

Minutes of the special meeting of the San Anselmo City Council held on April 2, 1968.

Present Councilmen: Scott, Capurro, Ragan, Reichmuth, Smith
Mayor Smith, presiding.

City Council
San Anselmo

Gentlemen:

You are hereby notified pursuant to the call of Mayor Arthur W. Smith that the San Anselmo City Council will hold a special meeting on Tuesday, April 2, 1968 at 8:00 p.m. City Hall, San Anselmo.

This meeting is called for the following purpose only:

1. For the sole purpose of investigating certain widely-advertised charges that the San Anselmo City Council and possibly its administrative officials have failed in their duty to the City in that they did not take advantage of funds which were available to the City from other sources, such as Marin Municipal Water District, Marin County, and the State and Federal governments.

Anita Gannon, City Clerk

Receipt of a copy of this letter is hereby acknowledged:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>DATE</u>
<u>Arthur W. Smith</u> Arthur W. Smith	<u>3:50</u>	<u>4/1/68</u>
<u>Woodrow V. Capurro</u> Woodrow V. Capurro	<u>5:40</u>	<u>4/1/68</u>
<u>John M. Reichmuth</u> John M. Reichmuth	<u>6:12</u>	<u>4/1/68</u>
<u>Robert Scott</u> Robert Scott	<u>6:00 PM</u>	<u>4/1/68</u>
<u>Duane Ragan</u> Duane Ragan	<u>7:12 PM</u>	<u>4/1/68</u>

Mayor Smith stated that this was a special meeting call^d for a limited purpose. The purpose was to give a report and explain to the citizens of San Anselmo the facts as to certain charges publicized against the City Council and that therefore, when the report was concluded the meeting would be adjourned. Comments and debate from the floor would not be recognized there being no need for debate.

Councilman Ragan stated he did not feel this council should become a political arena to discuss or mull over campaign charges or to otherwise become involved in a political campaign. Furthermore, he felt these charges are of such a nature that there is no justification for this council to defend its actions or the actions of its department heads. Therefore, would take no part in discussion.

Charge #1 - San Anselmo lost nearly \$5,000 of Water District surplus funds last year.

Fire Chief reported figures obtained from Water District showing all matching funds were used for past couple of years.

Prior to July 1, 1967 the Fire Chief made application for some of the funds that would become available under the new program, to be used in connection with the upgrading of the main on Tamalpais Avenue. This was based on the preliminary estimate of costs given by the Water District, which exceeded our normal quota of matching funds.

Subsequently, the actual costs proved less, and it was not necessary to have these funds. In fiscal year 1967-68 there was \$9,445.00 available. Sausalito received \$4,915.00 of this amount and Fairfax received \$4,530.00. Chief stated he plans to repeat a request for funds in the 1968-69 budget. Councilman Reichmuth asked the Chief if we lost money? The Chief replied about \$3,000. but could apply for same again.

Charge #2 - The voters of San Anselmo are paying \$6,200 a year in county taxes because the council did not support the County Police Services District proposal.

City Administrator reported that according to city council minutes, council supported proposed county service area in unincorporated areas for Sheriff's Patrol Services on a number of occasions, letters were written to the Board of Supervisors and proposal was supported thru Marin County Mayors and Councilmen and City County Service Committee.

Charge #3 - It is costing San Anselmo taxpayers \$9,000 a year for Council salaries, an expenditure on which taxpayers have so far not had a chance to vote.

City Attorney stated at the time the salary ordinance was passed, it was agreed this matter would be placed on the ballot at the April election, and this was done.

Charge #4 - Fortunately, we will get our share of the increased tobacco tax (approximately \$20,000 annually) even though the Council refused to ask for it.

City Administrator stated council refused to support proposed legislation because it had undesirable aspects. The legislation which finally passed was part of the Governors over-all tax program, which was supported by the League of California Cities. The council has subsequently gone on record favoring a new method of distributing this tax which would double our revenue from this source.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Anita Gannon, City Clerk