

**REGULAR MEETING  
of the  
CITY OF RIALTO  
CITY COUNCIL  
City of Rialto, acting as Successor Agency to the  
Redevelopment Agency**

**MINUTES  
May 26, 2020**

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rialto was held in the City Council Chambers located at 150 South Palm Avenue, Rialto, California 92376, and via Teleconference on Tuesday, May 26, 2020.

0o0

This meeting was called by the presiding officer of the Rialto City Council in accordance with the provisions of **Government Code §54956** of the State of California.

0o0

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Deborah Robertson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

0o0

The roll was called, and the following were present: Mayor Deborah Robertson, Mayor Pro Tem Ed Scott, Council Member Joe Baca Jr., and Council Member Andy Carrizales. Also present were City Manager Rod Foster, Interim City Attorney Eric Vail and City Clerk Barbara McGee. Council Member Rafael Trujillo and City Treasurer Edward Carrillo were absent.

0o0

**Pledge of Allegiance  
and Invocation**

Mayor Pro Tem Scott led all members for the pledge of allegiance.  
Pastor Mario Cañedo from Calvary Chapel Rialto gave the Invocation.

0o0

**Interim City Attorney's Report on Closed  
Session**

Interim City Attorney Eric Vail stated that closed session was canceled. Item will be re-noticed at a subsequent meeting.  
No reportable action.

0o0

Council Member Trujillo arrived at 6:34 p.m.

0o0

## **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Brenda Perez expressed concerns over illegal fireworks and noise disruption in her neighborhood late at night.

0o0

Julie Marcadel expressed concerns over the firework activity in her neighborhood and concerns over the vendors at the intersection of Riverside and Sierra and unsafe traffic conditions.

0o0

Mary Martinez expressed concerns over firework activity and believes the City should act in the best interest of the residents who elected the City Council. She believes illegal fireworks should be banned.

0o0

Kelli Clark expressed her concerns over the firework activity from May through New Year's Eve and stated many residents on the Nextdoor App want it to stop.

0o0

**City Council to consider removing or continuing any items on the agenda**

Council Member Carrizales stated that he will be abstaining from F.1 due to conflict of interest.

0o0

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **A. WAIVE FULL READING OF ORDINANCES**

1. Waive reading in full, all ordinances considered at this meeting.

### **B. APPROVAL OF WARRANT RESOLUTIONS**

B.1 Warrant Resolution No. 44 (05/14/2020)

B.2 Warrant Resolution No. 45 (05/21/2020)

### **C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

C.1 Regular City Council Meeting – April 28, 2020

0o0

### **D. CLAIMS AGAINST THE CITY**

D.1 Kenneth Wayne Hooker – Defendant and Cross-Complainant

0o0

### **E. SET PUBLIC HEARING**

E.1 Request City Council to **Set a Public Hearing for June 9, 2020**, to Consider and Approve General Plan Amendment 2020-0002 for the 2014-2021 Four Year (Mid-Cycle) Housing Element Update and Zoning Code Amendment 2020-0003 for amendments to various provisions of the Rialto Municipal Code (Title 18 - Zoning Code) related to manufactured housing, accessory dwelling units, reasonable accommodations, and emergency shelters, transitional and supportive housing, and density bonuses for affordable housing projects.

0o0

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **F. MISCELANEOUS**

F.1 Request City Council to Adopt **Resolution No. 7515**, entitled “A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Rialto, California, declaring City Owned Property located at the Southwest Corner of Alder Avenue and Casmalia also known as San Bernardino County Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 1119-241-01-0000 and 1119-241-02-0000, as Surplus Land and Directing the City Manager to follow the procedures set forth in the Surplus Land Act, California Government Code Section 54220, et seq., as amended on January 1, 2020 for the sale of the Surplus Land”.

F.2 Request City Council to 1 ) Receive an Update on and Confirm the Continued Existence of a Local Emergency Throughout the City of Rialto in Response to the COVID-19 Outbreak; and 2) Approve the City Reopening Plan Including Transition Dates, Event Scheduling, Employee and Customer Service Safety Practices, and City Council Meeting Processes.

0o0

Motion by Council Member Joe Baca Jr. second by Council Member Trujillo and carried by 5-0 vote to approve the consent calendar.

0o0

#### **TAB 1 –Delinquent Refuse Accounts with the San Bernardino County Assessor-Recorder-County Clerk**

Public Works Director Savat Khamphou presented staff report regarding the Placement of Liens for Delinquent Refuse Collection Accounts for the Fourth Quarter of 2019.

0o0

Motion by Council Member Joe Baca Jr. second by Council Member Trujillo and carried by 5-0 vote to approve Public Hearing for the Placement of Liens for Delinquent Refuse Collection Accounts for the Fourth Quarter of 2019; and Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the Filing of Liens Against Certain Properties for Delinquent Refuse Accounts with the San Bernardino County Assessor-Recorder-County Clerk.

0o0

#### **TAB 2 - CDBG Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2020-2024), Annual Action Plan (2020-2021)**

#### **TAB 3 – CDBG CARES Act Funding**

Deputy City Manager Steve Erlandson presented staff report regarding Consideration of the City’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2020-2024), Annual Action Plan (2020-2021), Citizen Participation Plan, and Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (2020-2024).

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail stated that the City Council will have to decide how to proceed on this matter. This item was continued from last meeting due to a conflict of interest of the Mayor. Mayor Robertson chose on the advice of her own independent counsel not to recuse herself therefore the City Council continued this item to today. The Mayor’s independent counsel sent a letter requesting TAB 2 and TAB 3 to be continued next meeting.

He asked if the Mayor is requesting that City Council continue this item.

**TAB 2 - CDBG Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2020-2024), Annual Action Plan (2020-2021)**  
**TAB 3 – CDBG CARES Act Funding**

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated that is the recommendation of her independent counsel given that the investigation has not concluded. She will leave City Council to decide what to do.

She also stated that recommendation per special counsel, he has amended his first recommendation and added that Mayor should recuse herself from these two items. Mayor expressed that she will not recuse herself. If Council wants to proceed, they may.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail asked if any other member of the City Council is going to move to continue TAB 2.

0o0

Council Member Trujillo asked of Interim City Attorney to present City Council with different options to continue this item. Is there a specific item within CDBG that are a conflict of interest?

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail stated the options are to continue the item, Mayor recuses herself, proceed with items but not take any action on any allocation or discussion about the Bethune Center.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated that part of the reason why she is not going to recuse herself is that it is not equitable to penalize someone by leaving them out without due process while the investigation has not been concluded. The other option is to proceed and to make certain everybody is treated equally. At the Federal level, non-profits are considered businesses, then NCNW would fall under a disadvantaged business enterprise. She referenced 49-CFR, part 23 to what is a considered a disadvantaged business enterprise. It is usually to anyone who is a minority or a women-owned business. In this case, NCNW is a non-profit business that could file for loans and grants and cautions that it may be violating their rights as a protected class if they chose to proceed. Or proceed and fund them and should anything be found that supports their position at the Federal level, then money is not awarded to them for fiscal year 2020-2021. If they are penalized on this, then the subsequent TAB deals with allocating the CARES Act dollars. They cannot actively participate in bids if there is a cloud of investigation over them.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail stated he joins special counsel in his concern for taking action with regard to an entity for which there might be a conflict of interest. The investigation has not been completed. It is uncertain if there will be a conflict of interest. The goal is to create decisions in an environment where the public knows there is no conflict of interest.

**TAB 2 - CDBG Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2020-2024), Annual Action Plan (2020-2021)**  
**TAB 3 – CDBG CARES Act Funding**

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated she is not precluding City Council from doing what they chose to do. She stated City's special counsel and Interim City Attorney concur, who has not concluded the investigation, to penalize or not give an organization due process. Mayor's counsel shared and pointed out items to special counsel and, at the Federal level, it has already been determined it does not warrant the conflict of interest.

If City Council wants to proceed, then proceed. She has comments regarding the presentation once the Public Hearing is open, elect to continue the Public Hearing or close the Public Hearing. She will not recuse herself. She stated Interim City Attorney or special counsel cannot keep her from participating. She chooses not to act on special counsel or Interim City Attorney's recommendation.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail stated he has already recommended as much as he can to City Council.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott asked when special counsel is going to complete the investigation and if it would be prior to the next City Council meeting.

0o0

City Manager Foster stated there should be a draft report within the next two weeks and cannot guarantee it would be before the next City Council meeting.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail clarified for the record that City Council has now opened the Public Hearing.

0o0

Mayor Robertson declared the Public Hearing open.

She stated that the time for City Council to decide is not paramount because they are funds allocated to the next fiscal year. The City Council has two more meetings before acting, allocating and informing the federal government (HUD) of their decision.

She stated that this is a big Federal allocation, and it is important to have citizens participation. She stated that in the report, the ad-hoc committee gave one recommendation, but staff came back with another recommendation. It is noted that in the reports that she would not act on the matter for the Bethune Center.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott stated considering Mayor Robertson's comments, he believes it would be appropriate to continue the items for another two weeks and request special counsel to complete his finding and report within the two-week period.

0o0

**TAB 2 - CDBG Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2020-2024), Annual Action Plan (2020-2021)**  
**TAB 3 – CDBG CARES Act Funding**

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Scott, second by Council Member Baca Jr. and carried by a 5-0 vote to continue TAB 2 and TAB 3 to the first meeting in June.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail asked that City Clerk forward the City Council any written communication or voice messages received on this item.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated that in addition, public comments will be carried over to the next meeting.

0o0

**TAB 4 – Memorandum of Understanding with the Rialto Police Benefit Association – Management Unit for the period covering July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021**

City Manager Foster presented the staff report to request City Council to approve the Collective Bargaining Memorandum of Understanding by and between the City of Rialto and the Rialto Police Benefit Association - Management Unit for the period covering July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021.

0o0

**RECORDED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Richard Royce, President of the Rialto Police Benefit Association stated that during the meetings they were able to clarify and address some unresolved issues found in prior contracts and a roadmap for future negotiations. Both the Management and General groups voted unanimously to accept the contracts. He would like to thank all the team members for their time and dedication in getting this done as well as the Council and the community for their trust and support as they continue providing public safety for the City of Rialto.

0o0

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Scott, second by Council Member Joe Baca, Jr. and carried by 5-0 vote to approve the Collective Bargaining Memorandum of Understanding by and between the City of Rialto and the Rialto Police Benefit Association – Management Unit for the period covering July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021.

0o0

Mayor Robertson commended the management team and recognized there were matters that needed to be straightened up. The contracts were well done and not excessive. She asked if the total cost to the general fund included PERS.

0o0

City Manager Foster stated PERS is part of that inclusionary cost.

0o0

**TAB 5 – Memorandum of Understanding by and between the City of Rialto and the Rialto Police Benefit Association – General Unit for the period covering July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021**

Mayor Pro Tem Scott echoed Mayor Robertson's comments and thanked the Management Team for the good job they did and the professionalism everybody showed in the process.

0o0

City Manager Foster presented staff report to request City Council to approve the Collective Bargaining Memorandum of Understanding by and between the City of Rialto and the Rialto Police Benefit Association – General Unit for the period covering July 1, 2019 to June 2021.

0o0

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Scott, second by Council Member Joe Baca, Jr. and carried by 5-0 vote to approve the Collective Bargaining Memorandum of Understanding by and between the City of Rialto and the Rialto Police Benefit Association – General Unit for the period covering July 1, 2019 to June 2021.

0o0

**RECORDED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Corporal Rice with the Rialto Police Department calling on behalf of the Rialto Benefit Association - General Membership Bargaining Group thanked City Manager Rod Foster, Deputy City Manager Stephen Erlandson and Human Resources Director Angela McCray for their diligence during the negotiation process. He also thanked the City Council for valuing the members of the police department and look forward to more productive negotiations in the future.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated that this was the first time that she heard from both members on behalf of their association and gave applause and accolades.

0o0

**TAB 6 – Frisbie Park Project Contract Change Orders and Dog Park**

Savat Khamphou, Public Works Director presented staff report to request City Council to Approve Contract change Nos. 1-25; 2) Authorize City Manager to approve a Construction Contingency in the amount not to exceed \$300,000 (2%) for any Potential Construction Contract Change Orders, Professional Services, and Related Support Costs; 93) Approve a First Amendment to the Professional Services Agreement with Griffin Structures, Inc. in the Amount not to exceed \$42,000; 4) Approve Purchase Order to west Valley Water District for Permit Fees in the Amount of \$22,011.68 and; 5) Delete the Dog Park as Part of the Frisbie Park Project and defer it to the Future Phase or Separate Project.

0o0

**TAB 6 – Frisbie Park Project Contract  
Change Orders and Dog Park**

Michael Tahan with PPM Group and Scott Rice with Community Works gave a presentation update on the Frisbie Park Project and Dog Park.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott asked what happened to the City Council direction that the dog park was supposed to be kept within \$200,000 to 300,000 that was required for the tennis courts.

0o0

Mr. Tahan stated that they tried to work with contractor but was unable to meet the expectation of the City Council that was given on July 9, 2019 and that is why they came up with that recommendation.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott stated that the City Council gave direction and people are supposed to follow direction. Why has it not been done, Mr. Foster? This approach has cost the City money. He does not recall asking for multiple plans costing \$47,000 for the design.

0o0

City Manager Foster stated there is no acceptable excuse when this does not happen. There was a value engineered option, overages from the standpoint of the project, either a smaller dog park, delay it for a future phase. He referred to Director of Public Works who monitored the project.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott stated he has a problem with this. Mayor Robertson and City Clerk McGee led the effort to convert Andreson's Dog Park at a very reasonable cost by getting college students' help. He suggests this avenue be pursued. He will not support a \$600,000 dog park but will follow the Mayor's lead on this. But it concerns him that the money was spent and to move forward with something that is contrary to the direction of the City Council.

0o0

Director Khamphou stated there is no excuse and his recommendations to defer this to another project is a good one and they will follow that.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott reiterated that he will follow the Mayor and City Council's lead. He is only making a comment and a suggestion. He wants to hear from the rest of the City Council.

0o0



**TAB 6 – Frisbie Park Project Contract  
Change Orders and Dog Park**

Council Member Baca, Jr. concurs with Mayor Pro Tem Scott. The preliminary cost estimate for the dog park was \$401,000, and the direction was to have a cost savings. At that price, the tennis and basketball courts could have been kept.

He asked what is “An additional Mobilization Management?”

The goal is to get a dog park, and will support the Mayor’s wishes and her efforts, but it just seems like a huge number.

But it was very clear from the City Council what the direction was and how the cost was to be kept at a minimal.

0o0

Director Khamphou stated that the scope is above and beyond the RC Graves contract cost. Additional resources must be added to that. They are trying to capture how much they would charge for that in the City’s estimate.

0o0

Council Member Carrizales stated he was very concerned when a project goes in the opposite direction. He stated he cannot see spending this amount for a dog park when Andreson’s Park was done at a fraction of the cost. He suggested that City Clerk McGee assist in this project.

0o0

Council Member Trujillo stated that the charm of the construction of the last dog park was that it was a community effort and recycled items were repurposed and surprised that the first model of success was not followed in building of this dog park. He is asking for changes that would engage the community.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated that the project started July 12, 2016. She expressed concerns with the design changes. It was supposed to be multi-use. Direction was given to the team to look at the previous model and determine no more than \$200,000. It has taken four years and the park is not on schedule. She has questions on the change orders and asked who authorized them. The project has been underway and still no report from staff. She asked what is going to be done and what is going to be delivered and what is the schedule.

0o0

Council Member Carrizales stated he does not recall receiving updates or clear answer from Community Services Director Brents on the project or asked the City Council for clear direction on how to proceed.

0o0

**TAB 6 – Frisbie Park Project Contract  
Change Orders and Dog Park**

Perry Brents, Community Services Director answered questions on the dog park and multi-use basketball. He stated that the City Council voted to have the basketball courts on the south side replaced with a dog park. The design was displayed on the day of the groundbreaking. The basketball and tennis courts were scheduled for the north side. That design has not changed. He received no updates on the other design changes to park. Once RC Graves contractor began work, there was no contact with Community Services.

0o0

Mayor Robertson inquired about the location of the skate park design.

0o0

Director Brents stated the skate park is in the same location. The design on the north side never changed. The design on the south side changed.

0o0

Mayor Robertson also asked Fire Chief Grayson, who was Interim City Administrator during that time for information.

0o0

Fire Chief Grayson stated that the groundbreaking took place just as City Manager Foster assumed office. He stated that what the City put out to bid was what was constructed. The one difference is the removal of the two courts on the south side of the project in lieu of the dog park. No changes to the multi-use courts or other amenities to the north side of the project. The original concept for the dog park was presented on the day of the groundbreaking in June.

0o0

Mayor Robertson asked why during the course of the Frisbie project no one inquired on Andreson's dog park concept. Who would have the road map on this?

0o0

Mr. Tahan stated he came on board to assist Public Works Director Khamphou in mid-March with this project. There was a gap in managing the project after Hector Gonzales departed with the City in December and staff turnover delayed the project. He wanted to work with the City Manager to determine the status of the project.

0o0

Mayor Robertson asked how much was allocated for the dog park project.

0o0

Mr. Tahan indicated based on the City Council direction on July 9, 2019 was approximately \$200,000. Dog Parks start at a million dollars and this was a negotiated price.

0o0

**TAB 6 – Frisbie Park Project Contract  
Change Orders and Dog Park**

Mayor Robertson stated it has gone beyond what was projected. How much has been spent thus far for the dog park?

0o0

Mr. Tahan stated \$47,845.00.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott believes staff should be redirected to have a discussion with the design consultant and he expressed concerns regarding other DRC projects.

0o0

Mayor Robertson is recommending the project be moved over to a department that will work with the community or through other grants. This project should not have to linger.

0o0

Council Member Carrizales asked if the rock is part of the mobilization. Why is all the rock there?

0o0

Scott Rice, Community Works stated that under the current contract, it is the contractor's responsibility to remove all material. To keep the cost down, the rock was repurposed. He stated that the cost that is being proposed by the contractor is what the contractor is offering to build it. It is not the design cost. The City Council has the option to get other pricing and should not accept pricing that is a gouge. The price does not reflect the design.

0o0

City Manager Rod Foster stated that at this point in time, he will bring it back to staff's recommendation. Change orders are for work that had already been authorized. He reiterated matters that need to be addressed within each item of TAB 6. He would ask for City Council's concurrence on those recommendations. You can simply decide if you want to have an additional amount of money that would be within my authority to bring the project done. I am not asking for that. We can certainly bring back change orders as we see them. We do need to move forward with item 3. Item 4, as you all discussed, should have been caught. We should know who the water provider is. And then section 5, which was to delete the dog park, was simply due to costs. We've already heard that City Council would like us to go back and try to find a way that we can do that given within the time that we had. Regarding time on the project, as far as I know, we are still on for October or November based upon where we're at. I think we are at 70 percent done. That might be a little aggressive, but I am hoping it will be done by the end of the year. I would rather ask the City Council to consider the staff recommendation, and if you want to delete item 2, that gives me additional authority, to be able to work on change orders.

**TAB 6 – Frisbie Park Project Contract  
Change Orders and Dog Park**

City Manager Rod Foster stated there are change orders that are coming down the road that we were trying to expedite to be able to get this project done. I think we have talked enough about this design here organically. I rather have individual conversations now that I see how this project has come together.

0o0

Mr. Tahan stated that the challenges that have been talked about from procedures that have not been followed or change orders or design issues, he would be closely working with Mr. Savat, Public Work Director on implementing procedures and guidelines in line to avoid these issues in the future. That is why he is working with City Manager to ensure accountability for the consultants and construction management team as well as the Public Works Department.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated she would like to see who oversees what from a consultant's perspective.

0o0

Council Member Baca, Jr. stated based on City Manager Foster's discussion on item 2 of staff's recommendations, he asked if item 2 could be postponed and what happens to the project if it does not get approved tonight.

0o0

City Manager Foster indicated that there are some change orders that will accompany this project that Mr. Tahan identified. At some point in time, it must be move forward, so the project is not delayed.

0o0

Mr. Tahan stated there are several elements that could delay the schedule. He is recommending electrical panels that are not protected and a few other design issues and he wants to make certain there are enough resources so that the contractor is not delayed.

0o0

Council Member Baca, Jr. stated that it was important to move this forward and not delay the project.

0o0

Mayor Robertson asked what the project contingency is.

0o0

Mr. Tahan stated they are asking for a 2% contingency for the overall project.

0o0

City Manager Foster stated that includes the credit for removing the basketball courts. It does not include any costs for any dog park in the future.

**TAB 6 – Frisbie Park Project Contract  
Change Orders and Dog Park**

0o0

Mayor Robertson asked if there is a penalty if it is pulled out of the contract.

0o0

Mr. Tahan stated that the contract signed with the City does not include a dog park. The dog park would be an added scope to the contract.

0o0

Mayor Robertson thought it was part of the contract, and it was presented during the groundbreaking. Instead of becoming clear, it is becoming stranger.

She is very reluctant to act on it. She suggests not to proceed within this contractor.

0o0

Council Member Joe Baca, Jr. recommends moving approval on TAB 6 Items 1-4 and recommends staff bring an item back to City Council with a better price on the dog park.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott suggests moving forward with the change orders and the contingency providing that staff comes back to City Council with answers as to why they exist and who authorized them so the project can be finished. The dog park has always been part of the project since it was approved. The cost has not been determined.

He is adding to Council Member Baca Jr's, motion that it be brought back in two weeks with a plan as to how to proceed with a dog park.

0o0

Mayor Robertson is requesting a date specific time on the project.

0o0

Motion by Council Member Baca Jr., and second by Mayor Pro Tem Scott and carried by a 5-0 vote to approve Items 1-4 under staff's recommendations, amend Item 5 and ask staff to bring back a plan next City Council meeting as to how to reduce the cost on the dog park.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail stated that Items 1-4 are to be brought back with a justification as to why those change orders are necessary.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott stated Items 1-4 did not have to be brought back at the City Council meeting. He would like to know what the plan is for the dog park and how it they will move forward with it.

0o0

Mayor Robertson agreed with Mayor Pro Tem Scott. She did not want to have Items 1-4 back as an agenda item.

**TAB 7 – Emergency Ordinance  
Temporarily Prohibiting Rental Increases  
within the City**

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott stated this item was requested by Council Member Trujillo. He requested that it relate to residential rental. However, the staff report reads “commercial”. He is disappointed that staff does not take direction from City Council. He owns commercial property in the downtown area. He feels it would not be proper for him to participate on this item. He will abstain from this Item.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail explained why the word “commercial” was indicated.

0o0

Mayor Pro Tem Scott explained there are two types of recusals from participation either to gain money or to lose money and if becomes an ethical issue related to the FPPC.

0o0

Mayor Robertson asks why the word “commercial” was added if it was clearly speaking to residential.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail stated that there were several items that needed to be excluded from the City’s consideration of a rent freeze ordinance. “Commercial” was one of those elements. He apologized for erring in being over inclusive.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated that when City Council first acted which was to prohibit evictions during COVID-19, it did not cover permitting those placing their annual rent increases. In addition, a future conversation will be about the CARES Act funds and many would like rental assistance to be included in those funds. She expressed concerns with how to set a program in that direction with those in delinquent status prior to COVID-19.

0o0

Council Member Carrizales stated that he too has commercial property that he leases and leases to and is confused with the language. He asked City Attorney if “commercial” was added by mistake.

0o0

Interim City Attorney Vail stated that City Council can’t have a discussion about putting a commercial rent freeze in place because it is prohibited by state law. There is an FPPC regulation that allows all Council Members to discuss emergency provisions necessary by the State of Emergency. Even if there were a conflict of interest, under the normal conditions, the rent freeze would have related simply to the COVID-19 situation, you are not considered to have a conflict of interest.

**TAB 7 – Emergency Ordinance  
Temporarily Prohibiting Rental Increases  
within the City**

Interim City Attorney Vail stated “Commercial” was included to indicate that you could not take any action in a commercial property.

0o0

Council Member Carrizales abstained from TAB 7.

0o0

Council Member Trujillo stated that the residential component is one reason he brought this forward. If the City is going to consider rental assistance in the future, this will go together to support at-risk families impacted by COVID-19. It is a temporary measure for an emergency ordinance.

0o0

Council Member Baca Jr., applauds and support the concept. He stated that the City Council did not act on the CARES Act and no direction was given. In relation to rental assistance, he would like to see it available to Rialto residents and payments toward mortgages are ineligible. He stated HUD has eligible guidelines for rental assistance. The City will have to come up with a plan for rental assistance. The City will have to potentially provide temporary air conditioners for seniors who do not have access to cooling centers, rent relief, potential business relief and helping seniors. He would like to make a motion to TABLE this item and bring the CARES Act before having this conversation.

0o0

Robert Seed with the California Business Roundtable wrote asking City Council to oppose TAB 7.

0o0

**RECORDED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Bryan Goodman, SVP Southern California Planning Community Development - Lewis Management Company wrote to strongly oppose any rent control measures being considered.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated there is concern about one side of the housing situation without recognizing there are other opportunities that need to be considered in addition to the CARES Act such as rental freeze, micro loans. At the next City Council Meeting staff will be given direction to come back with thoughts and then set a public hearing. She would like to TABLE this item as well. They need to be clear about what direction the City can go and should go before they act.

Perhaps this also needs to be discussed at the upcoming EDC dealing with economic development and economic recovery.

0o0

Council Member Trujillo stated that more options need to be provided by staff to the City Council and more thought put into it.

0o0

**TAB 7 – Emergency Ordinance  
Temporarily Prohibiting Rental Increases  
within the City**

Mayor Robertson suggested there be dialogue before it becomes an agenda item.

0o0

City Manager Foster stated they can certainly return and speak about ways that the City Council can program the COVID dollars. Also, he stated that in relation to TAB 7, a conversation was had. A decision was made, and it would have been beyond the authority of the City Manager and the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance without the City Council direction. The initial attempt is to get the general feeling of City Council, so if it something that needs to be done, it could come back.

0o0

Mayor Robertson stated that, in fact, it was an action to give direction. The direction is to have this conversation to determine which resources can be accomplished.

0o0

Motion by Council Member Baca Jr, and second by Mayor Robertson to and carried by a 3-0 vote to TABLE TAB 7 until a conversation and adequate resources can be made. Mayor Pro Tem Scott and Council Member Carrizales abstained.

0o0

Mayor and City Council gave their reports.

0o0

**REPORTS**

Motion by Council Member Baca Jr., second by Council Member Trujillo and carried by a 5-0 vote, to adjourn the City Council Meeting at 9:33 p.m.

0o0

**ADJOURNMENT**



MAYOR DEBORAH ROBERTSON

**ATTEST:**



CITY CLERK BARBARA A. MCGEE