He noted that the bottom line showed that the budget is approximately where it is expected to be at this time. He explained that Personnel Costs are just under 49% and overall the budget is just under 50%. He further explained that some items were at a higher level but explained this is because they are encumbered contracts that have already been paid for the year. An example of this would be the Public Liability Insurance, which has already been paid, therefore showing at a higher level.

Mr. Storey explained that the Income Balance Sheet is also where it is expected to be. He reiterated as pointed out last quarter that the amount reserved for Capital Replacement is the one area that is down further than what was hoped for.

At this point, Mr. Storey asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Seymore questioned if the budget was on track and Mr. Storey assured him that the budget was currently on track.

Mr. Seymore asked what the outlook for the agency was in regards to the overtime. Mr. Storey explained that in filling vacancies, there is a savings in regular salaries. He pointed out that regular salaries were at 44% which offsets the overtime

expenditures. He also indicated that administrative adjustments were made in the budget including \$11,000 from salary savings in vacant positions and \$5,000 in fringe. He also noted that based on figures for February 2010, the budget was where it was expected to be when factoring in vacancies and overtime.

Mr. Carmany questioned the net increase in the fund balance of \$150,000 and asked how it compared to prior years. Mr. Storey explained that that fund balance grows at this time because of the way the contract is written, West-Comm collects 35% and then 25% so there are more funds coming in at the beginning of the year than at the end of the year. He noted that by the end of the year, usually the only amount that is left in the fund is what is gained in Capital Replacement or in the Fringe Account involving building up the sick leave, vacation and other payroll accounts.

With no further questions Ms. Poe made a motion to receive and file the Quarterly Financial Statements and Mr. Seymore seconded the motion.

Motion Passed. Report received and filed.

Aye: Poe, Seymore, Sloan
Nay: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Agenda Item #2 – Proposed Budget FY 2010/11

Ms. Barr indicated that the Board had been presented with a Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 and reminded the Board that they had received a preliminary proposal in November. She noted that there had been several changes and adjustments since that preliminary budget was presented including the cost of insurance. She explained that CJPIA has proposed to change their funding model which would result in an increase in the premium and a change from a rolling retro plan to a prospective format. Ms. Barr indicated that the decrease that was anticipated in insurance costs would not be seen should this new proposal be adopted. She noted that these changes are still being voted on by CJPIA.

Mr. Seymore asked if the anticipated increase in liability was known and Ms. Barr indicated that it was included in the proposal. Mr. Stewart commented that the amount was \$37,000 and Ms. Barr further explained that with what was already budgeted, the increase in the amount that will need to be paid would be approximately \$15,000. She indicated that the biggest change is that historically, this liability has been funded through the fund balance with the anticipation that the agency would eventually realize a decrease. Since this is no longer expected if the proposed change is passed, Mr. Storey and the City Managers feel that it is better that this expense no longer be funded through the Fund Balance.

Ms. Barr indicated that the other major increase would be in the computer software and hardware. She noted that because of the lack of funds for replacement of some of the older equipment, it was planned to extend warranties and try to extend the lifetime of many of the computer components. She explained that this would show as an increase in the computer software and hardware line item but that it would balance out as opposed to taking the money out of the equipment account.

Ms. Barr went on to explain that there were some minor increases in telephone costs in the amount of \$420.

Ms. Barr explained that the largest increase in the budget, as always are the Personnel Costs. She indicated that the majority of the Personnel Cost increases have to do with the negotiated salary increases.

Ms. Barr stated that the bottom line, with regards to the Member Contributions, is a 6.8% increase, and that a good portion of this increase comes from the absence of the expected reduction to Member Contributions from other forms of revenue. With that, Ms. Barr asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Poe indicated that although it was understood where these increases were coming from and the reason for the increases, she did not see how her city was going to be able to afford this increase. She asked for any comments from City Manager Stewart who did not have any comments at this time. Ms. Poe noted that Los Alamitos was looking at an increase equal to one staff member's salary and that the city was already understaffed. She commented that she did not know how the other cities could handle this increase.

Mr. Carmany commented that although his city's revenues were down this year as well and that the operating departments had made corresponding reductions to keep the budget within balance, but that this increase would not be a problem for Seal Beach. He noted that he was happy with the way the budget was presented and indicated that his actual concern was that items are understated with regards to the needs for replacement of Capital Equipment. He noted that although there is concern of some of the member agencies ability to pay, his preference would be to increase contributions to better provide for the event of equipment failure and that there should be a better plan for reserve replacement.

Mr. Stewart asked what the total increase to the budget would be and Ms. Barr replied that the total increase to the budget is only 3.72%. Mr. Seymore clarified that the increase to member contributions was 6.8% and indicated that the City of Cypress had run their budget with only an increase of 1% for an entire city. He commented that as the largest of the JPA agencies with 45.3% of the membership contribution, the increase equates to one police officer for the city. He indicated that he understands what is being expressed with regards to the Capital Improvements and Equipment, but with regards to Cypress, a 6.8% increase is unacceptable. He

noted that he has asked many questions of Mr. Storey and over the life of the JPA, there was been a 67% increase. He compared this to the fact that inflation has only gone up 24%. He pointed to the imbalances in these numbers and indicated that things needed to be looked at. He explained that all departments have been asked to make cuts and that everyone is at "bare-bones" in their budgets. He confirmed that the entire budget increase, including salary increases, for the City of Cypress is only 1%. Mr. Stewart commented that the situation was worse for the City of Los Alamitos in that they were being asked to go back on Monday and recommend another \$600,000 worth of cuts from the general fund budget. He further indicated that in a year, when there is negative CPI growth, that it was going to be difficult to justify this 6.8% increase.

Ms. Barr indicated that she understood these concerns and that she was open to any suggestions that anyone may have with regards to the budget. She reiterated that the budget itself was up 3.72% and that was primarily from personnel costs as everything else has been cut and cut confirming what Mr. Carmany had indicated. Ms. Barr pointed out that supplies and services only increased by 0.86% and that the remainder of the increase was personnel costs at 3.92%. She further explained that this increase is due to the lack of reduction to the Member Contributions which results in the 6.8% increase. Mr. Stewart confirmed that this lack of decrease to the member contributions had to do with not using the reserves and Ms. Barr confirmed that this was correct. She noted that the Interest Income and P.O.S.T. reimbursements were down in addition to the fact that there was no increase from the Orange County Parks contract. She noted that there is a possibility of an increase from the Orange County Parks contract in January 2011, but this amount will not be known until the contract is renewed. Mr. Seymore asked how the contract works for the Orange County Parks and how their contribution is increased or if it automatically increases. Ms. Barr explained that built into the contract is an increase based upon the CPI at the end of April. She noted that in the previous year, there was no increase however in prior years, there were increases up to the maximum increase of 5% per their contract. Mr. Seymore commented that this corresponded with the downturn in the economy and that we probably wouldn't see an increase from the OC Parks contract this year either. Ms. Barr stated that there may be a slight increase and that the CPI has been rising slowly. Mr. Storey indicated that the CPI had negative growth last year and that in April, we would expect to see a probable 2% increase in the CPI at that time. Ms. Barr clarified that the increase is based on the June CPI.

Ms. Barr went on to note that \$7,500 is a very low amount of investment earnings especially when the agency has been realizing \$30,000 to as high as \$50,000 in investment earnings. She reiterated that P.O.S.T. and State reimbursements are down for multiple reasons including the State cutting back on reimbursements and due to the decrease in the number of people being sent to training the agency isn't receiving as much reimbursement. Ms. Barr indicated that there is no other source of revenue and pointed out that if there was another source of revenue, then the member contributions would be reduced.

Mr. Stewart asked to confirm that the two decisions facing the Board at this time were to continue on the path of not spending the reserve to balance the budget which would make the member contributions go up and that the second part is to determine what the appropriate level of contributions should be. Ms. Barr confirmed that these are the two decisions that need to be made.

Mr. Seymore indicated that, in discussion with City of Cypress staff members, it is felt that creativity is needed in how employees are scheduled, how overtime is handled and how much overtime is spent. He cited the example of the Cypress Police Department 19,000 hours of overtime being cut to 5,000 hours of overtime due to creativity by Chief Yokoyama. Mr. Seymore indicated that he felt that this issue needed to be given back to Ms. Barr and ideas and scenarios needed to be presented to get the Member Contributions down to a 2 to 3% increase.

Mr. Sloan indicated that he did not see where any additional cuts could be made. Mr. Stewart also commented regarding the changes that have taken place since the last meeting regarding the pending decision by CJPIA to discontinue the rolling retro formula. He stated that he felt that another look needed to be taken at the budget and that the City Managers needed to review it further.

Mr. Seymore once again indicated how large of a "hit" this would be and noted that the City of Cypress cannot afford a \$65,000 increase to their Member Contributions which would put them at over 1 million dollars in contributions to the JPA. He stated that the City just does not have the revenue as the sales tax revenue is down approximately 16% this quarter with more decreases anticipated. Mr. Seymore and Ms. Poe both indicated that it is only going to get worse and Mr. Seymore commented that he did not feel that we have seen the bottom of this economic downturn. He also noted that it would eventually get better and when it did, things would be brought back, but in the present time, creativity is needed in how things are done. Ms. Barr indicated that alternative ideas were requested from her at the last Board Meeting and a report was submitted to the City Managers in regards to overtime and scheduling including what other agencies are doing. She explained that she surveyed like-size agencies and found that their budgets are running at a million dollars to operate a single agency communications center. She explained to the Board that the decision would need to be made with regards to cutting staffing because that is the only place that any changes could be made. She asked Mr. Storey to concur that there was no other place that cuts could be made.

Mr. Bahorski interjected that he felt that a false assumption was being set and that the Board must set a policy as to where this issue should go and what is to be required of Ms. Barr. He recommended that the Board set forth what they wanted the Member Contributions to be and then that goal would be attempted to be reached. He indicated that the same argument has been aired over the past several meetings and that the Board needs to engage in some policy discussion to direct

Ms. Barr and the City Mangers. He indicated that he felt that it was a “red herring” to automatically say that people need to leave and that he felt that was wrong.

Ms. Barr apologized and tried to explain that by cutting staffing she meant to adjust staffing levels and cut overtime, Mr. Bahorski interrupted and indicated that he did not want to attempt to solve the issue now. Mr. Seymore stated that he did not want to try and say what needed to be changed at this time but that the issue needed to continue to be reviewed at this time.

Mr. Seymore advised that his personal opinion was that the Member Contribution needed to be at 2 to 3% and that 2 to 2 1/2% would be best. He requested that scenarios be presented to the Board at another Special Meeting that would address this issue sooner than later.

Ms. Poe questioned the indication that there was no other revenue. She asked about other agencies, cities, or counties that charge a fee for 9-1-1 calls. Ms. Barr confirmed that some counties and some cities do charge a fee for this service. Ms. Poe asked if this had ever been a consideration for the JPA. Ms. Barr advised that it had not been discussed by the JPA and explained that there are definite negative aspects to this practice as perceived by the public since they are already being taxed and pay for 9-1-1 service through their phone company and phone bill. She explained that this was the complaint of the public in regards to this practice.

Mr. Seymore asked if the JPA receives any of that money that is charged in the 9-1-1 service fee on the phone bill. Ms. Barr indicated that it is received every five years from the state. Mr. Seymore further questioned if the phone company paid the state and the state, in turn, paid the agencies and Ms. Barr confirmed this was correct. Ms. Barr further explained that the money is received in relation to 9-1-1 call volume. She went on to describe how the state uses the call volume information to determine how many 9-1-1 positions are needed by the JPA. When the funding level is determined, the State mandates how it can be used with regard to items and equipment that pertain specifically to 9-1-1 answering services. The funding cannot be used on any personnel costs. Ms. Barr indicated that, in the past the funds have been used to upgrade the telephone system. Mr. Seymore asked if the funds were used in the comm center remodel and Ms. Barr indicated that was correct. The funds were used in the remodel in 2007 towards purchase of the workstations, new telephone system and miscellaneous computer equipment. Ms. Poe asked again to clarify if the funding was received once every five years and that what could be purchased with these funds was limited. Ms. Barr confirmed that that the funding received every five years could only be used on what was approved by the State and included items such as software and equipment used to process 9-1-1 calls with the exception of personnel costs.

Ms. Poe indicated that she did not like seeing \$1,438 spent on warranty renewals, but that she understood that it was to keep old equipment and have a warranty on it. Mr. Seymore commented that he understood that if things fail, that was a

different set of circumstances. Mr. Seymore noted that this was the reason for reserve and contingency funds. He stated that it was unclear at this point whether using the General Fund money to pay for the insurance was a good practice and he deferred this to Mr. Storey.

Mr. Seymore indicated that he would like to get direction from the Board for Ms. Barr on what level they would like to see the membership contribution increase. He stated that he would prefer to see the increase be at 2 to 3%. He asked for Ms. Barr to return with different scenarios to achieve this including different schedules and ideas for alleviating the overtime. He requested that Ms. Barr be creative and see what can be done to reach the goal. Mr. Seymore indicated that the last thing he wanted to see was to have to let people go and he stated that he did not want to get into that. He stated that he wanted to see what could be done to make things work.

Ms. Poe asked if this was his motion and Mr. Seymore indicated that it was his motion. Ms. Poe seconded the motion and commented that all the Board members recognize that it is a very difficult time. She indicated that Los Alamitos was supposed to present a budget a month ago, but that the staff was having difficulty coming up with decreases. She noted that there were several things in the community that they would like to see happen, that traditionally happen, but that due to budget constraints, won't be happening this year because the funds just aren't there for it. She stated that she did not want to degrade the services provided by West-Comm, but that Los Alamitos would have a very hard time with the budget as it is currently presented.

Mr. Stewart asked if there was a time table for this request and Mr. Seymore asked if the motion was acceptable the way it was stated. Ms. Barr advised that her understanding of the motion was that the Board was directing the staff to come back with a budget proposal that limits the member contribution increase to 2-2 1/2% with a maximum of 3%. She asked what time frame the Board would like this proposal in and Mr. Seymore asked how long it would take for this to be completed and if 30 days would be sufficient. Ms. Barr advised that 30 days would be fine. Mr. Seymore asked if the Board wanted to set a date now and Mr. Bahorski stated to the West-Comm employees present that they could also contribute to this process. Mr. Seymore confirmed that any suggestions would be welcomed and commented that he was not trying to be a "bummer".

Mr. Carmany commented that in the last time that budget discussions were had, he spoke against using Reserves for operating, but in deference to some of the financial constraints of some of the partners, it was agreed upon as a one-time basis. He questioned whether the overall budget increase of 3.72% was what was the concern and what was being requested to be lowered to 2 1/2 to 3%. Mr. Seymore indicated that this was not the number in question, it was the Member Contribution percentage. Ms. Barr indicated that the only way to get Member Contributions down to the percentage that is being requested is to increase

earnings or revenues somewhere or to cut the budget sufficiently to get below the 6.8% increase to the 2 to 2 1/2% increase that is being requested.

Mr. Seymore confirmed that it is his recommendation and his motion to reduce the member contribution increase and for Ms. Barr to present whatever proposals are collectively reached in order to make this happen, even if they are at the 4% range. He commented that the City Mangers and Mr. Storey would also be present to assist. Ms. Barr asked Mr. Storey if he understood what was being requested and Mr. Storey reiterated that the request was to have the Staff and the City Mangers get together and work on scenarios to try to come up with a budget that is at 2-3% member contribution increase and to present those proposals. Mr. Seymore confirmed that this was correct and asked if the date for the next meeting could be set. Mr. Sloan commented that he was present at a Board Meeting several months ago and he felt that the same direction was given to Ms. Barr as was being given now and that it appeared that the Board was just delaying the inevitable and stated that he was going to have to vote against the motion. Mr. Seymore asked that a West-Comm Board of Directors Meeting be scheduled for Tuesday, April 6, 2010 at 4:30 pm.

With no further questions, motion by Mr. Seymore and second by Ms. Poe.

Motion Passed.

Aye:	Poe, Seymore
Nay:	Sloan
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

Agenda Item #3 – Resolution 10-01 – Resolution adopting a Conflict of Interest Code which supersede all prior Conflict of Interest Codes and any amendments adopted.

Ms. Barr asked if everyone received the revised Exhibit A and B to the Resolution for the Agenda Packet. She indicated that the revision only pertains to the Disclosure Categories for the designated positions of the Technical Operations Committee Member, Dispatch Administrator and Dispatch Supervisor and that the Disclosure Categories were changed from OC-01 to OC-05. She explained that the reason for this change is to keep the Disclosure Categories in line with what the current Disclosure Categories are. She further indicated that the reason that the resolution is before the Board is because the Orange County Clerk of the Board has created an automated system for the Conflict of Interest filing and in order for the JPA to participate in this system, the County has asked that each agency adopt the code so that every agency follows the model code. She advised that when the model code is followed, the OC Clerk of the Board ask that the OC Disclosure Categories be adopted as opposed to each agency's own separate list of

Disclosure Categories. Ms. Barr explained by adopting this new code and these new categories that all the 700 forms would be able to be filed electronically. She advised that there is no other change with regards to what is required to be disclosed or any other type of filing information and that this is basically to go to a paperless system. Michael Morguess clarified that the JPA's Conflict of Interest Code is currently the Model Conflict of Interest Code propagated by the FPBC and that it is merely being readopted and not being changed and that the Disclosure Categories are only changing in name, not in substance simply to allow use of the automated filing system of the Orange County Clerk. He indicated if the changes were in substance like changing the level of disclosure, there would have to be a public hearing to obtain the approval. Mr. Sloan asked if they would be completing new 700 forms and Mr. Morguess indicated this does not change the requirements. Mr. Seymore asked if this changed for Board Members and Ms. Barr explained that it does not change with regards to what has to be disclosed and indicated that with regards to the 700 forms that were already filed for this filing period that there would be no changes. She further indicated that once it was approved by this Board, this change has to go before the Orange County Board of Supervisors for approval as well. She indicated that this was for the future. Mr. Seymore asked if this was only for future filings and was only to change the name of the classifications and Mr. Morguess confirmed this. Mr. Seymore asked if the Board Members were previously under OC-01 and would now be under OC-05. Ms. Barr clarified her error in stating that in Exhibit A and Exhibit B, did not have the correct Disclosure Categories for the three positions and so this new revision has the correct Disclosure Categories which are OC-05 for those three positions. Mr. Seymore asked if this was only a policy issue and Mr. Morguess stated it was really less than that. Mr. Seymore then asked if the change to the FPBC filing rules were affected by this and asked if it was for the 700 form and the new 802 filing form regarding gifts over \$50 and questioned whether this was going to have to be adopted at the JPA level. Mr. Morguess indicated that any changes or amendments in the forms that had to be filed are incorporated into the model code so there is no need to adopt something new every time the FPBC changes something. He asked if this was a local change and Mr. Bahorski indicated that the FPBC came out with a new ruling which was in regards to gifts and tickets for children under either 18 or 21 that had to be reported within 30 days. He stated that he would assume that if a vendor took you to, for example, to a Lakers game, you would have to report that within 30 days. Mr. Seymore confirmed that this was the new 802 filing that has to be posted on a website for the public to see. Mr. Morguess indicated that those changes affect what you need to do in response to receiving gifts but that does not affect what the Board needs to do as far as adopting a new policy. He stated that all those changes are incorporated into the model code which states that any amendments are incorporated. Mr. Seymore asked if this agenda item would take care of that and Mr. Morguess and Ms. Barr both confirmed that it would. Mr. Morguess stated that the changes were automatic and that the Disclosure Requirements were the same. Mr. Stewart asked if there were administrative changes that Ms. Barr needed to make and Ms. Barr indicated that when the notice is received that the 700 forms need to be filed and along with it, you receive the rules and regulations regarding

the forms, in it, the changes that FPBC makes will come each year and because the model code is adopted, there does not need to be a new adoption each time or amending the code. Mr. Morguess reiterated that they are all incorporated.

With no further questions, motion by Mr. Seymore and second by Mr. Sloan for the approval and adoption of Resolution 10-01.

Motion Passed.

Aye: Poe, Seymore, Sloan
Nay: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Agenda Item #4 - Proclamation recognizing “National Public Safety Dispatcher Week”

Ms. Barr provided background information indicating that the second week in April is declared “National Public Safety Dispatcher Week” and that the week honors the dispatch profession. She indicated that in the past each of the cities has presented a proclamation to the West-Comm Dispatchers and that it is typically put on the agenda sometime during March or April. She requested that the West-Comm Board of Directors to also present a proclamation regarding National Public Safety Dispatcher Week. She also indicated that this year, West-Comm has the special honor of having one of its own employees, Dispatcher Joshua Goldmark, being named the Southern California Dispatcher of the Year. She indicated that West-Comm has a very good record with regard to its employees being recognized for this award and in 2007, Kathi Moen was the Southern California Dispatch Supervisor of the Year and that last year Melissa Wintersole was the runner-up Southern California Dispatcher of the Year.

Ms. Barr recommended that the Board approve and adopt the Proclamation as presented.

With no further questions, motion by Mr. Seymore and second by Ms. Poe to approve and adopt the Proclamation and Ms. Poe seconded the motion.

Motion Passed.

Aye: Poe, Seymore, Sloan
Nay: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Ms. Poe asked if the presentations would be scheduled so that the dispatchers can attend each member agencies City Council meetings and Ms. Barr confirmed that was correct and that she would contact the City Clerks in conjunction with the Police Chiefs so that everyone was on board.

Agenda Item #5 – Election of the West-Comm JPA Board of Directors Chair and Vice-Chair per Resolution 08-02

Mr. Seymore opened the floor for nominations of the JPA Board of Directors Chair.

With no further questions, motion by Mr. Sloan and second by Ms. Poe to nominate Mr. Seymore as the JPA Board of Directors Chair. Mr. Seymore indicated that he would be more than proud to serve as the Chair.

Motion Passed.

Aye: Poe, Seymore, Sloan
Nay: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Mr. Seymore opened the floor for nominations of the JPA Board of Directors Vice-Chair.

With no further questions, motion by Mr. Sloan and second by Mr. Seymore to nominate Ms. Poe as the JPA Board of Directors Vice-Chair. Ms. Poe accepted the nomination.

Motion Passed.

Aye: Poe, Seymore, Sloan
Nay: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

DISCUSSION ITEMS

#1 – Comments from Board of Directors:

Mr. Sloan indicated that he was proud to be a member of the Board of Directors and that he admired the process. He commented that one of the perks of being the Mayor is getting to make appointments to these committees and he appointed himself. Ms. Barr thanked him for this appointment. Mr. Sloan indicated that he was really impressed with the entire organization and thanked everyone for the hard work by the Board and the employees.

Ms. Poe also commented that she was involved with the formation of the JPA and that she was delighted when asked by the Council to be a Board Member. She indicated that she felt bad that the JPA has these budget issues because it is known how important this is. She further commented that she has family members who use 9-1-1 regularly for health issues and if 9-1-1 wasn't there and the response wasn't the way it is, there would be tragedy in her family. She indicated that she knew that this affects everyone that lives in the community and that is real hard to reconcile that with the dollars that has to be put into it. She stated that she wishes that this didn't have to be gone through, but that every City is going through it. She indicated that for Los Alamitos, \$600,000 is a large chunk of the mid-year budget and it was already an issue last year. She commented that she felt that everyone has to recognize that things aren't getting better and that they won't be better for a while and that everyone is going to have to "bite this bullet" hard. She reiterated that she feels bad that this is the way things are, but they just have to be dealt with.

Mr. Seymore concurred with Ms. Poe and commented that he sits on the Orange County Fire Authority Board of Directors and that they are fighting "tooth and nail" to balance the budget there as well because the State took \$14 million dollars from them and \$1.2 million from Cypress. He reiterated that it was unfortunate and that although these things are not something that they want to do, as elected officials, they are elected to watch over our employees and the money and make smart decisions. He reminded everyone that when times are good, there are always things that can be done on the backside. He commented that it is a pleasure serving as the Chair of the Board and he looks forward to continuing to do that.

#2 – Comments from the Administrative Oversight Staff:

Mr. Stewart commented that although it seems that everyone is very critical of Ms. Barr and that it seems that she has been a "moving target", that the AOS is not critical of her and there are no guidelines given on how to deal with this. He acknowledged that he knows she is working on the budget and that the AOS wants to help come to a solution. He indicated that, from his perspective, he did not want it to seem that they were "blind-siding" Ms. Barr on this issue. Ms. Barr stated that she did not feel that this was the case.

#3 – Comments from the Technical Operations Committee: None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Mr. Seymore adjourned the meeting at 5:32 p.m. The next Special Board Meeting will be at 4:30 p.m. on April 6, 2010, at the Seal Beach Police Department.

Todd Seymore, Chairperson

Date