

**Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Oakley City Council
February 25, 2015**

**Oakley City Hall
City Council Chambers
3231 Main Street
Oakley, CA 94561
4:00 p.m.- 6:00 p.m.**

1. Welcome

Finance Director Paul Abelson welcomed attendees at 4:00 p.m. Approximately 10 people were in attendance. Mayor Hardcastle, Vice Mayor Romick and Councilmember Higgins were in attendance at various times throughout the meeting.

2. Public Comments

Online Comment Forms

No online comment forms were submitted.

Public Comment Cards

No public comment cards were submitted.

3. Gather Public Input regarding the Ongoing Police Services Study

Finance Director Paul Abelson provided an overview of the Police Services Study and opened the discussion for comments, concerns, questions and suggestions.

Items discussed included cost, liability, workers compensation and other potential service impacts, including a 4850 risk transfer question. The following questions were raised:

- Will the transition happen all at once or be phased?
- How will the City ensure a smooth transition of technology and communications services?
- Will the savings be earmarked for increasing police staff or will it go into the General Fund?
- Looking long term, has the City determined and how many new officers will be added in the years to come, and when they will be added?
- When will the City release the budget?
- With 30 different areas of service having been examined by City staff; are budgets and contracted vs. in house costs for each area examined available for public review? If not, when will they become available?
- What is the timeline is for implementation?

Mr. Abelson explained that there are still moving targets, and for that reason the City remains cautious about releasing specific cost estimates by area. He emphasized the

importance of ensuring the City maintains or improves its level of service, and how that is paramount in the analysis. He commented that the City Council has requested City staff to report public input, so it can consider public input in addition to staff's analysis before it makes a final decision. He explained that if the City Council directs staff to move forward, the City is required to provide a 12-month notice to the County to allow time for transition.

One person expressed opposition to in-house police services.

Mr. Abelson explained that anticipated cost increases at the County would likely limit, if not preclude, future additions that the City believes will be necessary to maintain current service levels, and that an in-house model would likely allow the City to be more responsive to changes in service needs.

4. Closing Discussion & Comments

Mr. Abelson thanked everyone who attended and mentioned he will report back to the City Council all of the comments, concerns, questions and suggestions presented this evening.

5. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Libby Vreonis
City Clerk