

MINUTES
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2006

CALL TO ORDER Mayor Versaw called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 154 South Eighth Street, Grover Beach, California.

ROLL CALL

City Council: Council Members Ashton, Ekbom, Shoals, and Mayor Versaw were present. Mayor Pro Tem Lieberman was absent.

City Staff: City Manager Perrault, Assistant City Attorney Donaldson, City Clerk McMahon, Administrative Services Director Chapman, Police Chief Copsey, Parks and Recreation Director Petker, Public Works Superintendent Ford, and Human Resources Coordinator Barrett were also present.

Also present was City Engineer Garing and Labor Negotiator Katen.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS The Mayor opened the floor to any member of the public for comment on any items described in this agenda. He also stated that there would be additional opportunities for public comments later in the meeting.

- A. Don Fielding, Grover Beach, referenced Pavement Management Programs used by other agencies and raised concerns that implementation of the City's Pavement Management Program had been delayed.
- B. Liz Doukas, Grover Beach, raised concerns regarding the documentation process for street repair requests.

Mayor Versaw commented on the history of the pavement management system since acquisition in the 1990s, and the time-consuming nature of gathering the necessary data.

BUSINESS

1. Workshop for Review of the Draft Capital Improvement Plan and the Pavement Management Program.

City Manager Perrault thanked the Council for agreeing to the informal format for this work study session. He stated that the format of the presentation would consist of: 1) a review of the revised draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), a planning document for the construction of City facilities and infrastructure; and 2) an overview by the City Engineer Garing and Public Works Superintendent Ford of the revised Pavement Management Program to be utilized for future street rehabilitation projects.

Capital Improvement Plan

City Manager Perrault stated that, during the budget process, he had noted the Capital Improvement Plan needed to be reviewed as part of the budget process. The document presented to the Council at this meeting had been extensively revised by staff, and it was intended to contain succinct and sufficient information to enable the Council to make decisions and focus on the City's overall facilities and infrastructure needs. He stated the CIP was a five-year plan that included projects presently planned that were either funded or were to be initiated during the five-year period; however, it allowed for flexibility to incorporate new projects such as the Sewer Master Plan recently approved by the City Council. He pointed out differences between this and the previous CIP document, which was primarily a capital purchasing document, and outlined the structure of the revised CIP document.

City Manager Perrault defined projects to be included in the CIP as major facility or infrastructure projects with a life span of approximately 15-20 years and with a threshold project cost of \$50,000. He stated that the CIP document would automatically be updated twice a year, once as a companion of the regular budget process, and the second time during the mid-year process to incorporate changes as necessary.

He briefly discussed funding for street rehabilitation projects and the City's annual dedication of approximately \$500,000 per year toward street improvements. He noted that the Local Street Rehabilitation Program was a baseline program only and that it could not completely fund street rehabilitation city-wide. He cited additional potential revenue sources such as the Sales Tax Measure, appearing on the local ballot in November, and the state-wide Public Works Initiative, also appearing on the November ballot which, if approved, would provide one-time funding to the City in the amount of \$424,000.

City Manager Perrault requested that the Council focus on the structure of the document in terms of suggested changes or additions to the summaries, descriptions, or projects not currently listed that should be included. Staff would return at a later date for full, formal Council review and approval of the final document, following a Public Hearing.

Upon question, City Manager Perrault confirmed that once the CIP was formally approved, it would be reviewed concurrently with and become a part of the annual budget process.

Discussion was held, including:

- the flexibility of the document to add new or emergency projects as needed;
- adding a long-range or unfunded "wish" list at the end of the document;
- confirmation that document changes could occur every year as funding sources were identified;
- adding location maps in the document;
- projected revenue shortfalls during the five-year period;
- ADA upgrades for the Amtrak bus transfer area, and reconsideration of the design concept to relocate the bus transfer area to the west side of the Grover Beach Train Station;
- verbal explanations by staff of various projects in the document;
- future large development projects that would require extensive infrastructure improvements, such as the Beachfront Lodge and Conference Center Project at the end of West Grand Avenue and the Hilton Garden Inn proposed on El Camino Real; and
- infrastructure improvements needed to meet Fire Code regulations regarding water flows.

Action: Upon consensus, staff was directed to amend the Capital Improvement Plan based on Council comments and to schedule formal presentation at a joint meeting of the City Council and Improvement Agency for final review and approval.

Pavement Management System

City Manager Perrault called on City Engineer Garing and Public Works Superintendent Ford to present a summary of the Pavement Management System.

City Engineer Garing reviewed the history of street conditions and paving over the past 50 years, and current financing for street repairs which included construction of water mains associated with street construction. He displayed an Asphalt Institute diagram to illustrate the typical 20-year life span of a street, and described how streets normally began to deteriorate after a period of 15 to 17 years. He then described how the Pavement Management System worked, and noted the cost effectiveness of repairing streets early in the deterioration process.

He stated that the Pavement Management System contained data on when all City streets were constructed, and that it could be set to identify streets within any specified range of deterioration. He noted that it was a policy decision of the Council as to how to achieve a balance between repairing streets in the early deterioration stage when costs were less expensive, versus repairing streets at the complete deterioration point when repair costs were significantly higher, and whether to follow the program as designed or determine other criteria.

Upon question, City Engineer Garing clarified that the list of streets identified in Attachment 5 to the staff report entitled "Local Street Improvement Program Priority List" had been amended and the document was attached only as an example. Brief discussion was held regarding completing repairs for streets identified on that list.

Upon question, Public Works Superintendent Ford confirmed that most of the data for the Pavement Management System had been gathered and was being verified in order to produce a list of streets ranked in the order of needed repairs, along with cost information.

City Engineer Garing reiterated that the Pavement Management System was a tool, adjusted and managed by staff, and that it was a Council policy decision to determine priorities for street repair. The program was designed to give results in terms of costs, make recommendations for the type of repair, and show costs if repairs were delayed.

City Manager Perrault added that the Pavement Management System provided a baseline for discussion, and prioritization of future street repairs would depend largely on the outcome of the local Sales Tax Measure and the State Public Works Initiative on the November ballot. However, at some point a balance needed to be struck between the \$500,000 spent annually on street repairs and the estimated \$47 million needed to repair all streets in the City.

Further discussion was held, including:

- use of rubberized asphalt paving in larger communities or public works projects;
- the 25-year street design standards currently used by the City;
- various street rehabilitation methods versus complete street reconstruction;
- recommendations for street repairs being based primarily on available funding;
- financing street repairs through a bond issue or assessment district;
- public education on the financial challenges of street repairs, gathering public input and suggestions, specifically identifying the amount of street repairs that could be accomplished at, for example, the \$500,000 funding level and the \$800,000 funding level;
- whether it would be more cost effective to establish a program to systematically repair a certain percentage of streets at the 15-year life span and a percentage of streets at the point of complete deterioration;
- the City's policy change to hold property owners responsible for only the first four feet of street frontage, which basically eliminated the "rotating street patch crew" program; and
- providing further information on street improvements that were paid for by new construction.

Action: Upon consensus, staff was directed to: 1) present a "street list" generated from the Pavement Management System at a joint meeting of the City Council and Improvement Agency for review and approval, 2) that meeting would be scheduled as a Public Hearing for citizen input, and 3) the Council/Agency would discuss establishing a policy for applying the Pavement Management System technology to street repairs and reconstruction.

CLOSED SESSION

At 8:36 p.m., the Council met in Closed Session regarding the following item:

1. Conference with Labor Negotiators

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6.

Agency Negotiator: City Manager, James K. Katen, Administrative Services Director, Assistant Administrative Services Director, Human Resources Coordinator, Police Lieutenant, and Police Chief.

Represented Employee Group: Grover Beach Police Officers' Association (GBPOA)

Closed Session Announcements: At 9:14 p.m., Mayor Versaw reconvened the meeting in open session with all Council Members present, except for Mayor Pro Tem Lieberman, and announced there were no reportable actions taken during Closed Session.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the City Council, Mayor Versaw adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

/s/ LARRY VERSAW, MAYOR

Attest: /s/ DONNA L. McMAHON, CITY CLERK
(Approved at CC Mtg 11/20/06)