

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- -JULY 17, 2012- -7:00 P.M.

Mayor Gilmore convened the meeting at 7:14 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Present: Councilmembers Bonta, deHaan, Johnson, Tam, and Mayor Gilmore – 5.

Absent: None.

AGENDA CHANGES

None.

PROCLAMATIONS, SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY & ANNOUNCEMENTS

(12-378) Proclamation Recognizing Alameda Municipal Power (AMP) for 125 Years of Service; and Presentation to the City of Alameda by the State of California Legislative Office Commending AMP on Its 125th Anniversary of Providing Public Power.

Mayor Gilmore read and presented the proclamation to the members of the Public Utilities Board and AMP General Manager.

(12-379) Proclamation Recognizing the City's Antique Fire Apparatus Volunteers.

Mayor Gilmore read and presented the proclamation to Richard Davis, Charles Daniels, Richard Bennett, Kenneth Rankin and Douglas Clifton.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

(12-380) Ken Peterson, Alameda, discussed financial practices and commingling funds.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Gilmore announced that final passage of the Housing Element ordinance [paragraph no. 12-397] was removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Vice Mayor Bonta moved approval of the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

Councilmember Johnson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Tam noted that she would abstain from voting on the Clean Lakes, Inc. [paragraph no. 12-387].

On the call for the question, the motion carried by unanimous voice vote – 5. [Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(*12-381) Minutes of the Special and Regular City Council Meetings Held on June 19, 2012. Approved.

(*12-382) Ratified bills in the amount of \$3,389,511.51.

(*12-383) Recommendation to Approve a One-Year Contract With Graphtek Advertising and Design in an Amount Not to Exceed \$6,000 for Technical Support for the City's Website. Accepted.

(*12-384) Recommendation to Adopt Plans and Specifications and Authorize a Call for Bids for Repair of Portland Cement Concrete Sidewalk, Curb, Gutter, Driveway, and Minor Street Patching, FY12-13, Phase 13, No. P.W. 04-12-08. Accepted.

(*12-385) Recommendation to Reject the Sole Bid and Authorize a New Call for Bids for Urban Forest Maintenance Services (Citywide), No. P.W. 06-11-16. Accepted.

(*12-386) Recommendation to Allocate \$80,000 from the Sewer Enterprise Fund and Award a Contract in the Amount of \$430,000, Including Contingencies, to Roto Rooter for Sewer Point Repairs and Asphalt Concrete Replacement within the City of Alameda, No. P.W. 05-12-09. Accepted.

(*12-387) Recommendation to Award a Contract in the Amount of \$107,000, Including Contingencies, to Clean Lakes, Inc. for Vegetation Management, Debris Management, and Water Quality Monitoring for the South Shore Lagoons, No. P.W. 05-12-11, Subject to Funding Approval by the Alameda West Lagoon Homeowners Association's Board of Directors. Accepted.

Note: The staff recommendation passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Bonta, deHaan, Johnson and Mayor Gilmore – 4. Abstention: Councilmember Tam - 1.

(*12-388) Recommendation to Allocate \$37,500 from the Sewer Enterprise Fund and Approve a Second Amendment to the Contract with Waterworks Engineers for the Preparation of Engineering Documents for the Upgrade of the City of Alameda Sewer Pump Stations, Phase 3: Bay Farm Island Pump Station Rehabilitation, No. P.W. 12-10-35. Accepted.

(*12-389) Recommendation to Endorse the East Bay Economic Development Alliance's Open for Business Pledge. Accepted.

(*12-390) Resolution No. 14719, "Ratifying the Public Utilities Board's Approval of the Northern California Power Agency Legislative and Regulatory Program Agreement." Adopted.

(*12-391) Resolution No. 14720, "Ratifying the Public Utility Board's Approval of the Amended and Restated Market Purchase Program Agreement with the Northern

California Power Agency.” Adopted.

(*12-392) Resolution No. 14721, “Accepting Agreements with Allsport America Inc., Doing Business As, Sport Court Tennis for Rehabilitation of Tennis Courts (Various Locations), Funded by Measure WW in an Amount Not to Exceed \$350,000.” Adopted; and

(*12-392 A) Resolution No. 14722, “Accepting Service Agreement with Community Playgrounds for Demolition and Installation of Tillman Park Playground Funded by Measure WW in an Amount Not to Exceed \$31,048.” Adopted.

(*12-393) Resolution No. 14723, “Calling for a General Municipal Election to be Consolidated with the Statewide General Election to be Held in the City of Alameda on Tuesday, November 6, 2012 and Requesting the Alameda County Board of Supervisors to Permit the Registrar of Voters to Render Specified Services to the City Relating to the Conduct of Said Election.” Adopted.

(*12-394) Resolution No. 14724, “Amending Resolution No. 14637 to Add July 24, 2012 as a Regular City Council Meeting.” Adopted.

(*12-395) Ordinance No. 3052, “Approving a Lease and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Documents Necessary to Implement the Terms of the Lease with Delphi Productions, Inc. for Five Years in Building 39 at Alameda Point, 950 West Tower Avenue.” Finally passed.

(*12-396) Ordinance No. 3053, “Approving a Lease and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Documents Necessary to Implement the Terms of the Lease with American Bus Repair LLC, dba Coach Specialties for Two Years in a Portion of Building 24 at Alameda Point, 2301 Monarch Street.” Finally passed.

(12-397) Ordinance No. 3054, “Amending Various Sections of the Alameda Municipal Code Contained in Chapter XXX (Development Regulations) to Ensure Consistency Between the State Housing Element Law, the City of Alameda General Plan and the City of Alameda Municipal Code.” Finally passed.

The Planning Services Manager gave a Power Point presentation.

Spoke in opposition of the ordinance: Adam Garfinkle, Alameda; Barbara Rasmusson, Alameda; Connie Branson, Alameda; Lola Brown, Alameda; Dorothy Freeman, Alameda; Ashley Jones, Alameda; Lester Cabral, Alameda; Gail deHaan, Alameda; Alexander Stevens, Alameda; Jim Smallman, Alameda; Corinne Lambden, Alameda; Darcy Morrison, Alameda; Gretchen Lipow, Alameda (submitted information); Carol Gottstein, Alameda; former Councilmember Karin Lucas, Alameda; Bill Stallman, Alameda; and Reyla Graber, Alameda.

* * *

During Mr. Garfinkle's comments, Councilmember Tam left the dais at 8:18 p.m. and returned at 8:20 p.m.

* * *

Mayor Gilmore outlined the process followed to develop housing; stated the City is simply identifying sites where housing could be built, the City is not responsible for actually building housing; a developer or some other entity would pick a site and build housing on the site; projects still have to go through the entire planning process, which includes noticed hearings in front of the Planning Board; a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document might be required to address traffic mitigations, building height limits, and other things; the Housing Element simply identifies sites where housing can be built.

The Planning Services Manager stated Alameda Point was not included because staff was nervous the land would not be available during the planning period; "available" means a site has to be zoned for residential use and available to the market; Alameda Point is still under Navy ownership and is not available; last time, the City had a carryover of 345 units because Alameda Point was promised to be available by 2006 and is still not available; the next round will be much easier when Alameda Point is available; staff did not want to make any promises that cannot be kept because when promises are not kept cities are penalized under State law.

Following Ms. Rasmusson's comments, the Planning Services Manager responded multifamily housing could be built anywhere if the courts throw out Measure A; the Charter would only allow multifamily housing on sites identified to meet the State obligation if Measure A is preserved for the rest of the City; multifamily zoning would be prohibited by the Charter after the State obligation is met.

The City Manager stated Alameda Point is not a panacea because the agreement with the Navy limits the City to 1,425 housing units at Alameda Point; putting 4,000 units at Alameda Point does not pencil out; every project has to go through the CEQA process, the Planning Board process, and deal with traffic mitigations and all other density issues.

Mayor Gilmore stated the City is identifying sites for 2,400 units; 1,700 units will be required in the next round if the Housing Element is passed.

Councilmember deHaan requested staff to explain where the initial numbers come from.

The City Manager responded the number is a State generated number.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) sets the number.

The Planning Services Manager responded the State of California identifies how much housing the entire State needs; stated then, the State gives each region a portion,

which is where ABAG becomes involved; ABAG is the regional governing entity for the Bay Area; ABAG works with all the cities to allocate the units among the various cities; Alameda is no different than any every other city; all cities are concerned about traffic and have difficulty accommodating more housing; ABAG comes up with formulas on how to distribute units; the formula is very complicated and takes into account regional policies such as reducing greenhouse gases, preserving farmland, and access to transit; ABGA gave Alameda just under 2,100 units; the Housing Element was written for said number; the State sent Alameda a letter in 2009 indicating the City failed in the last round and received a penalty, which added 374 units.

Councilmember Johnson stated Alameda previously appealed an ABAG number and won at the ABAG level, but ultimately lost at the State level.

In response to Councilmember deHaan's inquiry regarding challenging the number, the Planning Services Manager stated the City has not done so since 2006; challenges are very difficult; some other city has to accept the units if ABAG takes the housing units away from Alameda; ABAG has to allocate all units and cannot tell the State the number is too high.

Discussed legal options under State and environmental law: Ken Peterson, Alameda.

Discussed complicated language and public noticing of the Housing Element; and protecting Measure A: Mary Anderson, Alameda.

Following Ms. Anderson's comments, the City Attorney explained the State's authority over housing; stated the government has a hierarchy with most power at the federal level, then, the State, then, local levels; California has Charter cities and general law cities; general law cities are created pursuant to statute and can only do what the legislature authorizes; Charter cities have more power; the State constitution allows for Charter cities as long as matters in the Charter are of municipal interest; for matters of Statewide interest, the State preempts the Charter; regarding the Housing Element, the State has stepped in and said providing housing is of Statewide concern; therefore, the State directs what the City has to do; staff has been trying very hard to protect as much of the interpretation of Measure A as possible while still conforming with the requirements of State law; the overlay is being done to prevent losing all of Measure A's provisions; a density bonus ordinance had to be passed because the matter was a Statewide concern; the City passed a density bonus ordinance and still maintained Measure A; the City has to take a similar action [on the Housing Element] because Measure A could be found unconstitutional if challenged, since it does allow the City to comply with State law.

Discussed ways to get around State law and unit size designation for tax purposes: Bill Stallman, Alameda.

Urged the Council to adopt the ordinance: Helen Sause, Housing Opportunities Make Economic Sense (HOMES); Diane Lichtenstein, HOMES; Doug Biggs, Alameda Point

Collaborative; Kathryn Neale Manalo, Alameda; Darin Lounds, East Bay Housing Organizations (EBHO); Jon Spangler, Alameda; Deni Adaniya, Alameda; Joy Chin Malloy, Alameda; Laura Thomas, Renewed Hope Housing Advocates; Don Lattin, Alameda; Amie Fishman, EBHO; Gene Oh, Alameda Bicycle; Jean Fong, Alameda; Austin Tam, Alameda; Michael Yoshii, Buena Vista United Methodist Church; and former Supervisor Alice Lai Bitker, Alameda.

* * *

During Mr. Spangler's comments, Vice Mayor Bonta left the dais at 9:15 p.m. and returned at 9:17 p.m.

* * *

Mayor Gilmore inquired whether or not the housing numbers would be different if the City left ABAG.

The Assistant City Manager stated Corte Madera left ABAG in March; other neighboring cities were talking about leaving and decided not to follow because they would be losing their voice at the table.

The City Manager stated cities that do not belong to ABAG are not at the table to argue.

Councilmember deHaan inquired stated Alameda has taken its fair share in the last 15 years and has a mandatory 25% set aside for all development and 15% for infill projects; the City moved forward with density bonus and was not stopped by Measure A; the City did in-law units without being told to do so; housing has been built for seniors, the disabled and veterans; homeless accommodations have been included in Base conversion; the new City Manager issues press releases and community advisories at least once a week; he did not see one press release on the Housing Element.

The City Manager noted the front page of the newspaper has an article, "Planning Seeks Input on New Housing Element."

Councilmember deHaan stated the Encinal terminals and Chipman projects includes 24 acres to be developed and a total of 11 households were notified, which is not adequate; although the City has been working with the housing group, not everyone in the community knew; the outreach needs to be understood; the rest of the community is forgotten; the Housing Element is not an individual property site that requires 300 foot noticing; the entire City would be impacted; Alameda is the third highest, densest community in Alameda County and has some unique constraints; that he has some concerns.

The City Manager stated staff works hard to maintain lines of communication; the matter was discussed on blogs and in newspapers; the Housing Element is five years late and stating the community does not know excludes community members who did participate; questioned whether other matters of Citywide concern, such as the budget,

should require notification to every household; staff more than exceeded State law; Planning Board agendas now have seven day notice, not three; Council meetings are noticed 12 days, not three; the City has produced advisories since the new administration has taken over, which he is proud of; people who write and call, receive answers; addressed the timing of the hearing; stated staff is doing its best to preserve the way of life in Alameda.

Vice Mayor Bonta thanked the Planning Services Manager for his work and the comprehensive presentation detailing all public engagement opportunities; stated the hearing is robust community dialogue and exchange of ideas; the staff proposal is a common sense, practical, pragmatic approach, which is prudent both financially and legally; the City is out of compliance with State law and needs to get certified; the City has not had a certified Housing Element for 22 years; adoption preserves the City's access to State funding, avoids lawsuits, keeps local control and provides housing options for all residents.

Vice Mayor Bonta moved final passage of the ordinance.

Councilmember Tam seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Councilmember Tam stated the meeting culminates a long public process; the Housing Element ensures community concerns can be addressed by preserving local control over Measure A, rather than having control taken away by the State or courts; quality of life concerns will be addressed under CEQA when projects commence; the proposed overlay is a creative way of preserving Measure A; thanked staff.

Councilmember Johnson inquired how much transportation funding the City could face losing without a certified Housing Element, to which the Planning Services Manager responded the amount for the next round for the entire Bay Area is \$320 million.

Councilmember Johnson stated the State is coming down harder on cities without an adopted Housing Element; all cities have unique circumstances and do not agree with the number of units assigned; Alameda has had positive things from Measure A, but Measure A does not prevent the demolition of historic structures; the Council adopted an ordinance which requires a process before demolishing a historic structure; the City faces great risk if the Housing Element is not certified; there could be loss of control over the permit process and the loss of Measure A; the staff proposal would preserve Measure A and result in a certified Housing Element to avoid consequences; the City has to comply with State law; the City would not eliminate the 2,400 unit requirement by not adopting the Housing Element.

Mayor Gilmore stated the State does not care about Alameda's uniqueness; a court would come to the conclusion that Measure A does not comply with State law, which is a problem for the City; the entire Island would lose Measure A; the City has taken a rational approach to identify 10 sites to comply with State law and maintain Measure A

for the rest of the Island; State law cannot be avoided; other cities have faced detriment by trying to avoid State law; the Housing Element is a way to come into compliance with State law; more so than complying with State law, the Housing Element is the right thing to do; older people want to stay in Alameda and should have the opportunity to move to smaller homes; young adults cannot afford to live in Alameda; hard working people should have the opportunity to live in Alameda.

Councilmember deHaan read from the ordinance; stated parking waivers are not moving in the right direction; that he would not support the ordinance; the matter is not about affordable housing but is about how the ordinance is constructed; pre-Measure A did not allow the type of building being proposed.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Bonta: Aye; deHaan: No; Johnson: Aye; Tam: Aye; and Mayor Gilmore: Aye. Ayes – 4. Noes – 1.

* * *

(12-398) Councilmember Tam moved approval of considering all of the regular agenda items after 10:30 p.m.

Vice Mayor Bonta seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

* * *

* * *

Mayor Gilmore called a recess at 10:21 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

* * *

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

(12-399) Update on the Status of the Utilities Underground District Program Redesign.

The AMP General Manager gave a brief presentation.

Urged Council to move forward with the proposed program redesign: Corinne Lambden, Alameda.

In response to Councilmember deHaan's inquiry regarding scheduling, the AMP General Manager stated prioritization is one of the fundamental problems; so many criteria have been added over the years; a strategy would be developed to prioritize high public benefit projects for the majority of ratepayers; financial assistance may differ from project to project, which is not accounted for under current criteria.

Councilmember Tam moved acceptance of the report.

Councilmember Tam expressed concern with the public participation process taking too long.

The AMP General Manager stated a minimum customer acceptance threshold was established for cases when the notice was done years ago; Phase 6 from 2004 had 10 districts, which is too many districts; going forward, the time between deciding on a district and building would be as short as possible; the list would come back more frequently.

In response to Councilmember Johnson's inquiry regarding multi-family homes, the AMP General Manager stated multi-family homes do not receive any money from AMP, which will change; the current way payment is done is very confusing; all changes will be done together following community input.

Vice Mayor Bonta seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

* * *

Councilmember deHaan left the dais at 10:47 p.m. and returned at 10:48 p.m.

* * *

(12-400) Recommendation to Accept the Social Service Human Relations Board (SSHRB) Community Needs Assessment – Summary of Results.

Cynthia Wasko, SSHRB Chair, gave a Power Point presentation.

Mayor Gilmore thanked Ms. Wasko and the SSHRB members; stated the survey is an excellent tool and would also benefit the School District.

* * *

(12-401) Councilmember deHaan moved approval of continuing the meeting past 11:00 p.m.

Councilmember Johnson seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

* * *

Vice Mayor Bonta thanked Ms. Wasko and the SSHRB; stated the survey is always improving; knowing trends over time and isolating areas of interest would be very helpful; inquired about the disparity between census data and the number of Asian respondents.

Ms. Wasko stated the survey was available in Chinese and published in a Chinese newspaper; contacts within the Asian community were also used; noted 190 people did not respond to the question [about ethnicity], which could tip the scale; stated better outreach would be done next time.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether Alameda could be compared to other cities, to which Ms. Wasko responded several questions were also asked by other cities;

stated the comparison would be the SSHRB's next step if there is time; the survey was selected in order to allow comparison to other cities.

Councilmember Johnson thanked Ms. Wasko and the SSHRB; stated the survey provides better understanding of the community.

Councilmember Tam expressed her appreciation; stated the community services noted in the presentation are generally provided by non-profits or the County; inquired why the need for library services is listed so high and whether there is an access issue; noted public safety is similar.

Ms. Wasko responded one explanation could be people really value library services and see having a library in the community as one of the highest needs; stated health services become the highest priority for lower income; senior services become a higher priority for central Alameda; the Board looks forward to having a joint meeting with the Council to review the data; all non-profits can access the raw data and do analysis.

Vice Mayor Bonta moved approval of accepting the needs assessment.

Councilmember Tam seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

(12-402) Recommendation to Acknowledge Rent Increase Concerns at 300 Westline Drive and Authorize the Mayor to Send a Letter Encouraging the Owner to Comply with the Rent Review Advisory Committee (RRAC) Recommendations.

David Perry, RRAC, gave a brief presentation.

Provided background information on the rent increase and issues and urged Council to approve the staff recommendation: Mark Dahmen, Renter.

Provided background information and spoke in opposition of the recommendation: Erin Johnson, Prometheus-Property Community Manager; and Jason Villareal, Prometheus.

Mayor Gilmore stated that she appreciates Ms. Johnson and Mr. Villareal coming and providing information; however, the item probably could have been avoided if the property management sent someone to the RRAC meeting to resolve the matter.

Councilmember Tam concurred with Mayor Gilmore; stated that she would recommend sending the matter back to the RRAC and Council could revisit the issue if it is not resolved.

Councilmember Johnson stated the suggestion is good; the RRAC hearing is the process for resolving disputes between tenants and landlords in a more amicable way; Alameda does not have rent control; the process should be followed.

Vice Mayor Bonta concurred; stated the whole point of the process is to try to mediate

the dispute; inquired whether there is a reason why the property managers did not attend the RRAC meeting.

Mr. Villareal responded a similar RRAC meeting was held about a year ago; his colleague provided the same data, which was not listened to or well received by the RRAC; the matter reached an impasse, so the company decided to let the matter escalate to the Council.

Following brief questions regarding past experience at the RRAC, Mayor Gilmore stated the Council is strongly suggesting that the property managers go back and present data to the RRAC.

(12-403) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager or His Designee to Enter into Purchase Agreements Not to Exceed \$69,000 and Financing Agreements for an Amount Not to Exceed \$2,171,000 for the Replacement of Fire Department Apparatus.

The Fire Chief gave a brief presentation.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the equipment would be leased.

The Fire Chief responded in the affirmative; stated the truck, engine and ambulance would be leased.

In response to Councilmember deHaan's inquiry regarding the annual cost, the Fire Chief stated about \$190,000.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether depreciation would be done.

The Assistant City Manager responded the depreciation ordinance was contingent on the passage of Measure C.

Councilmember deHaan stated depreciation should go forward with the procurements.

Councilmember Johnson stated the City does not have money to pay for depreciation.

Councilmember deHaan inquired how much money is in the reserves for procurement.

The Assistant City Manager responded the equipment replacement fund had a beginning balance of \$3.4 million in the current fiscal year.

Councilmember deHaan stated that he is concerned about other departments and would prefer having all purchases at one time.

The Assistant City Manager stated the purchases were all included in the budget; Council approved a total appropriation and spending of \$1.036 million out of \$3.4 million.

Councilmember deHaan inquired why the purchase is separate.

The Assistant City Manager responded the action is to actually purchase and finance the equipment; stated Council approved the concept of moving forward with these particular apparatuses and vehicles [when the budget was adopted].

In response to Councilmember deHaan's inquiry regarding the take home vehicle, the Fire Chief stated the vehicle would be his.

Councilmember deHaan inquired why a Sports Utility Vehicle (SUV) is recommended, to which the Fire Chief responded an SUV gives several advantages; stated a lot more equipment is now carried; he needs access to equipment when he assumes incident command.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the vehicle would be similar to other command vehicles.

The Fire Chief responded the vehicle is a smaller command vehicle and would provide redundancy.

In response to Councilmember deHaan's inquiry regarding the type of vehicle, the Fire Chief stated a Ford Taurus SUV would be purchased as opposed to an Expedition or a Suburban.

Councilmember deHaan inquired how many miles are on the current vehicle, to which the Fire Chief responded 50,000 miles; further stated the vehicle would still be used and would replace a 1997 Crown Victoria.

The Assistant City Manager noted the Crown Victory has 146,498 miles; further stated the Fire Department is rotating the use of the vehicles.

Councilmember Johnson stated that she does not want people under the impression that the City is replacing a vehicle with 50,000 miles.

The Fire Chief stated a vehicle with 147,000 miles is being replaced; the vehicle with 50,000 miles would remain in the fleet and be used.

Urged approval of the staff recommendation: Jon Spangler, Alameda.

Vice Mayor Bonta requested staff to address what sort of equipment and vehicles could not be purchases since the [June 6th ballot] Measure was not passed.

The Assistant City Manager gave a brief presentation.

Vice Mayor Bonta inquired what could not be funded in the Fire Department 10 year

plan.

The Fire Chief gave a brief presentation.

Mayor Gilmore inquired how many vehicles would be past useful life in two years.

The Fire Chief responded there would not be any large purchases in the next two years; stated an engine and possibly another ambulance might need to be replaced in three years.

The Assistant City Manager noted the Fire Department is also scheduled to replace a fire pumper in fiscal year 2013-2014.

Councilmember deHaan commended the Fire Chief for putting together a long range plan; inquired how many people are needed to operate the truck.

The Fire Chief responded a minimum of three.

Mayor Gilmore requested information on status of the Police Department and Public Works fleets; stated there are vehicle needs throughout the City; however, lives could be at risk if public safety vehicles do not operate as intended.

The Police Chief gave a brief presentation.

Councilmember deHaan stated model changes are hard because equipment has to be changed; inquired about the costs to configure one patrol car.

The Police Chief provided background information on the new model; stated the lights, radios and cages from existing vehicles would be used; the only additional cost would be the transfer.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the cost would be around \$40,000.

The Police Chief responded his best guess at this point is probably \$24,000 to \$25,000 for a vehicle and the SUVs would cost about \$2,000 more than that; further stated the total cost would be about \$746,000; noted one big ticket item that the Police Department has not had before is vital.

The Public Works Director gave a brief presentation.

Vice Mayor Bonta moved approval of the staff recommendation.

Councilmember Johnson seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

CITY MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS

(12-404) The City Manager announced the Target groundbreaking would be tomorrow morning; stated all studies prepared since 2004, whether draft or final regarding assessments of Fire service, would be posted to the City's website by Thursday; that he would be doing a review of the International City Managers Association (ICMA) study, which has some grave logical errors; staff is working on website difficulties that have occurred in the past several days; the Police Department now has a drop box for expired medicines; City Council meetings to consider the Chuck Corica Golf Complex lease to Greenway Golf would be held next Tuesday and on July 31st; however, staff would not bring a long term lease for Jim's on the Course.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

(12-405) Carol Gottstein, Alameda, stated Councilmember deHaan had some good points about the [Housing Element] noticing; at a public participation workshop, she provided a bulletin by the American Planning Association on the problem of noticing the public with planning speak; using words like Housing Element makes people's eyes glaze over; anything that tangentially touches Measure A should mention Measure A somewhere in the headline; outlined typographical errors in the Housing Element she reviewed before the July 3rd Council meeting.

COUNCIL REFERRALS

None.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

(12-406) Mayor Gilmore announced that she attended the Mayor's conference; the major discussion topic was the Bay Area Plan, which is the sustainable community strategy, job, housing and transportation plan; a representative from ABAG's planning and research department gave the presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Gilmore adjourned the meeting at 11:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- -JULY 17, 2012- -6:00 P.M.

Mayor Gilmore convened the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

Roll Call – Present: Councilmembers Bonta, deHaan, Johnson, Tam, and Mayor Gilmore – 5.

[Note: Vice Mayor Bonta arrived at 6:06 p.m.]

Absent: None.

The meeting was adjourned to Closed Session to consider:

(12-374) Workers' Compensation Claim (54956.95); Claimant: William Scott; Agency Claimed Against: City of Alameda

(12-375) Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation (54956.9(c)); Number of Cases: Two

Following the closed session, the meeting was reconvened and Mayor Gilmore announced that regarding the Workers' Compensation Claim, the Council gave direction to staff; and regarding Anticipated Litigation, the Council gave direction to staff.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Gilmore adjourned the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- -JULY 17, 2012- -6:58 P.M.

Mayor Gilmore convened the meeting at 7:10 p.m. Councilmember Tam led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL – Present: Councilmembers Bonta, deHaan, Johnson, Tam, and Mayor Gilmore – 5.

Absent: None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Johnson moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Vice Mayor Bonta seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 5. [Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(12-376) Recommendation to Find that Target Corporation is a Qualified Developer Pursuant to the Alameda Landing Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA), and Consent to the Partial Assignment and Assumption Agreement (Disposition and Development Agreement (Alameda Landing Mixed Use Commercial Project) – Portion of Parcel 2), and Authorize the City Manager to Execute the Required Documents. Accepted. [City Acting as Successor Agency to the Community Improvement Commission]; and

(*12-376 A) Recommendation to Consent to Partial Assignment and Assumption Agreement (Development Agreement (Alameda Landing Mixed Use Project) – Portion of Parcel 2) to Target Corporation, and Authorize the City Manager to Execute the Required Documents. Accepted.

AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Gilmore adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND
ALAMEDA PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY (APFA) MEETING
TUESDAY- -JULY 17, 2012- -6:59 P.M.

THIS MEETING WAS CANCELLED.

AGENDA ITEM

(12-377 CC) Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of Resolution Approving Proceedings to Finance and Refinance Improvements to the City's Municipal Sewer System, Approving the Issuance and Sale of Sewer Revenue Bonds by the Alameda Public Financing Authority for Such Purposes and Approving Related Documents and Official Actions; and

(12-02 APFA) Adoption of Authorizing the Issuance and Sale of Sewer Revenue Bonds to Finance and Refinance Improvements to the City of Alameda's Municipal Sewer System and Approving Related Documents and Official Actions. **NOT HEARD.**

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk