

MINUTES OF THE CONTINUED MARCH 16, 2021 CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- -MARCH 30, 2021- -5:30 P.M.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft convened the meeting at 5:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, Herrera Spencer, Knox White, Vella, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 5. [Note: The meeting was conducted via Zoom]

Absent: None.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

(21-184) Recommendation to Consider Options for the Alameda Police Department's Emergency Response Vehicle.

The Interim Police Chief gave a brief presentation.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the estimated time of arrival if the City borrows an armored vehicle from another city.

The Interim Police Chief responded the soonest a vehicle could arrive under ideal circumstances would be 20 minutes from the City of Oakland; stated the amount of time to make the operator request with no central system must be considered and time may increase due to traffic.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the City of Alameda has borrowed an armored vehicle from another City.

The Police Captain responded in the affirmative; stated prior to the City having its own armored vehicle, the City borrowed an armored vehicle for pre-planned events with ample time to reach out to local agencies.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the City of Alameda has not borrowed an armored vehicle for an emergency, to which the Police Captain responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired what is considered a pre-planned event.

The Police Captain responded a pre-planned event would be a Police incident prepared for at least 14 days in advance; stated arrest warrants considered high-risk use the vehicle for more control over serving the warrant and handling the incident.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired what staff thinks about the proposed policy in the Mayor's correspondence, as opposed to the City's policy and proposed alternative shown in the staff report.

The Interim Police Chief responded staff believes the policy shown in the correspondence is consistent with use of the vehicle; stated staff has no problem expanding the policy to the proposed Berkeley policy.

Discussed the Council meeting of June 2020 referencing selling the armored vehicle; stated that he is surprised to see the matter come up nine months later; discussed the staff report and vehicle use; stated the vehicle has only been used three times in Alameda with two of the three times using it as a loud speaker; the matter reads as mildly deceptive; noted Berkeley has purchased a bullet-proof van: Zac Bowling, Alameda.

Stated the three vehicle uses in Alameda were for protection or cover instances and none were related to active shooter incidents; that she does not see using the vehicle for de-escalation; noted two incidents from 2016 are missing from the detailed report; the vehicle has been overwhelmingly used in other cities; questioned the training costs for medics; stated medically trained professionals should respond to mental health situations; discussed a recent shooting in Colorado: Jenice Anderson, Alameda.

Discussed his experience as a Berkeley Police Reserve Officer during a shooting at Henry's Pub; stated law enforcement tactics have had to adjust to lessons learned from several mass shootings; an Officer has to go out and engage to reports of an active shooter; if an Officer fails, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team and Ballistic Armored Tactical Transport (BATT) are deployed to end the shooting; expressed concern about giving up local control of the equipment; stated taking away the equipment sends the wrong message; urged Council to tighten up the use policy: Michael Robles-Wong, Alameda.

Discussed the June 24, 2020 Council meeting; stated the decision to sell the vehicle has been tested; urged Council to have the integrity to do what is right and stand up for racial justice; stated the Alameda Police Department (APD) has used the vehicle three times in eight years; discussed the three vehicle uses; stated the choice is clear: Erin Fraser, Alameda.

Stated that she is confused why the vehicle is still present and questioned how APD is able to push to keep the vehicle; the vehicle is unnecessary, is a waste of taxpayer dollars and is not used as intended; discussed vehicle incident reports; stated the arguments to keep the vehicle are irrelevant due to previous Council discussion, debate and vote; discussed the recent event of a man waiving a gun at protestors; stated the vehicle is subjectively used; urged Council to keep its word and ensure the vehicle is sold: Alexia Arocha, Alameda.

Urged Council to follow through on the unanimous recommendation from June 2020 to sell the armored vehicle; stated the vehicle is a symbol and is not used often; outlined an incident of a man with a gun during the Martin Luther King (MLK) Day protest; urged the City to have actions speak louder than words and follow through on the previous promise: Laura Cutrona, Alameda.

Urged Council to retain the vehicle, not sell; stated the lives of Officers and citizens can be saved in extraordinary situations and conditions; discussed the example of an Officer or citizen being shot during an active shooter situation; stated the vehicle is the only and safest way to attempt rescuing injured victims; the vehicle is not used often; however, it is handy

when tragedy occurs; the vehicle is fully paid for and the maintenance costs are minimal; the vehicle is not military surplus equipment and is not indicative of APD militarization; the vehicle is a tool to be used in violent confrontations to help maximize Officer and citizen safety: Burny Matthews, Alameda.

Urged Council to keep the vehicle; stated previous Council discussion around selling the vehicle occurred when crime was not as high; there have been a number of shootings and members of the community have been held at gunpoint; discussed incidents in Colorado and Georgia; stated APD needs to understand that the City backs them 100% and wants to keep them safe; selling the vehicle sends a message that the City does not care about APD and their safety; discussed APD hiring difficulties: Colleen Arnerich, Alameda.

Discussed the budget and funding being used for training purposes and for the vehicle; stated there are issues for people experiencing mental health crises more frequently than matters requiring the vehicle; the matter is about putting priorities and funding where best served to keep the entire community safe; urged Council sell the vehicle and put the training and funding for maintenance into ways which can serve the community: Beth Kenny, Alameda.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated Council has an important decision to make; Council must ensure decisions are well-reasoned, well thought out and rational; decisions are not made for symbolism and are based on facts and data; noted modification to the staff report was at her request to the City Manager; the decision before Council is whether Council should direct the City Manager to sell the emergency response vehicle; there have been no allegations of misuse of the vehicle; Council recently heard recommendations and a lengthy report from the Police Reform and Racial Justice Subcommittees; none of the committees recommended selling the vehicle; every other Bay Area city Police Department has an emergency response vehicle; she takes very seriously the health and safety of residents and those who work and visit the City; she pays special heed to the head of the Department of Homeland Security who has outlined the heightened risk of domestic terror; several e-mails received from residents have used the analogy of an insurance policy; the analogies are apt; she reached out to Mayor Jesse Arreguin about the City of Berkeley's emergency response vehicle policy; stated that she is impressed with the policy and requested the policy be attached to the staff report; strongly urged Council to move forward with retaining the vehicle and requiring a use policy similar to the City of Berkeley; the purpose of the policy is to provide direction about usage, training and storage of the vehicle; the goal is to safely resolve incidents where an objective risk to the safety of civilians or Officers exists from a person or persons who may be considered armed and dangerous; use of the vehicle will only be authorized by the Special Response Team, Commander or team leader, unless exigent circumstances exist; the policy outlines when the vehicle shall not be used; the policy will require a usage log, which would be provided to Council on an annual basis or any time requested by Council; provisions for operator training will be included; as part of the rescue team, supervisors should consider hostage negotiators, special response, medic or tactical emergency support personnel; the vehicle must always have an operator and someone from APD; expressed support for a robust Council conversation; considering what makes Alameda different from every other Bay Area city to not allow this tool; stated the vehicle is not for militaristic use or use on peaceful protests; having the vehicle helps in the instance where lives could be saved.

In response to Councilmember Herrera Spencer's request about the history, the City Manager stated Council previously approved the budget with different considerations including reductions in the Police Department due to protests after last Memorial Day; the vehicle became a component of the motion in passing the budget; the Police Department believed that not all information had been considered since the focus was on the budget; he wanted to come back and have Council review the matter by itself; the delay is partially due to staff and other agenda items.

The Police Captain stated the matter was brought to his attention mid-August 2020; he felt that he owed it to APD to present the other side; a Council report was drafted to explain the importance of the vehicle to the Department and Alameda citizens; he would like to ensure the City is prepared to handle any incident as quickly and safely as possible.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated there have been public comments related to the 33 instances of use; 30 uses were for mutual aid and three uses were within the City of Alameda; inquired whether the use of the vehicle impacts the recommendation to retain the vehicle.

The Interim Police Chief responded APD is similar to the Fire Department; stated cities need each other to supply aid whether it be a canine, motorcycle Officers or other equipment, such as the vehicle; exchange of equipment and personnel between cities is goodwill between communities and also acts as a force multiplier when an adequate amount of Officers or equipment is not available; being able to loan the vehicle out is building goodwill in knowing Alameda can call on other cities if need be; he is thankful the vehicle is not used often within the City of Alameda.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated Councilmember Herrera Spencer's question is whether the use impacts the recommendation to retain.

The Interim Police Chief responded in the negative; outlined terms of the emergency nature of deploying the vehicle; stated seconds count and the ability to deploy in a hurry is needed; the metaphor of an insurance policy is apt.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated there have been comments related to racial equity, subjective use, racial justice and militarization; inquired whether APD staff can provide response to the comments.

The Interim Police Chief responded the vehicle is not used based on race; that he questioned whether the vehicle should have been deployed at the MLK Day incident; stated the incident evolved so rapidly that the vehicle was not deployed; use of the vehicle is not based on race or any other protected class; the vehicle is used based on the need to provide public safety.

Councilmember Knox White stated regarding the Police and Equity Committees not addressing the vehicle, a recommendation would have been odd due to Council's unanimous decision to sell; if the City moves forward with maintaining the vehicle based on the compelling argument that the vehicle may be the point between life and death in the

case of an active shooter, Council should ensure the policy limits the vehicle to occurrences with an active shooter; Berkeley has staging off-site for quick deployment in the event of an active shooter situation; there is a reason the vehicle is not painted in the City's colors; the vehicle is intimidating and does not look like any other City vehicle; the City of Emeryville has an armored Ford Transit vehicle that looks like an average vehicle; the City's vehicle is designed to intimidate and scare people; there is an impact when the vehicle drives into the community; discussed an eviction in West Oakland utilizing an armored vehicle; stated that he would like to see use of the vehicle limited to address specific issues and not loan it out as backup for pre-planned events in other cities; one of the incidents in deploying the vehicle consisted of directing traffic during a parade and demonstration; the vehicle has been used in places where there was no threat of shooting; noted the former Police Chief spoke about using the vehicle in a number of local protests; expressed support for narrowing the scope to meet the community's need for the vehicle.

Councilmember Daysog stated the staff report says it all in the Executive Summary: "the emergency response vehicle is a critical tool to assist the Police Department in keeping the citizens of Alameda safe;" he hopes there will never be a tragic situation in Alameda which requires the use of such a vehicle; should a tragic situation unfold, the City must be sure to use the vehicle and help safeguard residents and the Police force; Council should reconsider the June 2020 vote; the City should keep the vehicle; it is unknown what will happen; the ability to act swiftly is imperative during a crisis; expressed concern about policies which amount to checklists that require the Police to wait a certain amount of time in order to satisfy checklist review; stated that he likes the way the current policy reads: "permission to utilize the vehicle will come from the CERT commander during SWAT operations or a supervisor in high risk incidents falling outside of the scope of a CERT operations..." the City is depending on the professional judgement of staff to interpret the circumstances; Council needs to provide the discretion to act quickly; expressed support for sending the vehicle out even if it is not used; noted in situations of active shooters, the preference is not to wait.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the Berkeley policy is three pages long and is not as much a checklist, rather it provides criteria for objective risk and situation assessment; the use is left to professionals; expressed support for a more spelled out policy; noted the Interim Police Chief has expressed support for the Berkeley policy and said the policy could easily be implemented in Alameda.

Vice Mayor Vella stated that she shares Councilmember Knox White's concerns; Council previously voted on the matter; she understands there is confusion on matters returning to Council when a unanimous vote of Council has occurred; Council should not be so cavalier with deploying a vehicle when not needed; a message is sent having the vehicle deployed in any neighborhood and driving around town; Council has received e-mails when Oakland's tactical vehicle was parked on Park Street; Council needs to be careful due to the symbolism; the vehicle is not normal, is not an armored van, which other cities have, and is not inconspicuous; discretion is a tricky thing; while it is nice to have discretion, there will be times where a disagreement occurs on whether or not the vehicle should have been deployed; there is an issue with the existing policy showing a lot of discretion should Council desire to reverse course from previous direction; Council needs to curtail the

amount of available discretion when deploying such a different vehicle; Council must be clear about when the vehicle should be deployed as well as placing a limit on use; expressed concern about fear mongering; stated the intent is not to deploy the vehicle at any given event; Council must be critical of when the vehicle is deployed and ensure the vehicle is not being used for crowd control measures or intimidation of free speech; Council cannot curtail free speech as part of the Code of Conduct; expressed support for Council being thoughtful in putting checks on the use of the vehicle.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft read from the Berkeley vehicle policy: "the vehicle shall not be deployed during non-violent demonstrations, including for crowd control and management absent specific articulable objective facts demonstrating a risk of injury or death to Police Officers and or the public;" stated Council needs to limit the discretion; the limits are well spelled out in the Berkeley policy; inquired whether Councilmember Knox White would consider supporting painting the vehicle.

Councilmember Knox White responded that he does not want to spend a lot of money on the vehicle if it is kept; stated that he would prefer the vehicle not be out and active to reduce the impact; it is okay if the vehicle needs to be repainted; however, spending \$15,000 to paint the vehicle is not desired.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft moved approval of retaining the vehicle and adopting an Emergency Response Vehicle Policy similar or identical to the City of Berkeley policy.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he would second the motion with leaving out the reference to Berkeley; staff returning with a policy similar to Berkeley would be okay; reversing the decision is important; the existing policy is fine; he does not buy-off on City of Berkeley's policy at this time.

(21-185) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft requested two additional minutes of speaking time.

Councilmember Daysog moved approval of giving two more minutes for everyone.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, which required four affirmative votes and failed by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: No; Knox White: No; Vella: No; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 2. Noes: 3.

Vice Mayor Vella moved approval of giving the Mayor two more minutes.

Councilmember Knox White seconded the motion, which carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: No; Knox White: Aye; Vella: Aye; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 4. Noes: 1.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she wants to see a policy similar to the current City of Berkeley Police Department policy.

Councilmember Daysog moved approval of reversing the June 2020 Council decision to sell

the armored vehicle.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she wants to come back to the paint and intimidation issue; she agrees with Councilmembers and members of the public who have concerns; inquired whether images of the vehicle can be displayed; stated the vehicle is smaller than some Alameda Fire Department (AFD) vehicles; inquired the reason the vehicle is painted the existing color, whether APD is agreeable to painting the vehicle and whether there are recommendations to addressing the issue of matching City vehicles.

The City Clerk displayed photos of the vehicle.

The Interim Police Chief responded the vehicle does not need to be green; stated the color is not important from a Department standpoint; he understands the concerns.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he will provide another motion related to policy after a vote is taken on the current motion.

On the call for the question, the motion failed by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: Aye; Knox White: No; Vella: No; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: No. Ayes: 2. Noes: 3.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer moved approval of retaining the vehicle and temporarily keeping the current policy until staff can return with a recommendation looking at both the Alameda and Berkeley policy for Council to decide.

Councilmember Daysog seconded the motion.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft requested the City Clerk re-read the motion.

The City Clerk stated the motion is to approve retaining the vehicle and keeping the current policy until staff comes back looking at Alameda and Berkeley's policy to decide at that time whether the vehicle will be retained.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated when the matter returns, Council can focus on the policy; noted that she has not had a chance to hone in on the policy as much as she would like; Council can decide to reverse the decision and not retain the vehicle; stated that she would like to look at the policies; staff and other Councilmembers can look into other cities policies and propose alternates.

Councilmember Daysog confirmed his second of the motion.

Councilmember Knox White stated that he cannot support the motion; there has been enough unanimous Council direction for policies to come back that have been sitting out for up to 18 months; this is a recipe for never seeing the policy again; the matter has had nine months; he is not sure the reason the proposed policies were not presented with the matter;

if the June 2020 Council direction is reversed, clarity of intentions must be provided, even if the clarity is to provide guidance about the policy and a date certain for the policy to return to Council.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated an Attorney may need to weigh-in; a motion had been made that she was not in support of; staff is able to return with a policy proposal for Council consideration and community input.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer amended her motion to approve retaining the vehicle and utilizing the Berkeley policy until another policy can be recommended by staff and return to Council for consideration and changes.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether a date certain needs to be included.

Councilmember Knox White responded Councilmember Herrera Spencer's motion is cleaner in adopting Berkeley's policy and allowing for changes to be made when the matter returns.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that her preference is to have the policy come back in the next couple of meetings to ensure the public and Council can focus on the policy.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the best of both worlds would be to retain the vehicle, adopt the Berkeley policy but have the policy return to Council in one month for further review and modification.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer moved approval of Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's recommendation.

Councilmember Daysog withdrew his second.

Councilmember Knox White stated that he is willing to second the motion; offered a friendly amendment to add direction to staff to come back with some form of active shooter focus; noted Berkeley's policy does not change the existing policy much.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the reference to the Berkeley policy remains, to which Councilmember Knox White responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Knox White stated that he would like staff to return with proposed language for narrowing down to active shooter; Council can choose whether or not to adopt when it returns.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether Councilmember Herrera Spencer agrees to the modification to the motion.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the modification is in addition to the proposed language of the Berkeley policy, to which Councilmember Knox White responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer accepted the modification to the motion.

Councilmember Knox White seconded the motion.

Under discussion, the Interim Police Chief stated that staff is comfortable with the Berkeley policy being the policy adopted by Alameda.

Councilmember Daysog stated it is important that the Interim Police Chief feels that his judgement is satisfied with the Berkeley Police policy; he is not going to second guess professionals; the Interim Police Chief is going to put the life of his men and women on the line; expressed concern about the Police force being bogged down with process questions during an emergency situation; stated if the Police are satisfied with the Berkeley policy, he will not second guess staff.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she has accepted the friendly amendments; part of the reason to have the policy return is to allow the public an opportunity to look at other policies and provide edits.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: Aye; Knox White: No; Vella: No; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 3. Noes: 2.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft called a recess at 6:45 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

CITY MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS

(21-186) The City Manager announced the League of Women Voters and Communication Action for a Sustainable Alameda are holding an event on building electrification on April 8th; staff is addressing a continuation of the Alameda Swimming Pool Association Lease.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

(21-187) Puttichai Butsangde, Alameda, discussed hate crimes against Asians; stated there has been an 150% increase in Asian hate crimes the past two years; discussed crime statistics and incidents from January 28, 2021, March 9, 2021 and March 18, 2021; stated an increase in Police presence creates a conflict in the community; it is important to improve the relationship between the community and Police.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

(21-188) Councilmember Knox White announced the Youth Activists of Alameda have been organizing a rally on Zoom for tomorrow at 5:15 p.m. followed by an in-person rally at Chochenyo Park at 7:00 p.m. and information is housed at: <https://www.alamedaca.gov/Shortcut-Content/Events-Activities/Community-Event-Vigil-for-Asian-Lives>.

(21-189) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft announced there are 38 participants on Zoom.

COUNCIL REFERRALS

(21-190) Consider Establishing a New Methodology by which the Number of Housing Units are Calculated for Parcels Zoned C-2-PD (Central Business District with Planned Development Overlay). (Councilmember Daysog)

Councilmember Daysog gave a Power Point presentation.

Councilmember Daysog stated the successful No on Z campaign came from the understanding the need for more housing and modern apartments which are not consistent with the historic Measure A however, the need to balance the amount of new housing in a way supported by the island structure is also understood; many of the sites noted are within the historic built-out areas within the Otis Drive, South Shore and Fernside Drive areas.

Stated the proposed methodology change would violate the State Housing Crisis Act: Senate Bill (SB) 330; discussed the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and Measure Z; stated Council needs to consider how these types of changes are going to prevent meeting the needs allocation; the zoned areas in Alameda are going to be critical for the City's attempt to have a Housing Element that conforms to State law; the task will be made even harder for Planning staff; urged Council not to take action on the referral: Zac Bowling, Alameda.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the City is in the process of a General Plan update, which includes an update to the Housing Element; inquired how the update meshes with the Council Referral.

The Planning, Building and Transportation Director responded the City is in the midst of a Housing Element update; stated under State Law, the City is required to update the General Plan and Zoning Code to accommodate the RHNA, which has been established at approximately 5,400 units; the City needs to up-zone large areas of Alameda to accommodate the State mandate; changing the way the City calculates density to reduce the number of units on shopping centers will only increase the need to increase housing units in other places within the City; the effort is currently underway and will take roughly one year; matters will go to the Planning Board in the Spring/Summer of 2022 and will come before Council in the Fall; staff can integrate proposed ideas into the broad range of concepts being reviewed; a Planning Board subcommittee has been set up to help make recommendations to the full Planning Board and Council; the City cannot downzone property without up-zoning other property; the State and the City are in the midst of a housing crisis; a State Law on the books notes that cities cannot downzone without up-zoning elsewhere; the City is looking at an up-zone now and can integrate ideas into the planning process; the City will eventually have to find land and zone appropriately for 5,400 units; the City will determine how many units to place on each site over the next 12 months.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the matter is part of an ongoing public process, to which the Planning, Building and Transportation Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Daysog stated comments from the Planning, Building and Transportation Director are spot on; if Council allows for a lower amount of housing on shopping centers, the City might have to look elsewhere to make up the difference in housing units; there are places to look into, which would make better sense; noted Alameda Point has space in the Enterprise District; stated there will be transportation options for the area; expressed support for lower housing at South Shore by placing excess at Alameda Point; stated infrastructure is being put in to support additional housing at Alameda Point; he is making a case to change the methodology since the amount of new housing is unsustainable; stated that he does not know the overall number; he does not support 5,400 being the allocation number; recommended Council engage in the discussion to determine where to put the amount of housing in a place that makes the most sense; changing the Enterprise District to allow housing will not be easy; however, there are opportunities.

The Planning, Building and Transportation Director stated staff needs to look at the best places to put housing first; the Housing Element schedule makes the same argument; Alameda Point and Encinal Terminals are great places to put housing; the sites and entitlements will be brought to Council early in the process; the two sites equate for up to 2,000 of the 5,400 housing units; however, the sites require a supermajority Council approval; without a supermajority vote, staff will not know whether the City can afford to downzone or reduce the capacity at shopping centers; staff would have to include significantly more units at shopping centers.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired how many votes are needed to amend the Zoning Code.

The Planning, Building and Transportation Director responded three votes for the Zoning Code and four votes to approve housing at Alameda Point.

Councilmember Knox White moved approval of rejecting the referral while providing no direction for discussion; if the matter is included as part of something that stems from community discussions with the Planning Board and is recommended to Council, the discussion can occur; the community and Planning Board should do their work before Council begins to spot zone specific pieces of property.

Vice Mayor Vella seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the issues can be raised during the process, which is already in the works; it is important that the matter is discussed; questioned how the process will work.

The Planning, Building and Transportation Director responded that he has extended an invitation to Alameda Citizens Task Force (ACT) and Paul Foreman via e-mail; noted a Planning Board subcommittee is working with City staff; staff is encouraging all members of the community and interest groups to participate and provide good ideas; staff will be notifying ACT and Mr. Foreman when public meetings will occur; staff can currently integrate the proposal.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed support for the outreach.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the topics should be discussed; however, it is premature to discuss it now; the process should be public; a number of pieces of State legislation are being contemplated; outlined an upcoming meeting where many housing topics will be considered, including measures which will make building housing on shopping centers easier for a number of reasons; expressed support for a more public discussion of the matter.

Councilmember Daysog stated that his objective in bringing the referral was to: 1) lessen the amount of new housing on shopping center zones largely because many of the sites are within historic neighborhoods, which have already been built-out, and 2) recognize that Council must also have a conversation that lessening new housing units at shopping centers requires the amount to be made up elsewhere; Alameda Point is a natural place due to the infrastructure being put in place to support it; he is not against housing; Alameda is an Island with a limited number of ingress and egress.

Councilmember Knox White expressed concern about staff meeting with the same anti-housing group; stated that he would like a broad outreach plan; the direction is not to include the referral in the discussion; stated Council is not providing any direction on the matter; there is not a lot of support for integrating the matter into existing work unless there is broad community support.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: No; Herrera Spencer: No; Knox White: Aye; Vella: Aye; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 3. Noes: 2.

(21-191) Consider Directing Staff to Provide an Update on a Previously Approved Referral regarding Free Public WiFi throughout the City. (Councilmember Herrera Spencer)

Councilmember Herrera Spencer gave a brief presentation.

Stated that he would like having access to free WiFi; he is not able to get WiFi at certain times; noted Peets Coffee, Taco Bell and McDonalds have WiFi typically accessible from the parking lot; providing WiFi in the City would affect the education of people across the City and will be worth the cost: Benhamish Allen, Alameda.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer moved approval of accepting the Council Referral, and having staff return with an update on the status of getting free WiFi in parts of the community which will be accessible from outside of buildings and to incorporate alternative ways of connecting to the internet.

Councilmember Daysog seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the information sought is valuable, valid and timely; the request could have been put into an e-mail to staff for a quicker response; noted many Council Referrals could have been handled as an inquiry to staff; stated there might be more effective ways to provide information; announced that she will be reviving the Rules of Order subcommittee of herself and Councilmember Knox White to look into how to streamline and improve the Council Referral process; expressed concern about matters

waiting a long time.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she is not looking to send an e-mail; she would like to have a substantive discussion on the merits when staff returns and allow for public and Council interaction; she understands staff does not have the information at this time.

Vice Mayor Vella requested clarification from staff; expressed concern about the associated costs and implementation timeline; the budget is upcoming; she is concerned about voting one-offs, which could prove costly outside of the budget.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft questioned whether Vice Mayor Vella would prefer to have a motion include a referral to the budget for consideration.

Vice Mayor Vella responded in the affirmative; stated the matter could be part of the budget considerations.

Councilmember Knox White noted that he and the Information Technologies Director had previously met with the Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) and Common Networks to determine a process; stated the process is significantly less easy than initially contemplated; expressed concern about turning Council Referrals into calls for staff reports where staff is present at meetings; Council Referrals are a time for Council to discuss whether staff resources are to be used; a presentation has been made on the Smart Cities Program; he will not be supporting the motion, not because the matter is not useful; the City has a lot of work underway and what is currently being done is easily answered by e-mail.

The Information Technology Director stated staff went to Council last December to move forward with the Smart City Master Plan, which includes a Communications Master Plan, with the idea that consultants will work together with internal departments and focus groups throughout the community; staff launched the project in December and has met with Alameda County (AC) Transit, Alameda business districts, AUSD, College of Alameda and many other focus groups; staff has determined the need to target specific areas of the City to provide Smart City solutions, including public WiFi; staff is hoping to bring the matter to Council in May.

Councilmember Daysog stated Councilmember Herrera Spencer is noting a specific problem and wants to stand on behalf of constituents that are often left out of the equation; a lens is being brought to the topic that is worthy of having; expressed support for the lens of equity; stated it is nice to hear about the areas considered; public WiFi should be mindful of serving often forgotten constituents; the matter would be a missed opportunity and Council should not lose the special communities in the shuffle of the communication strategy.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated everything done by the City is done looking through a lens of equity; the Information Technologies Director has done many things to help families in the School District; noted focus groups are being included as part of the discussion.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated it has been over a year that people have been excluded from any means of communicating via online access; expressed support for the

City having a plan to look at providing WiFi across the City; stated that she hopes there is a way to have certain places with WiFi accessible outside in the meantime; questioned whether there are members of the business districts willing to step up and help people; the problem is serious; the School District is helping families with children; senior citizens and unemployed people cannot continue to wait for the most grandiose plan offered; she is disappointed that she does not hear urgency other than Councilmember Daysog; she is shocked that anyone would think the Council is serving the community by taking this long to come up with a place for people; people often go to Mastick Senior Center, Starbucks and Peets, which are not available; expressed support for a drive-up or walk-up access point sooner rather than later; urged Council to recognize the seriousness of the matter; stated that she is waiting for Council to step up.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the Information Technology Direct came to Council back in December; requested the motion be restated.

The City Clerk stated the motion is to adopt the Referral and have staff come back with alternative connections being considered.

On the call for the question, the motion failed by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: Aye; Knox White: No; Vella: No; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: No. Ayes: 2. Noes: 3.

(21-192) Consider Directing Staff to Extend Webster Street Physical Improvements/ Beautification. (Councilmember Daysog)

Councilmember Daysog gave a brief presentation.

Stated that he likes Webster Street's lights; he has noticed quite a few broken lights in the past few months and people sleeping on park and bus benches; expressed support for the speed limit being lowered to 15 miles per hour on Webster Street due to jaywalking: Benhamish Allen, Alameda.

Stated that she supports the Referral; the matter is a wonderful idea and benefits all citizens and visitors; urged Council support the restoration of historic facades: Carmen Reid, Alameda.

Councilmember Daysog moved approval of directing the City Manager and Economic Development Department to engage the Webster Street stakeholders about what kind of beautification landscaping might be done north of Webster Street; stated there are cost implications for the matter; however, the initial reconnaissance can be conducted; once the initial stage is completed, specific strategies can be formed.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Vice Mayor Vella questioned whether the area discussed is more than 500 feet away from Councilmember Daysog's home, to which Councilmember Daysog responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he really enjoys the new building at the College of Alameda; now is the time to start engaging.

Councilmember Knox White inquired whether anyone has requested the matter be brought forth.

Councilmember Daysog responded no one; stated that he would like the City Manager to use his professional expertise to sound out stakeholders.

Councilmember Knox White stated the City has an active Transportation Program Plan that looks at how to encourage people to walk and bike within business districts; this matter likely belongs within the Transportation Program Plan; expressed concern about jumping another transportation and business improvement project to the top of the line when Council has already given much direction on similar projects; he will not be supporting the motion; he would not be against the business districts making a request or it coming out in process.

Councilmember Daysog stated the points raised are valid; there are active Transportation Plans; however, the plans are transit related; the current matter is focused on other features, such as landscaping and light features; if stakeholders ask to move forward with the active transportation components faster, that is okay.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she likes the renovations done to Webster Street; she would like to see a list of Council priorities shown during Council Referrals; there is no point in setting priorities in order of importance if they are not going to be achieved by directing staff time and City resources towards the goals; matters do come along at times and should be addressed; however, it is difficult to know where this particular matter would fit into the priority list.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the Referral is appropriate and is exactly what Referrals are supposed to be; there appears to be an effort to discourage Referrals; Council has a process for Referrals; she plans to support the matter; Council can provide feedback; the matter does not appear to be extraordinary; she does not expect Commissions to be the only ones allowed to raise issues; Council is elected by the people; it is appropriate for a Councilmember to make a recommendation; Council is not dependent on Commissioners as the only ones to weigh-in on important issues.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft noted the report has listed the matter as important and urgent.

Councilmember Knox White stated the matter is appropriate as a Referral; the Referral process is to see whether or not there are at least three votes to prioritize and expend staff time on the issue; the process had been developed specifically due to a prior Councilmember giving direction to staff outside of Council discussions; Council has done a lot of work to set priorities and has set Boards and Commissions in a direction to work on said priorities; Boards and Commissions collect community input to provide recommendations to Council; Council has the final say; he thinks there is enough going on and projects are having a hard enough time continuing to move forward due to staff being inundated; expressed support for deeming the matter not a priority, while not making a statement on whether or not the project is good; the project may come out of one of the

plans already underway.

Councilmember Daysog stated the matter is being brought forward because Webster Street beautification stopped at Pacific Avenue; Webster Street, north of Pacific Avenue, has been waiting a long time; with much excitement in the area, it is time to stop treating the area as the ugly step child; the area is full of potential; in putting together a landscaping beautification strategy, Council will be having the City Manager work with stakeholders so the area can realize its potential.

Vice Mayor Vella stated the City has expended a significant amount of money on Webster Street between the Cross Alameda Trail improvements and some of the other bulb outs and platforms; other beautification options is a question of the bigger plan relative to multimodal transit review, including pedestrian access and other safety measures; a premium needs to be placed on making all modes of transit safer; safety should come before expenditures of staff time and money to prioritize making something look nice; the first step is to ensure the safety and functionality for pedestrians and cyclists, which is part of the ongoing process; Council must let the process play out; there are expenditures all over the City, including for Webster Street; she is not prepared to support the motion at this time.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the way an area looks matters to people; there are long stretches of Webster Street without any trees that need maintenance; safety is appreciated; the environment and respect for the area and the people in the area should be considered; the neglect of the area has gone on for many years; outline inequities between Park Street and Webster Street; stated Council can do more; community members would be happy to pay for tree planting; however, the City does need to step up; expressed support for staff working with the community and those who left behind.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he would be disappointed in Council if there not be three votes for the matter; the recommendation should be a no-brainer; the rest of Webster Street has been waiting quite a while; expressed support for the Cross-Alameda Trail and Jean Sweeney Park; questioned how to counter-balance the many liquor stores of the area with beautification that is welcoming.

Vice Mayor Vella stated it is one thing to look through an equity lens; questioned the importance of transit equity and ensuring safe, multimodal access; hardscapes are being worked on; the beautification portion follows the hardscaping; hardscaping and safe street design must be complete and landscape follows; expressed concern about jumping the gun on the matter and spending money planting trees at intersections that might need other things; her intent is not to say the City should not make Webster Street as nice looking as possible, it is to say there is a clear and laid out process that takes into account a number of different things.

On the call for the question, the motion failed by the following roll call vote: Councilmember Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: Aye; Knox White: No; Vella: No; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: No. Ayes: 2. Noes: 3.

(21-193) Consider Directing Staff to Review an “Adopt a Spot” Traffic Triangle, Traffic Circle and Traffic Corners Program. (Councilmember Daysog)

Councilmember Daysog gave a brief presentation.

Stated that he likes traffic triangles; discussed fairy doors in Alameda and a mural on Webster Street; questioned the ways in which someone would be allowed to artistically express themselves within the traffic triangle: Benhamish Allen, Alameda.

Stated that she appreciates the efforts to beautify the City; the idea is great and would have an overall positive effect on Alameda and will help build community: Carmen Reid, Alameda.

Stated that he does not have strong feelings on the issue; the matter raises a question whether there is a problem which needs solving; if people wish to beautify the City, there is an existing process to go through; he does not understand why an additional process is needed; expressed support for beautification of his street: Erin Fraser, Alameda.

Councilmember Daysog moved approval of having the City Manager and City Attorney staff review and evaluate Berkeley and Oakland's "Adopt a Spot" program to see how Alameda can have a similar program to encourage resident volunteers to help beautify certain spots of Alameda.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired the legal implications.

The Chief Assistant City Attorney responded the City Attorney's Office would need to do reconnaissance and speak with colleagues in both Berkeley and Oakland if directed by Council; staff will need to review ordinances to see which need revision as well as look at liability policies due to potential significant liability in having a formal process.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she has reviewed the article; noted Oakland has been doing this for 30 years; she is confident that Oakland has figured out the legality of the matter so the City is not liable; the matter is a great idea; the City does not always have the funds to address beautification throughout the City or equitably; the approach would encourage an opportunity all across town to help beautify the community.

Councilmember Knox White stated the priority ranking should change to not urgent and not important; giving direction to staff to find ways to include a matter like this into current projects and plans would be good; the City has had a number of times where communities have balked after being asked to accept long term maintenance agreements such as this; discussed efforts of Alamedans for Responsible Transit Shelters; stated there are spaces still waiting for the community-led transit infrastructure promised through fundraising; expressed concern about sending staff off and prioritizing work that has benefits, but little payoff; stated the matter could be turned into direction to staff included in transportation plans.

In response to Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's inquiry about the rating, Councilmember Knox White stated not urgent and important.

Councilmember Daysog stated the characterization sounds right; the matter is not urgent and is important.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the interpretation means the Referral will not bump up to the top of the staff's to-do list; stated that she would like a more substantive review for the matter.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he is not asking the City Manager and City Attorney's Office to put something together in three months; he does not want to wait 18 months or 2 years; it is an opportunity to engage residents in a well-articulated manner to beautify areas similar to Berkeley and Oakland.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft expressed concern about not having a legal analysis; stated that she would like a legal analysis and cost implication to accompany the matter if it returns.

Councilmember Daysog stated Councilmember Knox White's points are valid; expressed support for the City Manager and City Attorney providing a professional assessment relative to the comments raised Councilmember Knox White.

Councilmember Knox White stated that he will not support the current motion; expressed concern about sending staff off to start yet another program; there are already existing plans that would fit this type of program.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether there is a way to meld the concerns with the proposed motion.

Councilmember Daysog stated that his interpretation of the motion is that the points raised by Councilmember Knox White are valid and should be evaluated along with the City Manager and City Attorney evaluating the Berkeley and Oakland's plans; the idea is to get volunteers to do things in a well thought-out manner, taking into account the legal issues.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she thinks Councilmember Knox White is stating that some of the proposal falls under the things the City is working on already.

Councilmember Knox White stated that is true; expressed concern about directing the creation of a new program; stated that he would be willing to support the motion if it changes from the Referral to incorporating the matter into other programs and plans which are already being developed.

Councilmember Daysog stated the motion would include Councilmember Knox White's view, but also directs the City Manager to evaluate a program on a standalone basis as well; he trusts the City Manager can evaluate both things and come up with his recommendations and the City Attorney can come up with analyses as well; the original motion is separate from Councilmember Knox White's idea; however, he is still willing to have the City Manager evaluate the beautification recommendation through the lens raised by Councilmember Knox White; expressed support for ways to engage volunteers and for the City Manager to evaluate the possibility of a program similar to the City of Berkeley.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the City would need the legal analysis; expressed concern about volunteers out in the middle of busy intersections; stated there was a previous effort with daffodil bulbs on Park Street years ago.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he would frame the discussion as Berkeley's "Adopt a Spot" program has given the City Council a starting point to figure out how to involve residents on a volunteer basis to beautify certain spots in Alameda; some spots would not be beautified; however, the process will vet acceptable locations; as the process begins, the City Manager may recommend not copying Berkeley's program and to instead have the program in conjunction with the City's Active Transportation Plan.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: Aye; Knox White: No; Vella: No; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 3. Noes: 2.

(21-194) Consider Directing Staff to Provide a Public Analysis of: 1) When the Brown Act Applies to Commissions and Committees, 2) Documents and Information Released Pursuant to the Public Records Act, and 3) What is Privileged and How to Waive Privilege. (Councilmember Herrera Spencer)

Councilmember Herrera Spencer gave a brief presentation.

The Chief Assistant City Attorney stated staff does periodic trainings for all Commission members; if Council directs staff to incorporate additional factors or topics into the training, staff is happy to do so.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether training is completed every two years.

The City Attorney responded the City Attorney's Office and City Clerk's Department engages in bi-annual training with all members of Boards, Commissions and Council; stated if Council be interested in having staff emphasize particular aspects of training, staff is happy to do so; trainings are taped and will be widely available to the public.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the public is very engaged in the community; expressed support for the public being included; stated that she would like the public to have the opportunity to ask questions, not just listen; she is unsure whether the trainings are publically noticed; trainings being taped are not the same as being able to ask questions live.

The City Attorney stated that he defers to the City Clerk.

The City Clerk stated training is typically conducted in-person, in Council Chambers; Boards, Commissions and Council are invited because they are required to take the training under the Sunshine Ordinance; training is recorded and posted on the City's website; the last training provided was pre-COVID-19 and in-person; training has yet to be conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic via Zoom.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired when the next session is anticipated.

The City Clerk responded the training has not yet been scheduled; stated training is typically scheduled in August.

Councilmember Knox White inquired whether the Open Government Commission (OGC) has been discussing the matter; stated a Public Records Act workshop training was recently held by a member of the OGC; inquired the result of the Commissions discussion on public outreach for the issues.

The Chief Assistant City Attorney responded a training did occur; stated the training was not overseen by City staff; she is unsure the outcome of the training; there have been discussions about topics raised during OGC meetings; however, no specific direction has been given about additional trainings for the public.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she was surprised to see a Press Release about a member of the OGC, not City staff, providing training about Public Records Act requests; inquired how the training came about.

The Chief Assistant City Attorney responded that her understanding is the training first came up sometime last year; stated there had been discussion at an OGC meeting and a decision was made.

The City Clerk stated the training was raised at a couple of Commission meetings; the Commission supported having the outreach; the City Zoom account was used to conduct the training; the training had been delayed due to COVID-19 and was initially supposed to be at the Library; the Zoom was hosted based off direction provided over a year ago.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she did hear about the Commission providing outreach; the outreach is not what she is looking for; the matter is an important legal issue; there is confusion within the community; it is appropriate to have the City Attorney's Office conduct the training; she is asking to somehow include the public to ensure there is public participation.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer moved approval of staff looking into including the public the next time the City Attorney's Office provides training.

Councilmember Knox White seconded the motion, which carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: Aye; Herrera Spencer: Aye; Knox White: Aye; Vella: Aye; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 5.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft called a recess at 8:48 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

(21-195) Consider Addressing the Process for Potential Changes to the Jean Sweeney Open Space Park Design Development Plan, including Public Input. (Councilmembers Herrera Spencer and Daysog)

Councilmember Herrera Spencer gave a brief presentation.

The Recreation and Parks Director stated the public process conducted included high level concepts; outlined the grant application process; stated the opportunity was key in applying for funding to build out the western portion; the grant requires a public process; previous outreach was conducted prior to 2018; the grant process requires more current outreach to increase chances of qualifying with higher scores on the application; once a more detailed design is complete, the design will be brought forward for additional public process to the Recreation and Parks Commission and ultimately the City Council; the primary components in the plan remain the same from the original Master Plan; the primary components will still be funded by the grant regardless of the park arrangement.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft requested clarification about discussion parameters related to ongoing litigation.

The City Attorney stated any matter being litigated is scheduled for Closed Session in front of the Council; Council cannot have conversations about what has happened in Closed Session unless otherwise directed in rare circumstances; staff is happy to take direction and provide information where needed; staff will continue to caution Council to not discuss anything from Closed Session.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer requested a map of Jean Sweeney Park be displayed; stated after her Council Referral, the map was removed and replaced with a different map; noted the map conflicts with the Council approved plan.

Councilmember Knox White inquired whether the discussion is related to pieces of land which the City does not currently own.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded in the affirmative; stated the grant application requires staff to go after funding for title held, developable land.

Councilmember Knox White inquired whether all planning for the park was done through the City Council; stated that he remembers the Recreation and Parks Commission working with subcommittees and the community on most of the planning; the matter did come to Council a couple times for final approval; inquired whether the same process is currently being followed.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded in the affirmative; stated the bulk of the work for the original Master Plan was the done at the community level, then, Boards and Commissions and finally Council approval.

Councilmember Knox White inquired whether there are two standing subcommittees.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded in the affirmative; stated there was an overall steering committee and a community garden committee for the earlier phase; for the current process, a meeting was hold with the community garden committee.

The City Clerk presented the Park map.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the map was attached to the Recreation and Parks Commission agenda; there is no reference to the grant excluding the areas shown; there have been numerous meetings led by the Recreation and Parks Commission; the matter also came before Council and Council has discretion over changing the plan; the plan cannot be changed without Council approval; she strongly believes any discussion to change the plan should be held at the Council level to allow for public information.

Discussed Union Pacific land being used as part of the Jean Sweeney Park; stated there have been many Closed Session agendas regarding Union Pacific; a report should be made to the public as to why the plans have been changed; she hopes there would be opportunity for public input on any Council decision before public participation of a redesign; it is unfortunate a decision has been made without public comment; many volunteers help in the Jean Sweeney Park: Dorothy Freeman, Alameda.

Stated that he likes the Jean Sweeney Park; having different sections of the Park is good; expressed support for space for adults to exercise expressed concern about the end of streets not connecting to the Park: Benhamish Allen, Alameda.

Inquired about a stimulus windfall of approximately \$28 million and whether the City can use funds to acquire the remaining; the section has been included in the original plan; expressed support for seeking grant funds and using one area of the Park for pickle ball courts: Carmen Reid, Alameda.

Councilmember Daysog stated that his understanding is the project encompass a lot of the green and orange areas of the map presented; the north side of the Jean Sweeney Park is contiguous to the Marina Village light industrial business park; the original vision of Jean Sweeney Park on the south side would be contiguous to the neighborhoods; the intent of the Referral is to take pause and involve the public about what might be happening on the south side and to understand what is to come with financial implications.

Councilmember Knox White stated too much has been said; expressed concern about Councilmembers disclosing conversations which cause jumping to conclusions; stated the matter has been unfortunate and causes distrust; this is the second time since he has been on Council that Closed Session discussions have shown up in public comment; no land use decisions or changes have been made; Council cannot make said decisions behind closed doors; Council is in litigation; it is easy for some people to make allegations and bring matters forward which are inappropriate and illegal; Council needs to be careful.

Councilmember Knox White moved approval of stopping the discussion and making a commitment to the public that when matters are available to discuss and deliberate on, Council will provide an opportunity to both have discussion about any conversations made in Closed Session and have conversations that can lead to future discussions about the park.

Vice Mayor Vella seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Councilmember Herrera Spencer started the information she has shared is public information; the map is information shared as an attachment to an agenda item; members of the public have had a Zoom conversation; Council makes and votes on plans; any changes to the plan need to go to Council in open session; all information shared is public information and is not illegal; she is disappointed to have a Councilmember make such a statement; expressed support for educating the public on matters shared as public information; stated a plan for Jean Sweeney Park was voted on by City Council; discussions are taking place via Zoom as well as at the Recreation and Parks Commission; the map is shown as revised park boundaries; input is being sought for less park area, which contradicts the plan approved by Council; she opposes the motion.

On the call for the question the motion carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Daysog: No; Herrera Spencer: No; Knox White: Aye; Vella: Aye; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 3. Noes: 2.

Councilmember Knox White inquired whether any actions have been reported out regarding the matter.

The City Attorney responded in the negative; stated all report outs from Council have been that staff has provided information and Council has provided direction.

Councilmember Knox White inquired whether there have been reports out about changes to park boundaries or uses, to which the City Attorney responded in the negative.

Councilmember Knox White stated it is fair to assume that until such report is made, no decisions have been made.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

(21-196) Mayor's Nominations for Appointments to the Housing Authority Board of Commissioners and Recreation and Park Commission. Not heard.

(21-197) Councilmember Herrera Spencer announced a vigil is held tomorrow; the vigil is two parts: a Zoom meeting at 5:15 p.m. and an in-person vigil at Chochenyo Park.

(21-198) Vice Mayor Vella made an announcement regarding the Alameda County Healthy Homes meeting; stated that she forwarded the meeting Power Point presentation to the City Manager; discussed a Hospital Liaison Committee meeting.

(21-199) Councilmember Knox White stated the City Council and School Board Subcommittee met last week; outlined the issues which were discussed: a joint program is being put together to start education in schools and within the community around indigenous ancestors and the impacts of colonialism; ideas will be brought back to the subcommittee, which will be brought back to the School Board and Council; discussed an update on mental health services.

(21-200) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated a funding request for mental health services will be reviewed in the budget presentation in May; made an announcement regarding a meeting

with the Alameda Health Care District; stated there is a proactive tone in keeping Alameda Hospital open; the Board of Alameda Health Care District has voted to allocate \$250,000 for the upcoming fiscal year for community paramedicine; discussed an update from Dr. Mini Swift.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft adjourned the meeting at 9:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

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