



Citizens' Advisory Committee  
on  
Measure Z Expenditures  
Humboldt County  
MINUTES

**HUMBOLDT COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' CHAMBERS  
825 FIFTH STREET**

**Thursday January 31, 2019 2:00 PM- 4:00PM**

A. **SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

B. **INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

C. **MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA**

NO MODIFICATIONS

D. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

SONNY ANDERSON THANKED SHERIFF HONSAL FOR \$250,000, AND REQUESTED ROAD REPAIRS IN PETROLIA

E. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. **Approval of 9-6-18 minutes**

**Canzoneri** moved. **Ames** seconded. Minutes passed unanimously.

2. **County Administrative Office Updates**

**Clower** provided updates: Included in the committee packets are Form 700 forms and Measure K acknowledgments. These need to be signed by the committee and returned at the next meeting.

On November 6th Measure O passed with an overwhelming voter approval of more than 72%. This removes the sunset from Measure Z. The county will continue to refer to this measure as Measure Z. This measure is now in effect until ended by voters. At the last meeting your committee asked how voters would end the Measure. This requires a citizens initiative, signatures of 3-4000 would need to be obtained and presented to the

Elections Office to be placed on the next election ballot for a decision to be made by the majority vote of the people.

### **3. Update on fiscal year 2019-20 Projects**

**Clower** provided updates: All contracts have been signed and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Through the first quarter budget report presented to the Board of Supervisors on November 13, the Sheriff was approved to carry forward \$107,880 for the radio infrastructure project and the remaining unallocated funds of \$522,796 were allocated to Roads. Funds were not split between Roads and the Radio project as recommended in your committee's secondary recommendations as the Board had approved a General Fund allocation for the Radio Infrastructure Project of \$2.8 million at First Quarter.

First Quarter reports have been submitted and are available online. Second quarter reports are due at the end of this week.

### **4. Mid-Year Estimates**

#### **a. Revenue & expenses to date**

**Clower** provided updates: Contained in today's agenda is the worksheet detailing the year to date revenues and expenditures.

#### **b. Year-End Projections**

**Clower** provided updates: Staff are beginning to see a decline in sales tax revenues, accordingly, it is anticipated that Measure Z revenues will come in approximately \$500k shy of budget estimates. The majority of recipients have reported expenditures to be on target.

The Sheriff is anticipating some salary savings, as is DHHS. These savings will offset the revenue shortage, however the current information reflects year-end expenditures to exceed revenues by \$18,976. Staff anticipate that additional expenditure savings will be realized allowing for a positive balance at year-end.

Staff will not recommend the Board of Supervisors allocate any additional funds at mid-year and will monitor revenues closely to begin budget estimates for fiscal year 2019-20. It can be anticipated that revenues next year will be less than those budgeted in the current fiscal year. Staff are currently working to refine those estimates and will provide your committee with an estimate of available funding at the next meeting in March.

**Ziemer** asked for questions.

**Canzoneri** asked whether they are required to sign the Measure K acknowledgement. She does not think they should be required to sign as committee members.

**CAO** will clarify requirements prior to next meeting.

### **5. Discussion of recommendation process for fiscal year 2019-20**

**Ziemer** reviewed process of application to determine if any revisions to the vetting process are required. The first two years the committee put applications into categories of Must/Need/Nice, then went from there on prioritizing. Last year the committee voted yes/no, then used a tally system, with items with the most yes votes getting highest priority to prioritize applications. They try to prioritize applicants who can leverage Measure Z funds, and also consider whether the request is for one-time funding vs. ongoing funding. Those are not guarantees, but they have given priority to requests for entities that hired a position in previous years, to provide those agencies with continuity. The intent of the measure is also a consideration. These criteria are used to rank the applications before they are placed into tiers. The committee then asked the top applicants to return with a low- and mid-range budget in order to recommend the most amount of projects possible. They on occasion will ask an applicant to pare down the request, to accept more applications. Based on revenue projections they would then make recommendations to the BOS. The committee makes recommendations to the Board but needs to keep in mind that they may not take the committee's recommendations into account, as the ultimate decisions are at the Board's discretion.

**Ziemer** asked how they feel about the process.

**Kohl** asked what the criteria are for cities' allocations. **Ziemer** explained that they were very specific requests for personnel, etc, that they are considered on the merits of their requests and they are required to spend the money in the way they detailed in the application. **Kohl** asked why the difference between the adopted and adjusted budget. **Ziemer** explained that position allocations may be made for the full year, but they may not be filled for some time. Their expenditures are sent to the CAO quarterly. The committee assumes that position allocations will be approved since they have already incurred hiring costs, etc.

**Branscomb** explained that the fully completed applications have to be in the office by 2/25/19, or they will not be considered. **Ziemer** added that timeframes are compressed because of the budget timeframes so there is a fairly intensive review process. The committee historically will not take oral testimonials in favor of the application, but they can provide clarification to the committee if the committee requests it.

**Orcutt** asked that folks understand that the Hoopa contribution is for a large area in the county, not just for the Hoopa tribe.

**Ziemer** explained that the AIAA contribution is also serving a broad area.

**Robertson** asked the process for clarifying with applicants. **Ziemer** said that due to Brown Act, everything has to remain transparent, and can't be communicated in private. Historically, the committee reviews the application, and then runs questions through the CAO, before the CAO brings the answer back to the meetings.

**Honsal** clarified that applicants can answer questions during meetings.

**Ziemer** asked whether they want to endorse the historical process.

**Canzoneri** moved that they endorse the historical process. There was no second to the motion.

**Honsal** suggested that they reject applications that do not meet the requirements on the application.

**Binder** asked if they could switch process midway through the process.

**Ziemer** suggested that it would be inadvisable unless the process is not working because the public perception is important, and a change in process midstream may be unfair to the public and uncomfortable for the committee.

**Kohl** asked about the mechanism for public comment or input. **Ziemer** said that he will receive a Gmail account that is available to the public. **Honsal** said that 3 minutes are allowed in meetings, and it's important to consider the public's desires, but we do not want 40 people coming to meetings making 3 minute arguments for their application.

**Canzoneri** commented on Sonny Anderson's continued presence at meetings and asked how he felt about it. **Anderson** said the public comment process works great, and it's important for applicants to come to meetings. **Branscomb** said that it works well to have Sonny represent the Mattole Valley, rather than sending lots of people. **Clower** clarified that on publicly noticed meetings all public can speak.

**Ziemer** asked whether they want to endorse the historical process.

**Ames** added that the applications were categorized into three tiers that were must have. **Campbell** clarified that they rate yes or no, then come back and rank 1,2,3. A yes is not a guarantee. **Kohl** requested two years history of requests and the amounts they received for new committee members.

**Ziemer** asked whether they want to endorse the historical process.

**Branscomb** moved. **Ames** seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

## 6. Appointment of Chair/Vice Chair

**Ziemer** asked for nomination.

**Canzoneri** moved **Ziemer**.

**Branscomb** seconded.

**Ames** "thirded."

No discussion. Public comment: Sonny **Anderson** supported **Ziemer** as Chair.

**Orcutt** nominated **Canzoneri**. **Canzoneri** declined nomination as Chair, but would accept Vice Chair if nominated.

Motion for **Ziemer** carried unanimously.

Nominations for Vice Chair.

**Honsal** nominated **Canzoneri**

**Branscomb** seconded.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review of schedule for year:

Applications due 2/25, Meetings Thursdays at 2:00 through month of March. 4/4 if necessary. 9/12

**Honsal** moved **Canzoneri** seconded to keep meetings on same schedule.

Motion passed.

Final comments: **Ziemer** suggested extending the time for public comment, and **Honsal** said it would need to be done equitably.

Discussion of whether private telephone conversations with applicants is okay. **Ziemer** suggested that the committee use their Gmail account.

**Robertson** asked if they can find the budget projections online, and **Ziemer** said yes.

**Kohl** requested that the applications come electronically and in hard copy.

Adjourned at 3:09.

F. **ADJOURNMENT**

G. County of Humboldt Web Site: <http://www.humboldt.gov/MeasureZ>