AGENDA  Thursday, January 9, 2020

A. ROLL CALL

B. MINUTES

C. PRESENTATIONS AND PROCLAMATIONS

D. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

E.1 Hearing to consider an Appeal of the Planning Commission denial of a Minor Use Permit for a 10-foot tall, electrified perimeter fence at 6565 Smith Avenue – from Deputy Community Development Director Interiano.  (RESOLUTION)

F. CITY MANAGER REPORTS

(It is recommended that Item F.1 be acted on unless separate discussion and/or action is requested by a Council Member or a member of the audience.)

CONSENT

F.1 Approval of a Second Amendment to a Contractual Services Agreement with Management Partners for Community Development, Human Resources and Financial Consulting Services – from City Manager Benoun and Interim City Attorney Kokotaylo.  (RESOLUTION)

NONCONSENT

F.2 Consideration of recommendations to the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (WMA) Board regarding a potential Reusable Food Ware Ordinance – from Senior Administrative Analyst Khuu-Seeman.  (MOTION)
G. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS

H. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

I. CITY COUNCIL MATTERS

J. CITY COUNCIL ACTING AS THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

K. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

L. APPROPRIATIONS

Approval of Audited Demands. (MOTION)

M. CLOSED SESSION

N. ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Government Code 54957.5: Supplemental materials distributed less than 72 hours before this meeting, to a majority of the City Council, will be made available for public inspection at this meeting and at the City Clerk’s Office located at 37101 Newark Boulevard, 5th Floor, during normal business hours. Materials prepared by City staff and distributed during the meeting are available for public inspection at the meeting or after the meeting if prepared by some other person. Documents related to closed session items or are exempt from disclosure will not be made available for public inspection.

For those persons requiring hearing assistance, please make your request to the City Clerk two days prior to the meeting.
Welcome to the Newark City Council meeting. The following information will help you understand the City Council Agenda and what occurs during a City Council meeting. Your participation in your City government is encouraged, and we hope this information will enable you to become more involved. The Order of Business for Council meetings is as follows:

A. ROLL CALL
B. MINUTES
C. PRESENTATIONS AND PROCLAMATIONS
D. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
E. PUBLIC HEARINGS
F. CITY MANAGER REPORTS
G. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS
H. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
I. COUNCIL MATTERS
J. SUCCESSOR AGENCY
K. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
L. APPROPRIATIONS
M. CLOSED SESSION
N. ADJOURNMENT

Items listed on the agenda may be approved, disapproved, or continued to a future meeting. Many items require an action by motion or the adoption of a resolution or an ordinance. When this is required, the words MOTION, RESOLUTION, or ORDINANCE appear in parenthesis at the end of the item. If one of these words does not appear, the item is an informational item.

The attached Agenda gives the Background/Discussion of agenda items. Following this section is the word Attachment. Unless “none” follows Attachment, there is more documentation which is available for public review at the Newark Library, the City Clerk’s office or at www.newark.org. Those items on the Agenda which are coming from the Planning Commission will also include a section entitled Update, which will state what the Planning Commission’s action was on that particular item. Action indicates what staff’s recommendation is and what action(s) the Council may take.

Addressing the City Council: You may speak once and submit written materials on any listed item at the appropriate time. You may speak once and submit written materials on any item not on the agenda during Oral Communications. To address the Council, please seek the recognition of the Mayor by raising your hand. Once recognized, come forward to the lectern and you may, but you are not required to, state your name and address for the record. Public comments are limited to five (5) minutes per speaker, subject to adjustment by the Mayor. Matters brought before the Council which require an action may be either referred to staff or placed on a future Council agenda.

No question shall be asked of a council member, city staff, or an audience member except through the presiding officer. No person shall use vulgar, profane, loud or boisterous language that interrupts a meeting. Any person who refuses to carry out instructions given by the presiding officer for the purpose of maintaining order may be guilty of an infraction and may result in removal from the meeting.
E.1 Hearing to consider an Appeal of the Planning Commission denial of a Minor Use Permit for a 10-foot tall, electrified perimeter fence at 6565 Smith Avenue – from Deputy Community Development Director Interiano. (RESOLUTION)

Background/Discussion- Electric Guard Dog LLC (the Applicant) submitted an application to install a 10-foot tall electrified fence at 6565 Smith Avenue. Equipment Share, a construction equipment supplier, currently leases the General Industrial (GI) zoned property. The Applicant requested approval of the tall, electrified fence citing security reasons.

Applicant Proposal:

The Applicant submitted an application for a fully electrified fence that is ten feet in height to be installed around the entire 5 acre property, approximately 6-12 inches within an existing chain link fence (see attached site plan). The property at 6565 Smith Avenue is surrounded by Industrial zoned properties and is located in a street which ends in a cul-de-sac. There are five other properties, which are located in the cul-de-sac of Smith Avenue, and three of those properties have a 6 foot tall chain link fence with barbed wire. The property without barbed wire is adjacent to the subject property. The existing chain link fences with barbed wire are considered legal nonconforming since they were in place before the City’s new zoning regulations took effect in 2018.

Newark Municipal Code Requirements and Staff Analysis:

As part of the adopted 2018 Zoning Ordinance, the City made a concerted effort to amend development regulations to reduce visual impacts of all types of uses including industrial uses by measures such as prohibiting chain link fences, barbwire and restricting the use of hazardous materials on fences. The application does not meet the requirements of the NMC for an MUP as further described below.

Location of Fencing Materials:

An application for the use of hazardous fencing materials, which includes electrified fencing, requires a Minor Use Permit (MUP) pursuant to NMC section 17.17.040(B)(1) which states:

*Prohibition on Hazardous Fencing Materials*. The use of barbed wire, razor wire, ultra-barrier, electrified, and other hazardous fencing is not permitted unless such fencing is required by any law or regulation of the City, the State of California, Federal Government, or other public agency.

a. *Exception*. The Planning Commission may approve an exception to this standard for sites in Employment Districts, provided the hazardous fencing materials are located at the top portion of a fence which is at least six feet in height where the Planning Commission finds such fencing is necessary for security purposes.
Per the plain language of the Code, NMC section 17.17.040(B)(1) only allows for the placement of hazardous fencing materials on the top portion of a fence that is at least 6 feet tall. In this instance, the Applicant seeks to install a fully electrified fence for the entirety length of the fence itself. Thus, by the plain language of NMC section 17.17.040(B)(1), such fence is prohibited by the NMC.

Maximum Height and Required Findings:

Pursuant to Newark Municipal Code (NMC) section 17.17.040(A)(2), an application for a fence greater than 6 feet in height on a nonresidential property requires an MUP. An MUP for a fence greater than 6 feet in height must meet the requirements NMC section 17.17.040(A)(1)(a)(i)(3) and NMC section 17.17.040(A)(1)(a)(ii) which states (emphasis added in italics):

i. Maximum Height.
   (3) Materials. The Director may only approve additional fence height for fences made of masonry block, precast concrete, wood, or metal wrought iron. Vertical or horizontal extensions to an existing fence or wall shall be of the same material and design as the existing fence or wall.

ii. Review and Required Findings. In approving additional fence height, the Director shall make the following findings.
   (1) The additional fence height will not impair the provision of adequate light, air, circulation, and visual openness around adjacent residential structures.
   (2) The additional fence height will not detract from the overall appearance of the neighborhood.
   (3) The additional fence height is not detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of people living in the neighborhood.

Staff has not historically approved fence heights over 6 feet, with the exception of 8 foot tall walls along arterial roadways for noise related mitigation. In this instance, the Applicant is proposing a 10 foot tall electrified fence. Pursuant to NMC section 17.17.040(A)(1)(a)(i)(3) the City can only grant an MUP for a fence that is greater than 6 feet in height where the additional fence height is made of masonry block, precast concrete, wood, or metal wrought iron and where and where any vertical or horizontal extensions to an existing fence or wall is of the same material and design as the existing fence or wall. Here, the proposed electrified fence that runs 10 feet tall would violate the plain terms of this provision. Additionally, the proposed fence would detract from the overall appearance of the area.

In addition to concerns regarding aesthetics, the Police Department and Alameda County Fire Department have opined that an electrified fence would pose an unnecessary and unsafe condition for firefighters, officers, and other first responders and to the public in general during calls for service to the location. Specifically, first responders may be unable to access the premises due to the electrified fence and the process of de-electrifying the fence may negatively impact response times during the potential need for critical services.
Staff recommends that the City Council deny the appeal because the proposed electrified fence does not comply with the NMC and the existing process does not provide the City with the ability to grant the application.

**Planning Commission Meeting on November 12, 2019**

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this item and determined that the proposed application could not be approved because there were two findings required in the Zoning Code relating to fencing materials and fence height that could not be made. The zoning regulations, as written do not permit the type of fence as proposed by the Applicant. The Planning Commission voted to deny the application by a vote of 4-0 (Commissioner Otterstetter was absent).

**Attachments –**
1. Resolution
2. Appendix A-Supporting Docs
3. Justification for Appeal by Electric Guard Dog LLC
4. Planning Commission Resolution No. 1984
5. Draft Planning Commission Minutes November 12, 2019

**Action** – Staff recommends that the City Council, by resolution, deny the appeal and uphold the Planning Commission’s denial of U-19-8, a Minor Use Permit for a 10-foot tall electrified fence at 6565 Smith Avenue.
RESOLUTION NO.


WHEREAS, Keith Kaneko, representative of Electric Guard Dog, has filed an appeal with the City Council of the City of Newark of the denial of an application for U-19-8, a minor use permit, to allow a 10-foot tall fence (Hazardous Fencing Material pursuant to Newark Municipal Code (NMC) section 17.17.040(A)(2)) at 6565 Smith Avenue; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NMC section 17.31.060, a public hearing notice was published in The Tri City Voice on December 24, 2019 and mailed as required, and the City Council held a public hearing on said appeal at 7:30 p.m. on January 9, 2020 at the City Administration Building, 37101 Newark Boulevard, Newark, California; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on said application on November 12, 2019, and voted to deny the application pursuant to Resolution No. 1984;

WHEREAS, pursuant to NMC Chapter 17.35 (Use Permits), the City Council has determined that it cannot make the below required findings pursuant to Newark pursuant to NMC section 17.35.060 to grant the minor use permit:

A. The proposed use is allowed within the applicable zoning district and complies with all other applicable provisions of this Ordinance and all other titles of the Municipal Code
   Comment: The proposal does not comply with NMC section 17.17.040(A)(2) because the hazardous fencing materials are not located on top of a conforming fence. Additionally, NMC section 17.17.040(A)(1)(a)(ii) does not permit additional fence height for electrified fences above six feet in height.

C. The proposed use will not be adverse to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the community, nor detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements;
   Comment: The proposed electrified fence may jeopardize public safety by delaying an emergency response by first responders. There are alternatives to the proposed electrified fence such as security cameras, enhanced security services or other options that do not jeopardize public safety. Thus, the proposed electrified fence violates NMC section 17.17.040(A)(1)(a)(ii).

E. The proposed use complies with any design or development standards applicable to the zoning district or the use in question unless waived or modified pursuant to the provisions of this Ordinance;
   Comment: The fence materials do not comply with the zoning regulations. The fence materials are not consistent with the height and materials requirements of NMC section 17.17.040(A)(1)(a)(i)(3) as noted above.
F. The design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with the existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity; and

Comment: There are no known electrified fences on this street or within the City, therefore the fence would not be compatible with what is typically allowed. Additionally, any such fences would be in plain violation of the NMC.

Findings B, D, and G are not applicable to this determination.

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that it could not make the necessary findings pursuant to NMC Section 17.17.040 (Fences and Freestanding Walls).

Materials Section A(1)(a)(i)(3):

(3) Materials. The Director may only approve additional fence height for fences made of masonry block, precast concrete, wood, or metal wrought iron. Vertical or horizontal extensions to an existing fence or wall shall be of the same material and design as the existing fence or wall.

Comment: The proposed electrical fence does not meet the requirements due to the hazardous fencing materials not being placed on top of a conforming 6 feet tall fence as required by the regulations.

Required Findings Section A(1)(a)(ii):
ii. Review and Required Findings. In approving additional fence height, the Director shall make the following findings.

1. The additional fence height will not impair the provision of adequate light, air circulation, and visual openness around adjacent residential structures.

Comment: The proposed fence would not impair adequate light, air circulation and visual openness around adjacent residential structures. This finding can be made in the affirmative.

2. The additional fence height will not detract from the overall appearance of the neighborhood.

Comment: The proposed 12 gage electrical wire on the 10 foot tall fence would detract from the appearance of the property and the neighborhood as it is not a common material used for security in the City.
3. The additional fence height is not detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of people living in the neighborhood.

Comment: The additional electrified fence height may be detrimental to those who are not aware that the fence is electrified. The electrified fence will unnecessarily reduce the response time from first responders.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council hereby denies this appeal of the Planning Commission’s denial of an application for an MUP.

The City Council could not make the findings prescribed in Newark Municipal Code Sections 17.35.060 and 17.17.040, and directs the City Clerk to send a copy of the Resolution to the applicant.
May 6, 2019

City of Newark
37101 Newark Boulevard
Newark CA 94560

FORMAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL HEIGHT PER NEWARK CODE SECTION 17.17.040 (1)(A)

Please accept this letter as our formal request to allow for the installation of a 10-foot tall, low voltage, battery powered (12V DC) 10’ tall, monitored, perimeter security systems (i.e. electric fence) per CA Civil Code Section 835 which will be safely located inside of an existing perimeter barrier to secure the business during non-business hours. The security system has proven to be the most effective theft deterrent for businesses across the country. Even in cases where businesses were experiencing theft frequently, the installation of the security system immediately results in the cessation of any further attempted break-ins.

This additional height is essential for preserving substantial property rights possessed by other similarly zoned properties in the area - the right to protect and secure property, equipment, product, and, most importantly, the safety and interests of employees (employment, personal vehicles, etc.). It will not constitute a special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on other properties classified in the same zoning district. It is one of material effect on the property owner’s right to reasonably use and protect its property for its intended zoned use.

The additional height will not be materially detrimental to public welfare, injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity or district where the property is located. It is installed completely inside the existing perimeter fence and therefore not exposed to the public. To encounter the security system, one would have to be intentionally trespassing and illegally entering the property.

The general safety and welfare of the public is also maintained, crime is prevented, and the City can redirect law enforcement resources toward crime other than property break-ins and theft. Security cameras record crime and don't prevent it, guards are unreliable (don't show up for work, sleep on the job, and at times are complicit in the criminal action), and typical alarm systems only monitor buildings.

We look forward to working with the City of Newark Staff. Please let us know if there are any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Carol Bausinger
Compliance Manager
Electric Guard Dog, LLC
803-404-6189
cbausinger@electricguarddog.com
electricguarddog.com

Follow us:

Facebook
LinkedIn
Twitter

The Electric Guard Dog
The #1 Theft Deterrent Service in the U.S.
550 Assembly St., 5th Floor
Columbia, SC 29201
The Electric Guard Dog

The #1 Theft Deterrent Service in the U.S.
550 Assembly St., 5th Floor
Columbia, SC 29201

Justification for Additional Fence Height – Equipment Share @ 6565 Smith Avenue

Electric Guard Dog, LLC (EGD) on behalf of EQUIPMENT SHARE (EQUIPMENT SHARE), seeks to install a low voltage, battery powered (12V DC) 10’ tall, perimeter security fence (i.e. electric fence) per CA Civil Code Section 835 which will be safely located inside of the existing perimeter barrier fencing to secure the property during non-business hours. The Electric Guard Dog system consists of the aforementioned security system and has proven to be the most effective theft deterrent for businesses across the country such as EQUIPMENT SHARE. Even in cases where businesses were experiencing theft frequently, the installation of our system immediately results in the cessation of any further attempted break-ins.

Summary of Height Proposal

- Proposed electrified security fence to be located running concurrent with the existing perimeter fence (6-12-inch separation between fences).
- Proposed electrified security fence height to be 10 feet tall inside the existing perimeter fence.

Below are the justifications for granting the requested Additional Fence Height:

1. **The additional fence height will not impair the provision of adequate light, air, circulation, and visual openness around adjacent residential structures.**

   The additional fence height will not impair the provision of adequate light, air, circulation and visual openness around adjacent residential structures. The business is located in an industrial park and is virtually impossible to see. The security fence is constructed of 12 gage wire, fiberglass and steel poles only. There is no flow impediment of a physical or visual nature.

2. **The additional fence height will not detract from the overall appearance of the neighborhood.**

   This additional fence height is essential for preserving substantial property rights possessed by other properties in the area. First and foremost, the right to protect and secure property, equipment, product, and, most importantly, the safety and interests of employees (employment, personal vehicles, etc). EQUIPMENT SHARE is maximizing the security of this property with the proposed EGD security system which effectively deters the criminal class.

   Next, the additional fence height is justified to preserve the substantial property right to reasonably use this property for its intended zoned use – the outdoor storage and display of rental equipment.

   The granting of the additional fence height will not constitute a special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on other properties classified in the same zoning district from which the additional fence height is sought. It is one of material effect on the property owner’s right to reasonably use and protect its property for its intended zoned use.
The general safety and welfare of the public is also maintained, crime is prevented, and the City can redirect law enforcement resources toward crime other than property break-ins and theft. Cameras record crime and don’t prevent it, guards are unreliable (don’t show up for work, sleep on the job, and at times are complicit in the criminal action), and typical alarm systems only monitor buildings.

The EGD security system is the most reliable, economical, and safest perimeter security application available. The installation of the EGD system will secure the property, increase the security of the surrounding properties and the immediate area by deterring the criminal element from visiting the neighborhood.

3. **The additional fence height is not detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of people living in the neighborhood.**

   The approval of the additional fence height will not be materially detrimental to public welfare, injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity or district where the property is located. It is installed completely inside the existing perimeter fence and therefore not exposed to the public. To come in contact with the EGD security system, one would have to be intentionally trespassing and illegally entering the property.

   Next, positioning the electrified security fence concurrent with the existing perimeter fence offers a most visually obscured configuration. Conversely, setting the electrified security fence away from perimeter fence creates the obvious scenario of two separate stand-alone fences, resulting in an aesthetically obtrusive design.

   The additional fence height is the necessary mechanism to relieve a practical difficulty and potential hardship which could be experienced by EQUIPMENT SHARE. Much more effective and reliable than other means of security, Electric Guard Dog will provide EQUIPMENT SHARE with an affordable means to protect their assets and employees.

   In turn, this will allow them to invest financial resources into further growth, resulting in continued employment and an increased tax base for the community. The business is a reputable business, located in appropriate zoning and complies with all other local ordinances.

Based on the information and evidence presented above, we respectfully request the granting of this Administrative Additional fence height for EQUIPMENT SHARE. Much appreciated.
THE #1 THEFT DETERRENT IN THE U.S.

ELECTRIC GUARD DOG
HOW IT WORKS

Core Component Chart

SOLAR PANEL
BATTERY
CONTROLLER
ALARM PANEL & CELL UNIT
KEYPAD
FENCE & GATE
ALWAYS ON & GREEN

- Pulsed electricity
- Great addition to green strategy
- Vigilant - no power failures
- Non-metered
- Independent of the electrical grid
PHYSICAL DETERRENT

- ONLY built inside a non-electrified fence
- Perimeter fence is NEVER electrified
- Multi-lingual warning signs
- If someone touches our fence, they’re trespassing
SHOCK DETERRENT

- Pulsed electricity
- Medically safe
- Pulses every 1.3 seconds
- Pulse duration only .0001-.0004 of a second

WARNING! ELECTRIC FENCE
ALARMED AND MONITORED
7,000 V
The Electric Guard Dog
www.electricguarddog.com

¡PELIGRO! Cerca Eléctrica

ELECTRIC GUARD DOG
www.electricguarddog.com
SAFE & EFFECTIVE

"Electric security fences are safe and do not lead to ventricular fibrillation due to the short 0.0003 second shock duration."

Dr. John Webster
Professor Emeritus of Biomedical Engineering
Nationally Recognized Expert in Pulsed Electricity
SAFE & EFFECTIVE

"Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratories (NRTL) are third-party organizations recognized by OSHA as having the capability to provide product safety testing and certification services..."

NRTL certified means "...the product met the requirements of an appropriate consensus-based product safety Standard either by successfully testing the product itself, or by verifying that a contract laboratory has done so..."

--https://www.osha.gov/dts/otpca/nrtl
Certificate no. T 72171215 01

License Holder: Electric Guard Dog LLC
550 Assembly St., 5th Fl
COLUMBIA SC 29201
USA

Manufacturing Plant: Electric Guard Dog LLC
550 Assembly St., 5th Fl
COLUMBIA SC 29201
USA

Test report no.: USA-DN 31781025 001
Client Reference: Kristopher Brutscher

Tested to:
EN 60335-1:2012+A11
EN 60335-2-76:2005+A1+A2

Certified Product: Charge Controller and Energizer

Model Designation: TUV-EF172, TUV-EF174, TUV-EF175, TUV-EF177, TUV-EF178

Rated Voltage: DC 14.5-16.5V
Rated Current: 2.9A
Protection Class: III
Output Ratings DC: Charge Controller: 20A max.
Energizer: 9.9KV/zone

Special Remarks: Solely assessed per standards listed above.

Appendix: 1, 1-6

Licensed Test mark:

Licensed Test mark: EN 60335-1
EN 60335-2-76

Date of Issue
(day/mo/yr)
04/08/2017
CIVIL CODE
SECTION 829-835

835. (a) As used in this chapter, "electrified security fence" means any fence, other than an electrified fence described in Section 17151 of the Food and Agricultural Code, that meets the following requirements:

(1) The fence is powered by an electrical energizer with both of the following output characteristics:
   (A) The impulse repetition rate does not exceed 1 hertz (hz).
   (B) The impulse duration does not exceed 10 milliseconds, or 10/10000 of a second.

(2) The fence is used to protect and secure commercial or industrial property.

(b) An owner of real property may install and operate an electrified security fence on his or her property subject to all of the following:

(1) The property is not located in a residential zone.


(3) The fence is identified by prominently placed warning signs that are legible from both sides of the fence. At a minimum, the warning signs shall meet all of the following criteria:
   (A) The warning signs are placed at each gate and access point, and at intervals along the fence not exceeding 30 feet.
   (B) The warning signs are adjacent to any other signs relating to chemical, radiological, or biological hazards.
   (C) The warning signs are marked with a written warning or a commonly recognized symbol for shock, a written warning or a commonly recognized symbol to warn people with pacemakers, and a written warning or commonly recognized symbol about the danger of touching the fence in wet conditions.

(4) The height of the fence does not exceed 10 feet and is located behind a perimeter fence that is not less than 6 feet in height.

(c) An owner of real property shall not install and operate an electrified security fence where a local ordinance prohibits that installation and operation. If a local ordinance allows the installation and operation of an electrified security fence, the installation and operation of the fence shall meet the requirements of that ordinance and the requirements of subdivision (b).
ALARM DETERRENT

- Audible & Monitored
- Activates if wires are spread or cut
- 24-hour monitoring
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ALARM COMPANY OPERATOR

License No. ACO7084
Receipt No. 1712

ELECTRIC GUARD DOG, LLC
121 EXECUTIVE CENTER DR #230
COLUMBIA, SC 29210

Bureau of Security and Investigative Services
P.O. Box 989002
West Sacramento, CA 95798-9002
(916) 322-4000

Valid Until: 11/30/2019

In accordance with the provisions of Division 3, Chapter 11.6 of the Business and Professions Code, the company named hereon is issued an Alarm Company Operator License Renewal.

--- NON-TRANSFERABLE --- POST IN PUBLIC VIEW ---

WPIACO 10/2015
FAQ: EMERGENCY ACCESS?

- Knox box
- Allows emergency responders rapid access
Gated communities, apartment complexes, parking garages, pedestrian gates and industrial receiving areas are just a few applications of the Knox® electric override key switch. It can be ordered with single or dual key options for fire, EMS and law enforcement access.

Features and Benefits
- Single or dual key switch
- Fire, EMS or law enforcement identification labels
- One position, two position or momentary switch
- Face plate and lock cover ensure weather resistant operation.

Electrical Data
- **SWITCH:** SPDT or DPDT
- 7 A resistive, 4 A inductive, (sea level), 28 VDC.
- 7 A resistive, 2.5 A inductive, (50,000 ft.), 28 VDC.
- 7 A resistive or inductive, 115 VAC., 60 Hz.
- UL® and CSA listed: 7 A, 250 VAC.
- Temperature tolerance up to +180° F.

Knox® Rapid Entry System
The Knox Company manufactures a complete line of high security products including KnoxBox key boxes, key vaults, cabinets, key switches, padlocks, locking FDC caps, plugs and electronic master key security systems. For more information or technical assistance, please call Customer Service at 1-800-
AESTHETICS
FAQ: WHY MUST OUR FENCE BE TALLER?

It's the difference between this... And this...

800-432-6391 • info@electricguarddog.com   www.electricguarddog.com
Justification for Appeal – Planning Commission Denial of MUP U-19-8
Equipment Share @ 6565 Smith Avenue

Electric Guard Dog, LLC (EGD) on behalf of EQUIPMENT SHARE (EQUIPMENT SHARE), seeks to install a low voltage, battery powered (12V DC) 10’ tall, perimeter security fence (i.e. electric fence) per CA Civil Code Section 835 which will be safely located inside of the existing perimeter barrier fencing to secure the property during non-business hours. The Electric Guard Dog system consists of the aforementioned security system and has proven to be the most effective theft deterrent for businesses across the country such as EQUIPMENT SHARE. Even in cases where businesses were experiencing theft frequently, the installation of our system immediately results in the cessation of any further attempted break-ins.

On November 12, 2019, City of Newark Planning Commission heard and denied MUP U-19-8. We are requesting the review and decision from City Council on various points and references that were brought forth during the past Planning Commission hearing that are in discord with various sections of the municipal code. The fundamental basis for our appeal is founded on section 17.17.040 (B)(1)(a.) Exception and how other sections of the municipal code were inapplicably referenced to deny this MUP.

In the forthcoming City Council hearing, an introduction to this security system will be presented, along with its justified need at the EQUIPMENT SHARE property. Most importantly, we will be prepared to present and discuss the issues brought forth by the Planning Commission and how the findings are indeed met to approve such proposed security system.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Much appreciated.

Respectfully,

Keith Kaneko
Director of Business Development

Electric Guard Dog, LLC
916-532-6012
kkaneko@electricguarddog.com
electricguarddog.com

Follow us:

facebook linkedin twitter
RESOLUTION 1984


WHEREAS, Keith Kaneko, representative of Electric Guard Dog, has filed with the Planning Commission of the City of Newark an application for U-19-8, a minor use permit, to allow a 10-foot tall fence (Hazardous Fencing Material per N.M.C. 17.17.040 (A)(2)) at 6565 Smith Avenue; and

Pursuant to Newark Municipal Code ("NMC") Section 17.31.060, a public hearing notice was published in The Tri City Voice on October 29, 2019 and mailed as required, and the Planning Commission held a public hearing on said application at 7:30 p.m. on November 12, 2019 at the City Administration Building, 37101 Newark Boulevard, Newark, California; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NMC Chapter 17.35 (Use Permits), the Planning Commission has determined that it cannot make the required findings pursuant to Newark pursuant to NMC Section 17.35.060 to grant the minor use permit; per the following:

A. The proposed use is allowed within the applicable zoning district and complies with all other applicable provisions of this Ordinance and all other titles of the Municipal Code

Comment: The proposal does not comply with section 17.17.040(A)(2) in that the hazardous fencing materials are not located on top of a conforming fence.

C. The proposed use will not be adverse to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the community, nor detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements;

Comment: The proposed electrical fence may delay an emergency response by first responders.

E. The proposed use complies with any design or development standards applicable to the zoning district or the use in question unless waived or modified pursuant to the provisions of this Ordinance;

Comment: The fence materials do not comply with the zoning regulations therefore the specific finding of section 17.17.040 must be met. Due to the fence materials not being consistent with the height and materials requirements.

F. The design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with the existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity; and

Comment: There are no known electric fences on this street or within the City, therefore the fence would not be compatible with what is typically allowed
Findings B, D, and G are not applicable to this determination.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that it could not make the necessary findings pursuant to NMC Section 17.17.040 (Fences and Freestanding Walls).

Materials Section A(1)(a)(i)(3):
(3) Materials. The Director may only approve additional fence height for fences made of masonry block, precast concrete, wood, or metal wrought iron. Vertical or horizontal extensions to an existing fence or wall shall be of the same material and design as the existing fence or wall.

Comment: The proposed electrical fence does not meet the requirements due to the hazardous fencing materials not being placed on top of a conforming fence as required by the regulations.

Required Findings Section A(1)(a)(ii):
ii. Review and Required Findings. In approving additional fence height, the Director shall make the following findings.
1. The additional fence height will not impair the provision of adequate light, air circulation, and visual openness around adjacent residential structures.

Comment: The proposed fence would not impair adequate light, air circulation and visual openness around adjacent residential structures. This finding can be made in the affirmative.

2. The additional fence height will not detract from the overall appearance of the neighborhood.

Comment: The proposed 12 gage electrical wire on the 10 foot tall fence would detract from the appearance of the property and the neighborhood as it is not a common material used for security in the City.

3. The additional fence height is not detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of people living in the neighborhood.

Comment: The additional electrical fence height may be detrimental to those who are not aware that the fence is electrical. The electrical fence will likely reduce the response time from first responders.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission hereby denies this application for an MUP.
The Commission could not make the findings prescribed in Newark Municipal Code Sections 17.35.060 & 17.17.040, and directs a Notice of Decision be mailed to the applicant and filed with the City Clerk.

This Resolution was introduced at the Planning Commission’s November 12, 2019 meeting by Vice Chairman Jeff Aguilar, seconded by Commissioner John Becker, and passed as follows:

AYES: Commissioner John Becker, Vice Chairman Jeff Aguilar, Chairperson William Fitts, Commissioner Karen Bridges

NOES: N/A

ABSENT: Commissioner Debbie Otterstetter

__________________________  __________________________
STEVEN TURNER, Secretary    WILLIAM FITTS, Chairperson
A. **ROLL CALL**

Chair Fitts, Planning Commissioners Bridges, Aguilar, and Becker were present. Commissioner Otterstetter was noted absent.

Chair Fitts lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. **MINUTES**

B.1 Approval of Minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of Tuesday, October 22, 2019.

Commissioner Bridges moved, Chair Fitts seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed, 4 AYES, 1 ABSENT.

C. **WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Deputy Community Development Director Interiano stated that there were no written communications.

D. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

No one came forward to speak.

E. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

E.1 Hearing to consider U-19-8, to allow a 10-foot tall electrical fence around the perimeter of 6565 Smith Avenue. (APN: 092A-2300-021).

Deputy Community Development Director Interiano stated that Electric Guard Dog, LLC requested permission to install a 10-foot tall electric, perimeter fence at 6565 Smith Avenue. The property is zoned General Industrial (GI) and is surrounded by general industrial properties. Equipment Share, a construction equipment rental company, requested the fence for the security of their equipment.

Deputy Community Development Director Interiano stated that the applicant did not meet the findings required in the Zoning Code to approve the application. He further stated that Staff did not support the application because: the request does not comply with the intent of the Zoning Code for aesthetically pleasing fencing material, the fence height is above 6 feet, the request did
not meet the definition of allowed exception, approval would set a precedent, and the Police Department was concerned for the safety of first responders.

Chair Fitts opened the public hearing.

Keith Kaneko Electric Guard Dog, LLC, representing the applicant, gave a presentation in support of the application (on file with the Community Development Department). Equipment Share stores their rental equipment both indoors and outdoors. The requested fence will be within the perimeter of the property. He stated that warning signs would be placed every 30 linear feet. The fence pulses every 1.3 seconds and if touched will shock for a millisecond. It is a monitored alarm system, if the pulse does not return then the property manager will be notified. First responders would be provided a key for emergency shut off. He stated that the fence is safe, transparent, and the 10 foot height would prevent people from hopping over. The fence would be 6 to 12 inches behind the existing 6 foot tall chain link fence.

In response to Commissioner questions Mr. Kaneko stated that the shock stings and causes the person to let go of the fence, security guards were cost prohibitive for the site size, fence malfunctions would trigger an alarm mode and the electrification would be turned off, lowering the fence height would reduce the effectiveness.

Carlos Torres of Equipment Share stated that they would have to dig trenches and run electricity throughout the property for lights, cameras, and motion detectors which, in his opinion, were cost prohibitive and not effective.

Public Hearing closed.

Chair Fitts stated he would like to see a fence in person and suggested a possible continuation.

Commissioner Becker stated that he was unable to make two of the findings required in the Zoning Code relating to fencing materials and fence height.

Commissioner Aguilar added that the Police Department concerns were an issue too.

Commission Bridges stated that staff and the applicant should work together towards a solution. She also suggested that staff work with the City Council and consider changing the Zoning Code.

The Commissioners discussed a possible continuance and a site visit to see a fence in person. They concurred to vote on the item and requested that the applicant work with staff to see what alternatives might work within the existing code.

Commissioner Aguilar moved to deny U-19-8, a Minor Use Permit to allow a 10-foot tall electrical Fence at 6565 Smith Avenue, Commissioner Becker seconded with an amendment to the resolution, page 2 Required Findings Section A(1)(a)(ii)1. Comment: The proposed fees would NOT impair (add the word not). The Commissioners concurred with the amendment to the Motion. The motion passed 4 AYES, 1 ABSENT.
F.1 Approval of a Second Amendment to a Contractual Services Agreement with Management Partners for Community Development, Human Resources and Financial Consulting Services – from City Manager Benoun and Interim City Attorney Kokotaylo. (RESOLUTION)

Background/Discussion – The City Manager previously executed a contract with Management Partners for a compensation total not to exceed amount of $50,000 to provide assistance with community development matters. This assistance was necessary when the City’s previous community development director left for a position in another jurisdiction. Subsequently, the City Manager executed a first amendment to the contract during the City Council August Recess to increase the compensation total not to exceed amount to $132,000 and to expand the scope of work to include human resources and financial consulting assistance. This augmentation was necessary to provide staff with expert advice on various labor and employment matters and various budget and financial planning matters for the City. Staff continues to have an immediate and future need for the additional services as a result of the volume of work and complex issues facing the community development, human resources and finance departments.

The proposed resolution authorizes an increase in the total not to exceed compensation by $80,000 to $212,000 in order to allow Management Partners to continue providing assistance related to community development, human resources and financial consulting matters. This will provide sufficient funding for Management Partners to continue providing the necessary augmentation to for the City to move forward with crucial projects necessary to meet imminent needs.

Attachments – Resolution, Second Amendment to the Contractual Services Agreement

Action – Staff recommends that the City Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Second Amendment to the Contractual Services Agreement with Management Partners to Provide Professional Community Development, Human Resources and Financial Consulting Services.
RESOLUTION NO.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEWARK AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACTUAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH MANAGEMENT PARTNERS TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, HUMAN RESOURCES AND FINANCIAL Consulting Services

WHEREAS, the City of Newark awarded a Contractual Services Agreement to Management Partners for professional community development services (the “Agreement”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 10935, the City Manager executed an amendment to the Agreement to increase the amount of compensation and revise the scope of work to provide for augmentation of services to include human resources consulting assistance and finance consulting assistance (the “First Amendment”); and

WHEREAS, the City finds that there is an ongoing need for additional services and desires to amend the Agreement to provide additional funding for the existing scope of services that are provide by Consultant.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Newark that the City Manager is hereby authorized to execute the second amendment to the Contractual Services Agreement with Management Partners to provide professional services related to community development, human resources and financial consulting matters and to increase the not to exceed amount of the Agreement, as amended by the First Amendment, by $80,000 for a total not to exceed amount of $212,000. The second amendment is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACTUAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NEWARK AND MANAGEMENT PARTNERS

This Second Amendment to Contractual Services Agreement between the City of Newark, a municipal corporation, (“City”) and Management Partners, an Ohio corporation (“Consultant”) (together sometimes referred to as “Parties”) dated March 19, 2019, is entered into as of January 9, 2020.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Parties executed a Contractual Services Agreement (the “Agreement”) to provide professional community development services; and

WHEREAS, the Parties previously executed an amendment to the Agreement to increase the amount of compensation pursuant to the Agreement and revise the scope of work to provide for augmentation of services to include human resources consulting assistance and financial consulting assistance in an agreement dated August 21, 2019 (the “First Amendment”); and

WHEREAS, Section 25 of the Agreement allows the Parties to amend the Agreement provided that the amendment is in writing signed by the Parties; and

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to amend the Agreement, as amended by the First Amendment, to provide additional funding for the existing scope of services that are provide by Consultant; and

WHEREAS, City staff is authorized to execute this Amendment in a form approved by the City Attorney.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Exhibit A, Scope of Service, Payment, Qualifications, of the Agreement, is amended to provide the additional scope of work and additional payment, as identified in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

2. Section 3.A. “Not to Exceed” Compensation, of the Agreement, as amended by the First Amendment, is amended to increase the not to exceed compensation by $80,000 for a total not to exceed amount of $212,000 (from a previous not to exceed amount of $132,000 (increased from a not to exceed amount of $50,000 pursuant to the First Amendment)) and Exhibit B to the Agreement is revised accordingly to reflect the increased not to exceed amount.

3. With the exception of the foregoing, all other terms and conditions in the Agreement, as amended, remain in force and effect.
City of Newark

David J. Benoun
City Manager

Dated: ________________

Attest:

Sheila Harrington
City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

Kristopher J. Kokotaylo
Interim City Attorney
EXHIBIT 1
To: Mr. David Benoun, City Manager, City of Newark

From: Jan Perkins, Vice President

Subject: Economic Development Consulting Scope Added to Current Contract

Date: November 25, 2019

This memorandum is to outline our understanding of the scope of work desired by the City of Newark for expert economic development consulting assistance, which is to be incorporated into our existing contract with the City for a variety of management services. We understand the City would like Pat O'Keeffe of our team to provide support to the City on the NewPark Mall redevelopment project. This will involve reviewing documents, evaluating the developer's proposal, discussions with City staff, consultants, and the developer, providing expert advice, coordinating the input of retail and economic consultants, and participating in meetings with staff and the developer. We understand that this work will occur over the next several months. Pat's bio is attached.

We would anticipate up to 30 hours of assistance will be required for these services. The actual consultant hours will be paid by the City of Newark at a rate of $190 per hour plus mileage for Pat O'Keeffe, for an estimated total of $6,000.

Please feel free to contact me at (949) 202-8870 if you have any questions. Thank you.

Accepted for City of Newark by:

Name: ________________________________

Title: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
Management Partners
Patrick O’Keeffe, Special Advisor

Patrick has 39 years of public sector management experience, including over six years as a city manager. He serves as a facilitator for council workshops, other policy level group discussions, and management team retreats. Pat has facilitated council workshops for the cities of Half Moon Bay, Tulare, San Leandro, El Cerrito and Foster City, and numerous policy sessions for a group of agencies comprising the Tri-Valley Utilities. Those agencies are the cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, San Ramon and Dublin; the Alameda County Zone 7 Water Agency; and, the Dublin San Ramon Services District. Since joining Management Partners, Pat has provided expert executive management services and economic development project consulting to numerous Bay Area cities including South San Francisco, Redwood City, Hayward, Vallejo, Albany, El Cerrito, Walnut Creek, Pacifica and Martinez. He has updated the economic development plans for the cities of El Cerrito and Walnut Creek, and has facilitated performance evaluations for City Manager and City Attorney for the cities of Dublin and Saratoga. He has also provided organizational assessments for the Bay Area Rapid Transit District and the City of Sacramento. He has served in interim positions as the City Manager and Public Works Director for Albany, Assistant City Manager and Economic Development Director for South San Francisco, and Community Development Director for Martinez. He has served 26 cities in his five years with Management Partners.

He began his career with the City of Concord Redevelopment Agency where he served as project manager of public facility projects and public/private economic development partnerships. Patrick then served as director of the Community Development Department/ Redevelopment Agency Executive Director for the City of El Cerrito. Next, he was hired as director of economic development and housing for the City of Emeryville. He served in that role for 12 years and was then appointed city manager and served an additional six years.

Contact:
pokeeffe@managementpartners.com
(925) 997-7753
EXHIBIT 2
To: Mr. David Benoun, City Manager, City of Newark
From: Jan Perkins, Vice President
Subject: Contract Augmentation for Consulting Services
Date: December 11, 2019

This memorandum is to propose an augmentation to our contract for expert consulting services to continue through June 2020 in three areas: human resources, finance and economic development.

We understand the City may have need for our assistance approximately one day a week for finance, two days a week for human resources, and sufficient hours to provide economic development advice pertaining to the NewPark Mall project. We propose an augmentation in the amount of $80,000, which will provide approximately 500 hours of consulting assistance during this six month period, plus mileage expenses for our consulting team.

Please feel free to contact me at (949) 202-8870 if you have any questions. Thank you.

Accepted for City of Newark by:

Name: ________________________________

Title: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
F.2 Consideration of recommendations to the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (WMA) Board regarding a potential Reusable Food Ware Ordinance – from Senior Administrative Analyst Khuu-Seeman. (MOTION)

Background/Discussion – The Alameda County Waste Management Authority (WMA) Board is seeking input from member agencies regarding potential implementation of a Reusable Food Ware Ordinance as a means of reducing waste generation from eating and drinking establishments, including all restaurants, food trucks, and third-party delivery services. Plastic single-use food ware items such as plates, bowls, cups, utensils, condiment cups and straws provide consumers and businesses with short-term convenience at relatively little expense, but collectively, these items arguably create a long lasting and significant impact on the environment. The WMA Board’s current consideration of this issue is the result of a priority setting process that StopWaste completed approximately one year ago, during which member representatives voiced concerns from county residents regarding the proliferation of plastic waste in local communities, particularly from single-use food ware. The WMA Board is requesting feedback from each jurisdiction through the respective Board members at the scheduled WMA January 22, 2020 meeting.

There are currently 16 Reusable Food Ware Ordinances either in place or in development in California, including 9 adopted ordinances in the Bay Area. These ordinances advance environmental policy objectives such as waste reduction, toxics reduction, and development of reuse infrastructure. A key aspect of any strategy to meet these objectives is to successfully promote and implement a switch from single-use plastics to durable, reusable food ware and accessories. However, another option includes providing customers single-use products at nominal charges ($0.25 to $0.50).

StopWaste has identified two potential implementation approaches. One is to develop a countywide ordinance that could be implemented in phases over time with increasingly more complex elements. The other option is to develop a model ordinance that could be customized and implemented by individual member agencies. The relative benefits (+) and drawbacks (-) of these implementation approaches are cited by StopWaste as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Ordinance</th>
<th>Countywide Ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Provides greatest flexibility to member agencies</td>
<td>+ Provides greatest waste reduction impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ StopWaste provides the ordinance language, menus of elements, and messaging templates</td>
<td>+ StopWaste coordinates technical assistance and outreach/promotion and manages contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Best option if one size doesn’t fit all</td>
<td>+ Requires consistency across the county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Could result in inconsistent implementation and confusion across jurisdictions</td>
<td>+/- Enforcement with complaint-based approach versus more rigorous ongoing inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Member agencies take enforcement lead and potentially use their own personnel for inspections</td>
<td>- Would require StopWaste to shift resources away from other priorities; may require member agency funding support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For both ordinance options, StopWaste would provide the environmental review, promotional messaging templates and infrastructure support and development. Both ordinance options would potentially take resources away from the considerable effort needed from both StopWaste and member agency staff for compliance with the new regulations forthcoming from SB 1383 – the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Plan. SB 1383 regulates solid waste by directing the California Air Resources Board to reduce methane emissions by 40% by 2025. Additionally, SB 1383 directs CalRecycle to divert 75% of organics from landfills by 2025 statewide (compared to a 2014 baseline) and to recover 20% of edible food for human consumption statewide. Jurisdictions are ultimately responsible for the implementation and enforcement of SB 1383, starting January 1, 2022. Direct impacts to Newark are yet to be determined since the finalized SB 1383 language is expected to be published at the beginning of 2020.

In terms of cost, StopWaste estimates that Ordinance Development in 2019-2020 will be approximately $430,000 for either a countywide ordinance or a model ordinance approach. If a countywide ordinance is pursued, additional development costs are estimated at $768,000 in 2020-2021, with ongoing annual costs of $300,000 to $400,000 thereafter. StopWaste would assume the role of enforcement and technical assistance lead with member agencies providing funding support through Measure D or other funds. In contrast, development of a model ordinance is estimated at an additional $450,000 in 2020-2021. Ongoing annual costs for a model ordinance are not yet known and would be highly dependent on the level of enforcement required. Member agencies would assume the enforcement and technical assistance lead in this scenario.

The WMA Board poses several key questions related to a potential Reusable Food Ware Ordinance to individual member agencies for consideration, as follows:

1. Is this an important issue for your community?

2. If important, do you think it should be a countywide ordinance implemented by StopWaste, or a model ordinance that can be customized and implemented directly by cities?

3. Are these three basic ordinance elements something your jurisdiction would adopt?
   - Reusable food service ware required for all dine-in establishments
   - Single-use food ware must be BPI-certified compostable fiber (non-plastic)
   - Single-use accessories available only on demand or self-service

4. If a countywide ordinance is implemented, would your jurisdiction be willing to contribute resources to StopWaste in order to implement?

5. If a model ordinance works better, is your jurisdiction able to take on its implementation/enforcement along with the requirements of SB 1383?
Staff requests that the City Council provide feedback on this issue to the WMA Board through the City’s representative, Council Member Hannon. If the Council is in favor of a Reusable Food Ware Ordinance, staff has the following recommendations for the City Council to consider as part of this feedback:

- A countywide model ordinance appears to be the most beneficial option because it provides a consistent approach for all jurisdictions and allows StopWaste to take the primary lead for technical assistance, outreach/promotion, and enforcement measures. Where possible, flexibility should be built into the countywide ordinance.
- Requiring reusable food service ware for all dine-in establishments and for any single-use food ware to be BPI-certified compostable fiber and only available upon request are ordinance elements the City should consider the relative costs and challenges to affected local business owners. Also, there should be sufficient flexibility to phase-in these elements over reasonable timeframes for businesses.
- A thorough economic analysis of a countywide ordinance should be completed in advance of proposed ordinance adoption and any contribution of additional resources from member agencies.
- Given that the impacts associated with full implementation and enforcement of SB 1383 are still uncertain, it is difficult for the City to definitively identify the cumulative impact on resources of an additional local ordinance for Reusable Food Ware. Significant resource impacts are anticipated, though not yet quantified for both SB 1383 and any ordinance for Reusable Food Ware. The costs for these impacts will ultimately have to be borne by the consumer.

**Attachments** – Reusable Food Ware Ordinance Topic Brief, November 2019 (StopWaste); Reusable Food Ware Ordinance: Options and Impacts presentation (StopWaste)

**Action** – Staff recommends that the City Council consider providing, by motion, recommendations to the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (WMA) Board regarding a potential Reusable Food Ware Ordinance.
Reusable Food Ware Ordinance

Plastic single-use food ware items like plates, bowls, and utensils are prevalent in daily life. And while straws often get the most attention, these food ware items are also problematic, as they frequently serve a useful life of just minutes while their impact on human health and the environment is significant and long lasting.

StopWaste is currently considering options, including a possible ordinance, to reduce consumption of such items. If adopted countywide, the ordinance would apply to all Alameda County eating and drinking establishments, including food trucks and fast food establishments, as well as third-party delivery services such as DoorDash and Uber Eats. To date, 16 ordinances are in place or in development throughout California, with nine in the Bay Area alone.

A critical aspect of any strategy is to foster widespread adoption of durable reusable cups, containers, and cutlery. Switching from single-use plastics to compostable fiber is not a solution because it does not reduce consumption — many of these items still end up as litter, or are not successfully processed as recycling or compost, and end up in the landfill.

Potential Implementation Approaches

One option is to develop a model ordinance, ready for customization and implementation directly by member agencies. The second would be a countywide ordinance, which could be rolled out in distinct phases that add more complex elements over time. This would allow affected parties to prepare for the changes and address operational considerations.

Possible Ordinance Elements

- Reusable food ware required for all dine-in establishments
- Single-use food ware must be BPI-certified compostable fiber (non-plastic)
- Single-use accessories available only on demand/self-service
- 25¢ charge on single-use cups
- 25¢ - 50¢ charge per meal for to-go food ware if requested

Model Ordinance

+ Greatest flexibility to member agencies
+ StopWaste provides ordinance language, menu of elements, and messaging templates
+ Best option if one size doesn’t fit all
  - Could result in inconsistent implementation and confusion across jurisdictions

Countywide Ordinance

+ Greatest waste reduction impact
+ StopWaste coordinates TA, outreach, and promotion
+ Requires consistency across county
  - Would require StopWaste to shift resources away from other priorities

Reusable Food Ware Ordinance

StopWaste  •  1537 Webster St, Oakland, CA  94612  •  510-891-6500  •  www.StopWaste.org
Community Considerations for a Possible Reusable Food Ware Ordinance:

1. Is this an important issue for your community?

2. If important, do you think that it should be a countywide ordinance implemented by StopWaste, or a model ordinance that can be customized and implemented directly by cities?

3. If countywide, would your jurisdiction be willing to contribute resources to StopWaste in order to implement?

4. If a model ordinance works better, is your jurisdiction able to take on its implementation/enforcement along with the requirements of SB 1383?
Reusable Food Ware Ordinance: Options and Impacts

November 14, 2019
**Policy Objectives**

- **Waste Reduction**
  - Shift towards reusables, making the greatest impact we can
  - Eliminate PFAS compounds

- **Develop Reuse Infrastructure**

- **Toxics Reduction**
  - Avoid landfill and contamination of compost and recycling streams
  - Address litter/pollution
Single-Use / Disposable Product Types

- Unlined/uncoated paper/fiber products
- Non-compostable poly-coated paper
- PLA-coated paper
- Compostable plastics
- Wood products

Policy Focus: **Reusable Alternatives**
Basic Ordinance Elements

- Reusable food service ware required for all dine-in establishments
- Single-use food ware must be BPI-certified compostable fiber (non-plastic)
- Single-use accessories available only on demand/self-service

Key Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What’s Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive Ordinance Elements

Basic ordinance elements, plus:

- $0.25 charge on single-use cups

- $0.25-0.50 charge per meal for to-go food service ware if requested
  
  - Food service ware: plates, cups, bowls, accessories
Other Bay Area Food Ware Ordinances

16 ordinances in place or in development in CA

9 Bay Area ordinances adopted

1 proposed state bill

1 proposed ballot measure

Map does not include straw-only ordinances
Implementation Approach

**Countywide Ordinance**
- Greatest waste reduction impact
- StopWaste coordinates TA and outreach/promotion.
- Requires consistency across county
- Complaint-based enforcement

**Model Ordinance**
- Greatest flexibility to member agencies
- StopWaste provides ordinance language, menu of elements, and messaging templates
- Best option if one size doesn’t fit all

For both ordinance options:
StopWaste conducts environmental review
Challenges

- Avoiding disposable alternatives
- Reusables Infrastructure Needed
- Inconsistency across County
- Resources to implement SB 1383
- Burden on businesses and consumers
  - Health code concerns
  - Accessibility
# Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Ordinance Development</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Option 1: <strong>Countywide</strong> Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Adoption, rollout, TA, enforcement</em></td>
<td>~$768,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2: <strong>Model</strong> Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>TA and outreach assistance</em></td>
<td>~$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Development Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$880,000 - $1.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td><strong>Ongoing Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for <strong>Countywide</strong> Ordinance (Only)</td>
<td>$300K - $400K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Members Next Steps

✓ Discuss with your Councils

Q: Are all three basic ordinance elements something your jurisdiction would adopt?

 Reusable food service ware required for all dine-in establishments

 Single-use food ware must be BPI-certified compostable fiber (non-plastic)

 Single-use accessories available only on demand/self-service

✓ Discussion/Decision: January WMA
StopWaste Role

**Model & Countywide Ordinances:**
- Environmental review
- Promotional messaging templates
- Infrastructure support and development

**Countywide Ordinance Only (all of the above, plus):**
- Outreach and marketing
- Manage master contracts for TA
- Enforcement/assistance
- Stakeholder Outreach
## Enforcement / TA: Implementation & Funding Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance Option</th>
<th>Enforcement &amp; TA Lead</th>
<th>Implementation &amp; Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Option 1: Countywide Ordinance** | StopWaste              | • Complaint-based vs. Inspections  
• Member Agency funding support  
• SW manages master contracts |
| **Option 2: Model Ordinance** | Member Agencies        | • Utilize Stormwater or Environmental Services depts.  
• SW provides general countywide promotional messaging |
MEMO

DATE: December 16, 2019
TO: City Council
FROM: Sheila Harrington, City Clerk
SUBJECT: Approval of Audited Demands for the City Council Meeting of January 09, 2020.

REGISTER OF AUDITED DEMANDS
US Bank General Checking Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Check Numbers</th>
<th>Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 06, 2019</td>
<td>Page 1-2</td>
<td>119705 to 119775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 2019</td>
<td>Page 1-2</td>
<td>119776 to 119826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: December 16, 2019

TO: Sheila Harrington, City Clerk

FROM: Krysten Lee, Finance Manager

SUBJECT: Approval of Audited Demands for the City Council Meeting of January 09, 2020.

The attached list of Audited Demands is accurate and there are sufficient funds for payment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MICR Check#</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Payee Name</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119705</td>
<td>ABACUS PRODUCTS INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>523.71</td>
<td>CITY LETTERHEAD/ENVELOPES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119706</td>
<td>AD SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>COURT RECORDING &amp; COURIER SRVCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119707</td>
<td>APLAC ATTN: REMITTANCE PROCESSING SERVIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,338.80</td>
<td>SHORT TERM DISABILITY PREMIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119708</td>
<td>AIR PRODUCTS GROUP, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>2,046.26</td>
<td>AIR FILTER SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119709</td>
<td>ALAMEDA COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT ATTN: ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>877,330.42</td>
<td>FIRE SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119710</td>
<td>ALAMEDA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE REGION</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>ACADEMY FEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119711</td>
<td>APOC INTERNATIONAL ATTN: MEMBER DUES</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>APOC INT'L MEMBERSHIP 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119712</td>
<td>BATTERY SYSTEMS INC ATTN: ACCOUNTS RECEI</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>826.84</td>
<td>BATTERIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119713</td>
<td>BAY AREA BARRICADE SERVICE INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>502.32</td>
<td>TOW FUND PURCHASE CONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119714</td>
<td>BURTON'S FIRE INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>139.00</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119715</td>
<td>CAL ENGINEERING &amp; GEOLOGY, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>2,195.74</td>
<td>BUILDING PLAN CHECK SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119716</td>
<td>BUREAU VERITAS NORTH AMERICA INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>4,608.31</td>
<td>ANNUAL MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119717</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,027.50</td>
<td>GEOTECH CONSULTING SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119718</td>
<td>CLASSIC GRAPHICS T &amp; J LEWIS INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>627.44</td>
<td>REPAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119719</td>
<td>CONCAST</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>266.88</td>
<td>CABLE SVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119720</td>
<td>COTTON, SHRES AND ASSOCIATES, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,125.00</td>
<td>FY 2019-2020 GEOTECHNICAL PEER REVIEWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119721</td>
<td>THE CALIFORNIA PEACE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATI</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT MEMBERSHIP 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119722</td>
<td>CSG CONSULTANTS, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>2,850.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING PLAN CHECK AND CONSULTANT SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119723</td>
<td>VIDYA SETHURAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>DANCE PERMIT DEPOSIT REFUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119724</td>
<td>SERENA VALENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>RENTAL DEPOSIT REFUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119725</td>
<td>DALE HARDWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>156.46</td>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119726</td>
<td>DELTA DENTAL OF CALIFORNIA ATTN: ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>413.20</td>
<td>DENTAL PREMIUM - DEC'19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119727</td>
<td>DELTA DENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY ATTN: ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>233.58</td>
<td>DENTAL PREMIUM - DEC'19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119728</td>
<td>EAST BAY REFRIGERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>7,414.83</td>
<td>EQUIP REFRIGERATOR FOR PROPERTY/EVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119729</td>
<td>ECS IMAGING, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,796.50</td>
<td>DOCUMENT SCANNING Reinstated from claim#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119730</td>
<td>FIDELITY SECURITY LIFE INSURANCE/EXEMED</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>74.83</td>
<td>VISION PREMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119731</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>SHIPPING CHARGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119732</td>
<td>FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>334.77</td>
<td>DONATION - NOV '19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119733</td>
<td>FREMONT CHRYSLER DODGE JEEP RAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>749.22</td>
<td>PARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119734</td>
<td>FREMONT FORD/AUTOBODY OF FREMONT ATTN: T</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>2,634.00</td>
<td>PARTS RECIPIENT K9 KENNEL CONCRETE WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119735</td>
<td>RICH HOP IT PEACE LANDSCAPE AND CONCRETE</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>34,298.55</td>
<td>GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES FOR CVIC CENTER P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119736</td>
<td>GEOCON CONSULTANTS, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>22,985.09</td>
<td>ERP MAINTENANCE JAN 2020 - JUNE 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119737</td>
<td>HARRIS COMPUTER SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>143.35</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119738</td>
<td>DAVID HIGBEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>951.93</td>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119739</td>
<td>HOME DEPT CREDIT SERVICES DEPT. 32 - 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>825.00</td>
<td>PATROL DCM POST TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119740</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>RECORDS/DISP NON POST TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119741</td>
<td>TAPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>25,665.83</td>
<td>PROJECT 2020-10 VEHICLE PURCHASE HARLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119742</td>
<td>HLC MOTOR COMPANY LIVERMORE HARLEY-DAVID</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>123.28</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119743</td>
<td>JULIE MACIAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>391.84</td>
<td>EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119744</td>
<td>MANAGED HEALTH NETWORK BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,362.81</td>
<td>LONG TERM DISABILITY PREMIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119745</td>
<td>METLIFE SBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>18,272.50</td>
<td>ENGINEERING PLAN CHECK AND CONSULTANT SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119746</td>
<td>MNS ENGINEERS INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>2,469.38</td>
<td>PORTABLE RADIO BATTERIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119747</td>
<td>MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>142.00</td>
<td>NENA MEMBERSHIP 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119748</td>
<td>NENA NATIONAL EMERGENCY NUMBER ASSOCIAT</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>NEOPOST POSTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119749</td>
<td>NEOFUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>20,213.42</td>
<td>STREETLIGHTS/TRAFFIC SIGNALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119750</td>
<td>PACIFIC GAS &amp; ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>18,724.14</td>
<td>ENGINEERING PLAN CHECK AND CONSULTANT SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119751</td>
<td>PARFOUR CONSULTING GROUP, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>881.00</td>
<td>PEST CONTROL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119752</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE PEST MANAGEMENT LPC SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>5,400.35</td>
<td>PETTY CASH REPLACEMENT - 2017 INCIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119753</td>
<td>PETTY CASH CUSTODIAN-RECREATION EDDA RV</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>13,917.96</td>
<td>OLG TOWN SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119754</td>
<td>DAVID J POWERS &amp; ASSOCIATES INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119755</td>
<td>RHODES PLANNING GROUP, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By BRETT OEVERDIEK (BRETTO)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MICR</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119756</td>
<td>EDDA RIVERA LLP</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119757</td>
<td>RUTAN &amp; TUCKER LLP</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>33,060.00</td>
<td>LEGAL CONSULTING PURSUANT TO C19022 FY19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119758</td>
<td>SFFGC-WATER DEPARTMENT CUSTOMER SERVICE</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>3,359.19</td>
<td>RENT/WATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119759</td>
<td>SAN MATEO REGIONAL NETWORK INC SMRN.COM</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>12 MONTHS SMTP PREMAIL MAIL FILTERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119760</td>
<td>S.B.R.P.S.T.C.</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>PATROL POST TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119761</td>
<td>PATRICK SMITH</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119762</td>
<td>SMG &amp; ASSOCIATES, INC.</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>7,561.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING PLAN CHECK AND CONSULTANT SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119763</td>
<td>SONITROL</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>2,136.00</td>
<td>VIDEO CAMERA MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119764</td>
<td>SURF TO SHOW ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE MANA</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>STORMWATER INSPECTION SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119765</td>
<td>T-MOBILE</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>400.67</td>
<td>TMOBILE CELL SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119766</td>
<td>THEREBU, LLC.</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,210.72</td>
<td>HVAC REPAIR Reinstated from claim# 13653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119767</td>
<td>TURF &amp; INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT CO</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>1,723.63</td>
<td>TIRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119768</td>
<td>TYLER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>509.71</td>
<td>FLEET SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119769</td>
<td>UNITED STATES POSTMASTER</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>114,400.00</td>
<td>ERP IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119770</td>
<td>PROVIDENT LIFE &amp; ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMP</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>2,765.00</td>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119771</td>
<td>VERDE DESIGN INC</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>261.24</td>
<td>PAYROLL PREMIUM - E0246526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119772</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>0,030.00</td>
<td>DESIGN SERVICES FOR CIP #1192 SPORTSFIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119773</td>
<td>WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTION ALLIANCE</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>4,117.00</td>
<td>VERIZON YEARLY CELL PHONE SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119774</td>
<td>YORK RISK SERVICES GROUP ATTN: CLIENT TR</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>846.00</td>
<td>RETAIL SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119775</td>
<td>YORK RISK SERVICES GROUP ATTN: CLIENT TR</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>34,625.68</td>
<td>WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,321,298.83

By BRETT OEVERNDIEK (BRETTO)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check#</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119776</td>
<td>ABBE &amp; ASSOCIATES LLC</td>
<td>ABBE &amp; ASSOCIATES LLC</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>9,635.06</td>
<td>CONSULTANT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119777</td>
<td>ADAMSON POLICE PRODUCTS</td>
<td>ADAMSON POLICE PRODUCTS</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2,710.83</td>
<td>FLARES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119778</td>
<td>ALPINE AWARDS</td>
<td>ALPINE AWARDS</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>472.23</td>
<td>TSHIRTS AND UNIFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119779</td>
<td>ANDRE'S MECHANICAL &amp; GENERAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ANDRE'S MECHANICAL &amp; GENERAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>1,471.90</td>
<td>PUMP REPAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119780</td>
<td>ANNETTE PAREDES</td>
<td>ANNETTE PAREDES</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119781</td>
<td>ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP</td>
<td>ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>3,333.50</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SRVCS PURSUANT TO AGMT C190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119782</td>
<td>ERIC BARAJAS</td>
<td>ERIC BARAJAS</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>131.03</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119783</td>
<td>BRUCE BARTON PUMP SERVICE INC</td>
<td>BRUCE BARTON PUMP SERVICE INC</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>543.57</td>
<td>PUMP/WELL REPAIRS/SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119784</td>
<td>BAY CENTRAL PRINTING</td>
<td>BAY CENTRAL PRINTING</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>191.34</td>
<td>BUSINESS CARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119785</td>
<td>GVE VENTURES INC. DBA BOB MURRAY &amp; ASSOC</td>
<td>GVE VENTURES INC. DBA BOB MURRAY &amp; ASSOC</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>3,086.28</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119786</td>
<td>SUNTON'S FIRE INC</td>
<td>SUNTON'S FIRE INC</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>521.61</td>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119787</td>
<td>CARBONIC SERVICE</td>
<td>CARBONIC SERVICE</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>210.12</td>
<td>CO2 BULK DELIVERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119788</td>
<td>CENTREVILLE LOCKSMITH</td>
<td>CENTREVILLE LOCKSMITH</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>LOCK AND KEY SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119789</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>CABLE SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119790</td>
<td>GARY MORSE MERRA MORSE</td>
<td>GARY MORSE MERRA MORSE</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE BOND RTN EP# 2018-0203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119791</td>
<td>DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION CALIFORN</td>
<td>DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION CALIFORN</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>325.00</td>
<td>LEGAL ADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119792</td>
<td>MARK DELAPPE</td>
<td>MARK DELAPPE</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>163.82</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119793</td>
<td>DELL MARKETING L P C/O DELL USA L P</td>
<td>DELL MARKETING L P C/O DELL USA L P</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>4,639.62</td>
<td>PRE-APPROVAL # 2019-1-4 DISPATCH WORKSTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119794</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ACCOUNTING OFFICE</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ACCOUNTING OFFICE</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>498.03</td>
<td>FINGERPRINTING FEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119795</td>
<td>EDWARDS &amp; SONS EQUIPMENT SERVICE, INC.</td>
<td>EDWARDS &amp; SONS EQUIPMENT SERVICE, INC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>1,212.92</td>
<td>LIFT PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119796</td>
<td>FREMONT CHRYSLER DODGE JEEP RAM</td>
<td>FREMONT CHRYSLER DODGE JEEP RAM</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>949.42</td>
<td>PARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119797</td>
<td>FREMONT FORD/AUTOBODY OF FREMONT ATTN: T</td>
<td>FREMONT FORD/AUTOBODY OF FREMONT ATTN: T</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>669.78</td>
<td>PARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119798</td>
<td>PHILIP H HOLLAND</td>
<td>PHILIP H HOLLAND</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>RESERVE UNIF ALLOWANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119799</td>
<td>BRUCE HOWCROFT</td>
<td>BRUCE HOWCROFT</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>RESERVE UNIF ALLOWANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119800</td>
<td>KANEN TOURS, INC.</td>
<td>KANEN TOURS, INC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2,139.00</td>
<td>CHRISTMAS IN THE PARK TRIP 12/09/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119801</td>
<td>KBA DOCUMENT SOLUTIONS, LLC.</td>
<td>KBA DOCUMENT SOLUTIONS, LLC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>498.03</td>
<td>COPIER LEASE AGREEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119802</td>
<td>KING KUSTOM KOVERS INC</td>
<td>KING KUSTOM KOVERS INC</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>437.19</td>
<td>CUSHION REPAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119803</td>
<td>LDV, INC.</td>
<td>LDV, INC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>174,815.00</td>
<td>COMMAND VEHICLE RESO 10905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119804</td>
<td>LIYIN PEAVY COMPANY</td>
<td>LIYIN PEAVY COMPANY</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>298.79</td>
<td>EVIDENCE SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119805</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT PARTNERS INC.</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT PARTNERS INC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>6,900.70</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119806</td>
<td>MISSION UNIFORM SERVICE</td>
<td>MISSION UNIFORM SERVICE</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2,173.60</td>
<td>MATS, TOWELS, AND UNIFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119807</td>
<td>KKR AUTOMOTIVE DBA NAPA AUTO PARTS</td>
<td>KKR AUTOMOTIVE DBA NAPA AUTO PARTS</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>1,204.09</td>
<td>PARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119808</td>
<td>NATIONAL DATA &amp; SURVEYING SERVICES</td>
<td>NATIONAL DATA &amp; SURVEYING SERVICES</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td>CIP #1160 TRAFFIC CALMING - TRAFFIC COUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119809</td>
<td>PACIFIC GAS &amp; ELECTRIC</td>
<td>PACIFIC GAS &amp; ELECTRIC</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>102,621.96</td>
<td>STREETLIGHTS/TRAFFIC SIGNALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119810</td>
<td>PHAN'S SMOG STATION</td>
<td>PHAN'S SMOG STATION</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>SMOG TEST SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119811</td>
<td>PHOENIX GROUP INFORMATION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>PHOENIX GROUP INFORMATION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>1,194.95</td>
<td>PARKING CITATION PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119812</td>
<td>PORTER RENTS, LLC.</td>
<td>PORTER RENTS, LLC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119813</td>
<td>HELEN QUE-GARCIA</td>
<td>HELEN QUE-GARCIA</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>460.73</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119814</td>
<td>R3 CONSULTING, INC</td>
<td>R3 CONSULTING, INC</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>19,527.50</td>
<td>COST-BASED RATE REVIEW CONSULTING SERVIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119815</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES AUTHORITY</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES AUTHORITY</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>358.00</td>
<td>CONTRACT SERVICES FOR OCT 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119816</td>
<td>RHODES PLANNING GROUP, INC.</td>
<td>RHODES PLANNING GROUP, INC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>21,130.25</td>
<td>OLD TOWN SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119817</td>
<td>STAPLES</td>
<td>STAPLES</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>1,114.93</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119818</td>
<td>MARY TEIXEIRA</td>
<td>MARY TEIXEIRA</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119819</td>
<td>TURF &amp; INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT CO</td>
<td>TURF &amp; INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT CO</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>16,149.71</td>
<td>SEEDER AND AERA-VATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119820</td>
<td>UNION SANITARY DISTRICT ATTENTION ACCOUNT</td>
<td>UNION SANITARY DISTRICT ATTENTION ACCOUNT</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>308,044.70</td>
<td>USD PERMIT/CAPACITY FEES FOR NEW CIVIC C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119821</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL BUILDING SERVICES &amp; SUPPLY CO.</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL BUILDING SERVICES &amp; SUPPLY CO.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>32,198.00</td>
<td>JANITORIAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119822</td>
<td>V5 SYSTEMS INC.</td>
<td>V5 SYSTEMS INC.</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>643.68</td>
<td>TECH NEEDS/MAINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119823</td>
<td>VALLEY OIL COMPANY LOCKBOX# 138719</td>
<td>VALLEY OIL COMPANY LOCKBOX# 138719</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>18,593.59</td>
<td>OILER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119824</td>
<td>VERIZON BUSINESS SERVICES</td>
<td>VERIZON BUSINESS SERVICES</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>625.14</td>
<td>CELL SVC FOR MDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119825</td>
<td>CHRISTOPHER VUONG</td>
<td>CHRISTOPHER VUONG</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>130.99</td>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119826</td>
<td>WASHINGTON HOSPITAL GENERAL ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>WASHINGTON HOSPITAL GENERAL ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>VICTIM MEDICAL EXAMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By BRETT GOVERNIEK (BRETTO)
Final Disbursement List. Check Date 12/12/19, Due Date 12/23/19, Discount Date 12/23/19. Computer Checks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MICR</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Check#</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Total 744,276.57