

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
WEDNESDAY- -JANUARY 21, 2015- -6:30 P.M.

Mayor Spencer convened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Paul Foreman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, Ezzy Ashcraft, Matarrese, Oddie and Mayor Spencer – 5.

[Note: Councilmember Daysog arrived at 6: 01 p.m.]

Absent: None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

(15-069) Joseph Woodard, Alameda, discussed the budget and public safety contracts, including salaries and benefits.

COUNCIL REFERRALS

(15-070) Consider Directing Staff to Conduct a Study to Review Suggestions to Provide Relief for Traffic on Island Drive. (Councilmember Oddie) (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Councilmember Oddie made brief comments on the Referral.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she understands the Council can vote to proceed on Council referrals; she supports the referral and would make a motion with an amendment to request the City Council to direct appropriate City staff to conduct a study to determine if some or all of the suggestions would provide relief for traffic on Island Drive and, in addition, she would like to include “or other remedies;” the list is good, however, staff might come up with another idea or two to alleviate traffic.

The Assistant City Manager stated the appropriate language is to direct the City Manager so Council stays away from directing staff.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft concurred with the Assistant City Manager’s suggestion.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he is fine with the amendment; the list is not exhaustive of what causes traffic on Island Drive.

Vice Mayor Matarrese concurred with Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft’s suggestion to broaden the list and incorporate the Assistant City Manager’s suggestion that Council is directing the City Manager.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft moved approval [of the Council referral with

amendments to direct the City Manager to conduct a study to review suggestions: extend the left turn lane on Island Drive to Robert Davey Drive, renegotiate the Bay Farm Bridge hours of operation to allow the bridge to open for emergency only between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, work with Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) to change the start time for Lincoln Middle School to 8:10 a.m. thereby allowing a better flow of traffic up Island Drive with better traffic flow for student drop off at Earhart and Bay Farm elementary schools, check signal synchronization from Island Drive, Fernside Boulevard, and Otis Drive to Broadway, or other remedies to provide relief for traffic on Island Drive].

Councilmember Daysog seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Mayor Spencer requested staff to clarify whether a request can be made to Public Works when someone has a traffic issue; then, Public Works adds the issue to the queue and it goes through the process.

The Assistant City Manager stated said process is the case in general; the referral is pretty broad because it addresses a bridge and discusses working with the School District to change hours; it is appropriate for the Council to have a discussion because the matter is broader than one intersection.

Mayor Spencer stated in regards to AUSD, joint meetings between the City and the District have been held in the past to discuss similar issues; the matter would have gone to the joint committee as part of the process before, which is appropriate; the referral should go through the joint committee; having been on the School Board, she is familiar with said process.

The Assistant City Manager stated the joint committee is the appropriate body when staff reaches that point.

Mayor Spencer inquired if it was possible to amend the motion to state: "through the joint meeting."

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she favors keeping the language broad, rather than narrow because working with AUSD to change the start time encompasses a lot of things; it could encompass the committee, but might be as simple as making a phone call or two without the City having to wait for the committee to meet; the possibility of the committee meeting is not eliminated.

Mayor Spencer stated having served on the School Board for six years, she does not anticipate a school start time would change from a phone call; using the process which she has been a part of for a long time is appropriate.

The Assistant City Manager inquired whether the language could be revised to: "work with AUSD and the committee, as appropriate," so there is an opportunity to do both.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Spencer stated the language is appropriate; that she would like to work board to board.

Councilmember Oddie stated changing the time may require negotiations with the labor union so he is fine with the correction; however, he would prefer not to be so descriptive about how staff should operate because the Council does not know what it will entail.

Mayor Spencer stated in regards to the referral process, she understands that the referral comes to the Council; then, the Council agrees that the matter goes on an agenda for another decision; inquired whether the matter would come back to Council.

The Assistant City Manager responded in the affirmative; stated the referrals would have to come back to Council; the earliest would be in two meetings given publication deadlines; staff would come back with a proposal that lays out a scope: what it would take, how long it would take and potentially how much it would cost.

Mayor Spencer requested the statement about changing the start time be clarified; inquired if “work with AUSD to change the start time for Lincoln Middle School to 8:10 a.m.” suggest Council is agreeing to the change.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated the notion of keeping the matter broad is important because the examples are all anecdotal suggestions and are not based on any traffic engineering or study; the Council does not know if the time change may make traffic worse; the examples are suggested to be explored; staff is going to review the matter and give Council an evaluation; the City is a long way from calling the School District.

Mayor Spencer stated that she appreciates the clarification; she would strike the time and state: “work with AUSD to change the start time to allow a better flow of traffic” as opposed to being specific about a set time; the School District hearing the Council wants to change the start time to 8:10 a.m. is specific, not broad.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated examples are anecdotal; the referral process gives the Council majority an opportunity to direct the City Manager to expend staff time to research issues and apply a solution if one can be had.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether Council would be willing to strike the start time.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft inquired why Councilmember Oddie included the 8:10 a.m. time, to which Councilmember Oddie responded the time would make Lincoln Middle School start later than the elementary schools.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated there is some rationale.

Mayor Spencer stated elementary schools start at 8:20 a.m.; Lincoln starts at 8:00 a.m.;

the solution does not resolve the issue; parents would have to get to Lincoln at 8:10 a.m., drop off, and get back to the elementary schools at 8:20 a.m.

Councilmember Oddie stated details can be addressed when the matter comes back to Council; the referral is just a broad policy level discussion; ideas may work or may not provide relief; Council would receive information about what does and does not work; that he would prefer not to be overly prescriptive, set Council policy from a high level and not micromanage staff activity.

Mayor Spencer inquired if Councilmember Oddie would be willing to strike 8:10 a.m., to which Councilmember Oddie responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the referral would read: "to work with AUSD to change the start time for Lincoln Middle School to allow a better flow of traffic," to which Mayor Spencer responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he supports the referral which is based upon contact Councilmember Oddie had with residents and reflects true concerns; his concern is the City Council has to deal with competing concerns; putting checking signal synchronization from Island Drive, Fernside Boulevard, and Otis Drive to Broadway in the front of the queue would not be as fair to all Alameda residents as checking signal synchronization for all roads in Alameda; other parts of town might have the same issue; the fourth bullet point [check signal synchronization from Island Drive, Fernside Boulevard, and Otis Drive to Broadway] is general enough, so he will support the referral; however, when the matter is brought back to the City Council he might raise the same concern; concerns about Lincoln Middle School traffic flow warrant dealing with because issues related to the Bay Farm Bridge; questioned whether the first bullet [extend the left turn lane on Island Drive to Robert Davey Drive] is similar and whether left turn lanes throughout the City might need to be checked.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether asking Public Works staff to speak to the Council about how concerns would normally be addressed in the queue is appropriate; stated that she would not like to micromanage Public Works; she appreciates the comments about people from across the community having traffic concerns and why would Council prioritize this area over other community interests; questioned whether that [prioritization] would be part of the process.

The Assistant City Manager stated the matter could be agendized as a staff report.

Mayor Spencer stated no one intends to bump other areas through the motion.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she did not understand that Council was pushing the item to the front of the queue; she understood staff would come back with a report when able; as part of the report, Public Works could weigh in on the Mayor's question; the Council tends to hear from citizens on other problematic areas; Council does not want to micromanage staff; Council hearing the referral does not mean staff

would go back and put the item ahead of other things; the City Manager will tell the Council when the matter can be addressed; everyone has heard concerns that trying to get back and forth over the Bridge during commute time is challenging; no one is denying there is a problem; the City will try to address all problems as expeditiously as possible.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by unanimous vote – 5.

(15-071) Consider Directing Staff to Conduct a Consultant Study to Determine the Feasibility for a Wetland Mitigation Bank at Alameda Point. (Councilmember Oddie) (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Councilmember Oddie made brief comments on the referral.

Stated wetland mitigation banks typically produce a better environmental outcome; creating a bank would create a business deal for projects; areas will not be protect by sea level rise; suggested asking California Fish and Wildlife to do a walk through and receive free advice before spending money: Richard Bangert, Alameda.

Stated plans were passed to have wetlands at Alameda Point; obtaining information can never hurt; urged the Council to support the referral: Irene Dieter, Alameda.

Councilmember Oddie stated a portion of the referral addresses consultants estimating the cost of removing the concrete by the west side of the seaplane lagoon; he supports Mr. Bangert's idea of an interim step if it would be helpful; the City is moving on Site A and is maybe not moving so fast on Site B; that he would like to see the City move forward on the wetlands and the park portion of Alameda Point as well.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether Councilmember Oddie would amend his referral to include the intermediate step, to which Councilmember Oddie responded in the affirmative.

The Assistant City Manager suggested revising the referral to: "an appropriate agency" so it is not restricted to one body because there may be another body that staff would like to approach.

Vice Mayor Matarrese moved approval of the referral with amendments [directing the City Manager to conduct a consultant study to determine the feasibility for a wetland mitigation bank at Alameda Point, including the interim step of asking an appropriate agency to do a walk through and receive free advice before spending money].

Councilmember Oddie seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she thinks the suggestion is a good idea; Vice Mayor Matarrese discussed the matter on the campaign trail; Mr. Bangert indicated a bank may not be right for Alameda; while gaining information never

hurts, using consultants costs money; she favors the cautious route of having the appropriate State agency conduct a review; the City should get information and proceed in an incremental process, which is what the amended language encompasses.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether Councilmember Oddie agrees that the Council would hear back and staff would determine the next step depending upon what the State agency says, to which Councilmember Oddie responded in the affirmative.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

(15-072) Consider Directing Staff to Install Flashing Pedestrian Crosswalk Signs at Two Locations: 1) Maitland Drive and Mecartney Road, and 2) Mecartney Road and Belmont Place. (Councilmember Oddie) (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Councilmember Oddie made brief comments on the referral; noted the referral should read: Maitland Drive and Island Drive and Mecartney Road and Belmont Place; since the referral, he has also been asked about Broadway and San Jose Avenue; that he is willing to amend the referral so that Council will get a report back on priority areas for flashing crosswalks.

Mayor Spencer expressed her appreciation for Councilmember Oddie's comment.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she would like to hear from a department, such as Public Works, as to whether flashing pedestrian crosswalk signs are the best remedy.

Councilmember Oddie concurred flashing crosswalks might not be the best remedy.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated Councilmembers are probably not as well equipped to decide; something needs to be done to address the issue of pedestrian safety; the referral might be one thing to consider; however, there is probably a whole tool box; Public Works, the Transportation Commission and Police Department should review the matter.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he was amenable to modifying the referral or coming back with a different referral.

The Assistant City Manager recommended demoting the matter from a Council referral to add three individual intersections to the Public Works queue; stated there are many tools in the tool box; Public Works would have to study the matter and recommend the best option; the matter would be brought back so Council could see how the Public Works queue works as opposed to the referral regarding the Bay Farm Island Bridge [paragraph no. 15-070]; the two requests are very different scales; normally, an individual or group of neighbors would make a request; the request would go into the queue and Public Works does studies and public outreach; Public Works views each Councilmember as a representative of more than one neighbor; there is a balance of

why some matters are Council referrals and why others should go into the queue; the matter would come back to Council to see the difference in the procedures.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he is fine with demoting the referral; neighbors indicated they did not receive a response before but there is a new Public Works team now.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she is not sure whether the Public Works queue system is widely known; perhaps the public discussion will help increase awareness.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft moved approval of the Council referral as amended [demoting the referral to have Public Works add the matter to the queue and the matter would return to Council to compare the process to the Island Drive traffic study referral].

Councilmember Daysog inquired whether the City still has the Traffic Transportation Committee, which reviews requests for stop signs; noted there was a past controversy over the use of State warrants.

The Assistant City Manager stated staff now completes the review with the immediate neighbors; if there is an appeal, the matter is elevated to the Transportation Commission (TC); if the TC decision is appealed, the matter comes to Council.

Councilmember Daysog stated perhaps one issue to improve is the way in which the City makes residents aware of the process.

Councilmember Daysog seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Mayor Spencer stated later tonight, Council would discuss an open house to improve communications.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

(15-073) Consider Directing Staff to Collaborate with East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) on Acquisition and Expansion of Crab Cove. (Vice Mayor Matarrese) (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Vice Mayor Matarrese made brief comments on the referral.

Stated a letter should be drafted to the General Services Administration (GSA); the letter should encourage GSA to cease the eminent domain and accept the Park District's last offer: Richard Bangert, Alameda.

Stated that she supports the referral because it sends the right message to all the parties involved; the City needs to take an assertive role; the liaison committee has to find out what kind of help the Park District needs: Irene Dieter, Alameda.

Stated the City Manager has shown a strong bias against the Park District and should be recused from any meetings; provided examples: former Councilmember Karin Lucas, Friends of Crab Cove.

Stated during the petition campaign, everybody wanted to see Crab Cove become part of Crown Beach; expressed support for the referral: Gretchen Lipow, Alameda.

Stated that she supports the collaboration; encouraged improvements in the storm drainage on the easement in front of the park: Susan Galleymore, Alameda.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated 6,000 signatures being gathered very quickly shows that the people of Alameda are very interested in making sure this occurs and validates the 2008 election which included the project in Measure WW; a liaison committee with two elected EBRPD Board Members and two elected Councilmembers is a good model for setting the tone; management representing the City well in a conciliatory and productive manor going forward is important; the issue is critical because more park land is not available; the City has to work well with the sister agency [EBRPD], which has a stake in Alameda.

Councilmember Oddie stated passing the referral will turn the page; requested changes to the referral; suggested engaging the City's lobbyist in Washington D.C. to help assist in the matter; stated having assistance from federal representatives, such as the City's Congress member, would be nice; the State Assemblymember's office would be willing to lend a hand; that he spoke to the State Senator's office and was told that they would be willing to assist in any way possible; the City should approach State legislators, but should especially approach federal representatives because the issue needs to be resolved by the federal government.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated the support given by Attorney General Kamala Harris was greatly appreciated; all help is welcome; accepted the addition.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she has a different take on the referral; she has no problem working in harmony with fellow agencies; however, EBRPD sued the City; the ink hardly seems dry on the Settlement Agreement; the lawsuit cost the City hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees, which comes out of the City's General Fund; she supports parks in Alameda; Assymblymember Bonta's office deserves credit for stepping in and trying to help with the settlement; the litigation was long and costly; the Park District also paid legal fees and used a good, expensive law firm; the City has done its part to support the Park District land acquisition of Crab Cove; the last City Council voted to approve the [initiative] ordinance, which was a great community grassroots effort; the City down zoned the property to Open Space at risk of a lawsuit from the developer who had the option to purchase the land at the time; at some point, the Park District is going to have to pay something or convince the federal government to give them the land; the land was never the City's land; telling the federal government how to precede with regard to its property is not the City's role; GSA and EBRPD are



both capable of fighting their own battles; the City is fortunate to have EBRPD as the steward of wonderful land; she does not object to establishing a good working relationship between the City and Park District, however, the road runs two ways; she has not seen the Park District reach out to the City; there are opportunities for the City to work with the Park District in the future at Alameda Point and on the main Island; right now, the memory of the litigation and refusal to settle bothers her; the City cannot keep doing EBRPD's work, so she cannot support the referral.

Councilmember Daysog stated Mr. Bangert referred to land on Alameda Point near Encinal High School; in the mid 1990's, the City, particularly neighbors in the area including himself, were concerned about an EBRPD project being contemplated; a great agreement was reached with EBRPD at the time, which became a model of how the City can air out concerns; Crab Cove did not reflect how the situation worked in the 1990's; there is a lot of good in the proposal before Council; through whatever mechanism, the liaison committee or the City Manager meeting the General Manager, details will be ironed out and a positive relationship will return; the residents of the City, as well as Council, need to let State and federal representatives know the community's sentiments; he is fine with the referral.

Mayor Spencer stated the City Manager is part of the team and Council is working with the City Manager moving forward; that she was elected to represent all Alamedans and everyone is working together; she appreciates the comments about moving forward; in regards to Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft's comments, the prior Council rezoned the property to housing which led to the litigation; however, everyone wants what is best for the community moving forward; she has had conversations with EBRPD representatives; she also attended meetings with the Sierra Club and has spoken with State and federal representatives; everyone appreciate the park and will work together in regards to the referral; during litigation, conversations occur and positions are taken; then, the City moves forward, which is where the City is now; suggested that the City invite EBRPD to an upcoming Council meeting; stated EBRPD could update the Council on the project's status; then, the City could meet with EBRPD as appropriate; the City cordially inviting EBRPD to a meeting provides an opportunity to update the City about the project, with staff and Council recognizing this is post litigation; she does support the referral and she is a friend of Crown Beach and collected signatures.

Councilmember Oddie moved approval of the Council referral as amended to include outreach to others: federal, lobbyists, State.

Mayor Spencer stated the referral is to direct the City Manager to initiate the conversation; requested the motion be clarified.

Councilmember Oddie moved approval of the Council referral from the Vice Mayor to increase collaboration between the City of Alameda and EBRPD including the amendments adding enlisting the help of federal and State officials.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether the motion includes the City Council directing the City

Manager to meet with the EBRPD General Manager.

Councilmember Oddie and Vice Mayor Matarrese responded the motion is to approve the referral as written [request that the City Council direct the City Manager to meet with the General Manager of EBRPD and following that meeting, prepare a work plan for steps that the City can take to support EBRPD's land acquisition and expansion of Crab Cove; those steps shall include, but not be limited to those needed for: settling any remaining issues related to litigation (on advice of City Attorney and City Council), petitioning the GSA to cease eminent domain efforts (McKay), and establishing a Council-EBRPD liaison committee with the goal to establish a good working relationship between the two organizations and to maximize use of limited resources for current and future Alameda parklands; this plan, with projected milestones for key deliverables, shall be presented to the City Council for discussion and action not later than the first regular City Council meeting in February 2015].

Vice Mayor Matarrese seconded the motion, noting that the last line mentions February, 2015, which should be adjusted by staff to meet noticing requirements and preparation time; requested staff to indicate a date now or provide it at some point.

Under discussion, the Assistant City Manager stated that he cannot provide a date now; he would recommend having staff provide updates under City Manager communication on when all the referrals passed tonight would come back to the Council to handle response quickly.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated the referral is a chance to lead the effort; if the effort is not lead, it is going to languish; even though that part of the park system [Crab Cove] is not under the City's control, it is so important and future parks depend on it; therefore, the City has to lead; the method is not new and is very effective; the School-City liaison committee was composed of the City Manager, two members of Council, the School Superintendent and two members of the School Board; the committee was initiated when the City and School District were fighting over Bayport; the liaison committee got the City Manager and Superintendent together in the same room and helped lead the path to resolve the conflict between the School District and the City; the working relationship became very good, lasted several years and accomplished things, such as ensuring that schools maintained a much lower electric rate; the approach is not untried and will provide a lot of benefit.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether the motion could be amended to strike the part about the City Manager and include a liaison committee instead.

Vice Mayor Matarrese responded in the negative; stated the leaders of the two operations need to have a cordial relationship.

Councilmember Oddie concurred with Vice Mayor Matarrese; stated that he does not want to amend the motion.

Mayor Spencer stated that she will not support the motion and stands by her suggestion to invite EBRPD to a Council meeting; she is concerned about holding a back room meeting after being involved in litigation; the City should be very public; a liaison committee does not exist; the olive branch should be extended by inviting EBRPD to a Council meeting.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Daysog, Matarrese, and Oddie – 3. Noes: Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft and Mayor Spencer – 2.

(15-074) Consider Directing Staff to Create a Comprehensive Transit/Traffic Strategic Plan and Implementation Tool. (Councilmember Daysog) (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Councilmember Daysog gave a Power Point presentation on the referral.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated Councilmember Daysog's presentation might go a little beyond the scope of a Council referral, which are supposed to be a brief description of the subject to be printed on the agenda sufficient to inform the City Council and public of the nature of the referral; questioned whether Councilmember Daysog is asking Council to take positive action; suggested Council might want to consider directing the City Manager to consider the matter at a special City Council workshop, rather than just coming back to the Council as an agenda item; stated the referral jumped off the page as a framework considering the recent Council discussions on traffic and transit.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated the workshop idea for the topic and the direction Councilmember Daysog is laying out is relevant to all the discussions the City has had about development over the past few years and what the City would have going forward; he would also like to see if Council is interested in making the workshop joint with the Transportation Commission because part of the Commission's job is to take direction from the Council and get into details; Councilmember Daysog provided a sample schematic that could easily be populated by workshop with the Transportation Commission to deliver back to Council.

Councilmember Daysog stated maybe the motion should read: "consider directing the City Manager to facilitate a workshop with regards to comprehensive transit traffic strategic planning."

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated being comprehensive should not to just considered, but should be established as a goal or deliverable.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft inquired if the workshop would be a joint meeting.

Councilmember Oddie stated multiple workshops may be needed; suggested holding a workshop on Bay Farm; stated the idea is great; Councilmember Daysog has suggested

that the Council lead the discussion; ultimately, Councilmembers are accountable; the Planning Board and Planning staff does a lot of work; however, if things do not work or are perceived as not working, Council will be held accountable; Council should have some say and oversight responsibility; other things to include are: having a review of existing transportation goals, revising the City's Transportation Plan, the General Plan, the Bike Plan, the Traffic Capacity Management Procedures (TCMP), the long-range transit plan, the West Alameda Shuttle plan, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM); goals should be reviewed to determine which are not being met, including what additional planning can be done to ensure goals are met and to propose a course of action; there should be a tiered structure; the gold standard would be taking X number of cars and people off the road is going to cost X amount of money and whether the City willing to do so; then, there could be a silver standard and a bronze standard.

Councilmember Daysog stated the City of Emeryville spent \$400,000 on the Emery-go-round in 2015 and 2016 because Emery-go-round seeks to expand its services; Emery-go-round is not a poor operation, but the Emeryville wanted to expand operations and provided an infusion; the City of Alameda might have to make hard decisions; using Councilmember Oddie's terms, the City wants to achieve the gold standard; developers, through contributions, and residents, through fees, might only reach X in revenues to pay for the gold standard; however, X plus Y might be needed; questioned how the City would make up the delta; stated the workshops would to lay out issues, including gold, silver and bronze standards.

Councilmember Daysog moved approval of directing the City Manager to facilitate a workshop.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether the motion could be amended to include City of Alameda; meaning Citywide.

Councilmember Daysog agreed to amend the motion to include Mayor Spencer's amendment; stated however, the impacts and projects are stemming mostly in the northern waterfront and Alameda Point.

Vice Mayor Matarrese seconded the motion.

Under discussion, the Assistant City Manager stated staff can certainly do so; a joint meeting could try to be scheduled; staff would need to consider audio visual requirements and seating to have a formal joint meeting with the Council, Transportation Commission and Planning Board; noted a joint Planning Board and Transportation Commission workshop would be held in February; scheduling the Council workshop for some time in March makes sense.

The City Attorney stated legally, three bodies can meet; the meeting just needs to be noticed; the matter is really more logistically how to manage the meeting.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated the direction was not necessarily a hard and fast

three body workshop; the matter can be left to the City Manager working with staff to decide who to involve; Council is not specifying the workshop must be three bodies.

The Assistant City Manager stated staff appreciates the ability to have the conversation and determine the appropriate bodies; the Chief Operating Officer – Alameda Point has been contemplating the referral in general, is working on some thoughts and was planning on coming back in the beginning of March.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated having heard the original presentation and the comment from Councilmember Oddie, the City Council is going to maintain the lead because the buck stops with the City Council, which might help clear up the meeting logistics.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

(15-075) Consider Directing Staff to Initiate Steps in Preparing a Structurally Sustainable General Fund Budget. (Vice Mayor Matarrese) (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Vice Mayor Matarrese gave a brief presentation.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated it would be helpful to hear from staff, specifically the Assistant City Manager because she has such an active role in the budget and understands the intricacies.

The Assistant City Manager stated that she attended a presentation about Proposition 8 adjustments, which addressed property taxes and the economy; reassessment adjustments are going to impact property taxes; the City will see improvements probably next year and the year after; however, this year is not as great as staff had hoped; the public sector lags; the Vice Mayor is addressing dependency on one time funding; staff removes one time money when forecasting; forecasts are based on what is sustainable, not one time money; assumptions will be addressed at the first budget kick off meeting; staff will ensure that the concerns are addressed; staff does not consider one time money a source of revenue; she has not been in contact with the City Treasurer and Auditor; hopefully the Vice Mayor has and they agreed to participate.

Mayor Spencer stated the Council can invite them [Auditor and Treasurer]; that she does not see that as an issue.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated they [Auditor and Treasurer] participated in the past.

Councilmember Daysog stated in a meeting in October, the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, and Interim Finance Director discussed more revenue being anticipated and the reserves looking quite healthy; however, the City Manager noted revenue came from one time upside hits; the nature of one time reserves was discussed; he has had similar conversations with previous City Managers; he has seen City Managers on top of their game when dealing with these issues for the most part; however, the information

looks very opaque when put into a 200 page budget document and supporting reports, which is the issue Vice Mayor Matarrese is raising; one time revenues, reserves and advanced loans need to be clear when the City interacts with the public; these three specific items fall under the general notion of best practices; the City might want to have best practices when it comes to financial items and these three items rise to the top; the City Council should probably have a conversation to understand best practices when it comes to one time revenues because the City might not want to make permanent plans around one time revenues; one time revenues bump up from different sources from one year to the next, such as property being sold and the City receiving a lot of transfer tax revenue or the State making a decision regarding sales tax given to another city; these kinds of onetime revenue hits occur in different ways; deciding how to handle the funds is where the best practices notion comes into place; having principles and hard and fast policies is fine; based upon experience with different City Managers, he trusts leeway can be given as long as best practices are clear; having a onetime revenue jump is good news because the City can stash away funds and start the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) trust fund; the City Manager has made alterations to bargaining agreements to have Police and Fire pay more towards retirement; he would not handcuff the City Manager into how to do the budget, rather Council should give leeway so the City Manager is clear about best practices; when going through the budget sessions, Council can ask to what extent the City Manager has followed the best practices; differences can be spelled out if Council does not agree with the City Manager.

Councilmember Oddie stated that his thoughts are very similar to Councilmember Daysog; he was a little concerned about Council setting a policy without understanding the consequence; by setting a policy to not include certain revenues, Council might be setting a policy that could have potential service cuts; the Council might not want to do so at this point; best practices need to be followed; however, the proper time to address the matter is closer to the budget.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated that he used the word “principle” rather than “policy” on purpose; the referral is not so well written because according to the Charter, budget preparation belongs to the City Manager; his intention is not to direct the steps; the principles are talking points; he would like a motion passed which says: things are clearly defined, such as the definition of onetime revenue; going through the budget process, definitions should be understood and highlighted; advances, loans and other transfers have a habit of drifting off the radar, which is why the items should also be highlighted; the last point ties back to the midyear report projecting the General Fund reserves reaching zero in fiscal year 2018; Council has to keep its eye on the ball; the public needs to be reminded; if said matters are pointed out during budget discussion and said direction is given to the City Manager, then he will be satisfied that the intent of the referral would be accomplished.

The Assistant City Manager responded staff is fine with said direction.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated Vice Mayor Matarrese referred to something said

by staff: more information is better than less; she is grappling with the matter because she feels the City is following the principles; being aware of the principles is good; the City recently had some onetime revenue; the previous Council dealt with it very responsibly: revenue was divided into separate pots to address immediate needs, such as Public Works repairs and continuing to pay down the OPEB liability; Council needs flexibility when dealing with the budget; she would like the ideas discussed during the budget process; doing a Council referral seems to singling out and elevate the three principles to a certain level that maybe should be shared with other good budget principles; the Council is very mindful of the budget deficits and debts the City needs to pay down; she has been very satisfied with the Finance Department's work and reports; the budget has been put into clear, understandable language; she is not sure direction needs to be given to the City Manager at this time; however, the principles can be considered along with others during budget discussions.

Councilmember Daysog stated the Council has known the budget has been structurally impaired for a long time; in the late 1990's, Council knew the Base closure impacts would make revenue inadequate; in the 2000's, there was an increase in OPEB and CalPERS liabilities; former Councilmember DeHaan used to say the revenue stream coming in relative to unfunded liabilities was inadequate and there was a structural problem; the City Manager's task is to juggle a lot of balls and chip away at long term obligations while trying to maintain current services; as a result, sometimes the City Manager will dip into reserves to pay for operations or other times, cuts might be made and savings will be put into the General Fund reserve; all information is always available; Councilmembers have the responsibility to ask tough questions; the question is always does the Council trust that staff is working on solving outstanding issues; Council does not have to prescribe what the City Manager has to do as long as best practices and expectations are clear.

Mayor Spencer stated that she attended a new Mayor and Councilmembers training with Councilmember Oddie; Alameda County cities unfunded OPEB liability was discussed; a chart showed the General Fund percent range from all the cities in the County; the matter is very significant; the range as a percent of the General Fund as of June 2013 was 7% to 140%; Albany was at 7% and Alameda was at 140%; Alameda has the highest percentage; when the chart flashed everyone was looking at her; the issue is of Statewide importance; she truly appreciates why the Vice Mayor brought the referral; each Councilmember has the responsibility of due diligence to ask questions when the budget is presented; she has had meetings with staff regarding the budget process; ample public meetings and workshops with public discussions will be held; the first part of the request is for the City Council to direct the City Manager to take specific steps to prepare a structurally sustainable General Fund budget for the upcoming Fiscal Year 2015-2017 cycle; she has concerns about the language; the process is long term; everyone knows the City is not going to be able to address the matter in the two year cycle; she is looking for a long term plan on how the City will chip away and address the issue; the points are good principles that everyone would support; however, there should be Finance Director, City Treasurer and Auditor input; Council will have the opportunity to discuss assumptions and have input; requested the Assistant City

Manager to clarify the budget process.

The Assistant City Manager stated staff is looking to kick off the budget at the first meeting in March; assumptions will be discussed; suggested the referral language be modified to have the City Council direct the City Manager to prepare the General Fund budget for the upcoming two year cycle ensuring that the principles are defined and critically evaluated during the budget process; staff may not be able to follow the principles for a particular reason, such as being in a recession; rainy day funds and flexibility are needed; the Vice Mayor is asking staff to critically evaluate pieces during the budget process; staff is fine with doing so; defining advances, loans and transfers from other funds is important and can be done as part of the budget process.

Mayor Spencer stated that she is confident staff would do so without Council direction; if a definition is not adequate, Council can always ask questions.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated Council created something that she is prepared to support; the Assistant City Manager honed in on the concerns and made improvements.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated that he likes the language and appreciates staff listening.

Vice Mayor Matarrese moved approval of directing the City Manager to prepare the General Fund budget ensuring that the three points would be defined and critically evaluated; stated that he specified the Fiscal Year 2015-2017 cycle in order to start right now; the City has a long way to go.

Councilmember Oddie inquired if the last paragraph [the principles shall be evaluated by the City Council with advice from the City Treasurer and City Auditor up to and during the public hearings for the up-coming General Fund budget and during the course of the two year budget cycle] is still in the motion, to which Vice Mayor Matarrese responded in the negative.

Councilmember Oddie inquired if the three items are: one time revenues, advanced loans and reserves, to which Vice Mayor Matarrese responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Mayor Spencer inquired if the last paragraph was stricken to which Vice Mayor Matarrese responded in the affirmative; stated the assumption is that the Treasurer and Auditor are already involved.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he exhibited hesitation because he saw the discussion being framed as addressing the budget's structural deficit, which everyone knows exists; Council moved away from indicating that the referral will solve the budget structure, which is beyond the scope; he is supportive of the literal wording; the Council cannot make a promise that the structural deficit will be solved; the motion now has value to the public; specifying the three items is valuable.



Mayor Spencer inquired whether the three principles will be considering along with other assumptions, to which the Assistant City Manager responded in the affirmative; stated staff is going to define and evaluate the principles.

Mayor Spencer stated the language is intentionally broad; she expects staff would have done so without the referral; the referral is not necessary to have staff do so; Council will work with staff; she will support the motion but thinks it is redundant.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Dayosg, Ezzy Ashcraft, Matarrese and Mayor Spencer – 4. Abstention: Councilmember Oddie – 1.

(15-076) Consider Directing Staff to Re-establish the Economic Development Commission (EDC). (Vice Mayor Matarrese) (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Vice Mayor Matarrese made brief comments on the referral.

Mayor Spencer stated that she would like to hear from staff about the history of the Commission.

The Assistant City Manager stated the matter was presented to Council on October 1, 2013; the report discussed the reasons the Commission should be eliminated and what should be used in its place; a more nimble process was proposed to take the place of the EDC; the Council should have the benefit of a conversation with the Economic Development Manager who has done a lot of leg work on economic development, as well as the Community Development Director; the discussion should come back.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she reviewed the previous Council vote; a lot has occurred since the EDC was created; Vice Mayor Matarrese was one of the EDC founders; she briefly served on the Commission; the roll of the EDC was greatly reduced after redevelopment money was lost and a lot of projects in the pipeline were taken away; fortunately, projects, like the theater, were completed; by January 2012, the EDC had already reduced meetings to six times a year and was not doing much; by October 2013, two of four meetings had been canceled; a staff member and an attorney attend commission meetings; the Economic Development Manager's work on recruiting and attracting business would be interrupted to prepare reports and staff EDC meetings, which may not be the best use of time; the City has seen some good results in recent years from the use of ad hoc committees and task forces, such as the Fiscal Sustainability and Americas Cup committees; discussed business attraction strategies and provided examples; further stated the reasons the EDC was discontinued are still valid; there are other things the City might do short of revitalizing the Commission.

The Assistant City Manager noted another reason the Commission was disbanded was because City staff attends various business organizations monthly meeting and meets regularly with the same people that would occasionally be scheduled for an EDC

meeting; the issue is wanting to know how the four tasks in the referral [recommend policies and plans to the City Council for bringing businesses to Alameda and replacing jobs lost when the Navy left Alameda Point, work with current businesses and business associations to attract and retain businesses in Alameda, provide ways to coordinate with regional efforts to grow the local economy and Alameda's commercial tax base and perform other economic development activities at the direction of the City Council] are being performed; suggested the Economic Development Manager report back to Council to discuss the matter; suggested tabling the referral for now until Councils hear said report.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated that he might be open to the suggestion; in the past, the Commission had a litany of work and truly accomplished specific things requested by Council, such as the Downtown Plan for Park Street; the Commission had sufficient work; deficiencies at Alameda Point and Harbor Bay hinder business retention; business retention was a big part of the EDC; the Commission grappled with recruitment and retention, redevelopment was only a small piece; that he is willing to table the referral pending information, but would reserve the ability to bring the referral back with more justification.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he is not ready to dismiss the idea which has merit; if Council voted today, he would probably support ways to have a productive EDC; Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft's examples are the what he envisions the EDC doing; each Councilmember probably knows a business person that would be ideal to help cheerlead for Alameda and attract business; if the Commission is reconstituted, each Councilmember should appointment a member; perhaps the Mayor would select three or five members; he is inclined to support the referral or continue it to another day.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft noted one function of the Chamber of Commerce is businesses attracting other businesses; the Chamber is a broad based organization.

Councilmember Oddie stated the referral is worth considering; noted the State approved a replacement for redevelopment; hopefully, the Council will receive a staff report on the matter soon.

Councilmember Daysog stated the Mayor's Economic Development Task Force, which includes marque organizations, was established; that he envisions letterhead from the Mayor including the top business, which would be impressive when attracting businesses; the Task Force fits with the recent experience of attracting businesses via networks and personal contacts; having top national brand entities on the City's letterhead is powerful; Mayor Gilmore was very supportive and the City should continue the model.

Mayor Spencer stated that she reviewed the information establishing the Mayor's Economic Development Panel, which is to be composed of high level Alameda business and business association executives; the Panel's purpose is to enhance the business climate at Alameda business parks and commercial districts and support the growth of

Alameda's identified commercial and industrial business clusters by providing both strategic policy and tactical business attraction and retention advice; the seven member Panel would be appointed by the Mayor for two year terms and report to the City Council; in contrast to the EDC, the Panel would be a more flexible and informal structure assessing the rich pool of experience and personal contacts by working with the advisers individually or in subgroups; the Panel may officially convene once or twice per year; there are differences between an ad hoc committee and a Commission; the prior Council decision was progress; she appreciates having insight from the Councilmembers that made the decision; she concurs with Councilmember Daysog; inquired what Vice Mayor Matarrese would like to do and if he is open to having the Economic Development Manager speak to Council about why the change was made.

Vice Mayor Matarrese responded everyone can read why the change was made; that he would prefer a more formal and public process; he agrees to table the referral for the moment and come back with a more compelling argument after hearing the objections; he will come back with additional information.

Mayor Spencer stated the Mayors Economic Development Panel was agreed upon and can move forward; she is proceeding and looks forward to the Panel, which is a good step moving forward.

### COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

(15-077) Designation of a Voting Delegate and Alternate for the League of California Cities. (Continued from January 20, 2015)

Mayor Spencer stated the delegate is appointed by Council, not by the Mayor; the League of California Cities meetings are held monthly; meeting announcements and locations are sent to the representative; the designation of the voting delegate at the annual conference requires a Council vote; the League's mission is to expand and protect local control for cities through education and advocacy and to enhance the quality of life for all Californians; the liaison had been former Councilmember Tam and the alternate had been Councilmember Daysog; inquired whether Councilmember Daysog would like to provide additional information about the League; stated that she would support Councilmember Daysog being the delegate.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he was the City's representative to the League in 2005 and 2006; he appreciated serving as alternate which allowed him to attend meetings in Sacramento; the League of California Cities involves cities as a group to influence major legislation; he is a member of the Housing Community Development Subcommittee, which worked on a massage parlor ordinance; many cities across California were concerned about the State taking over ways in which massage parlors are allowed to operate locally; the Committee members worked with State legislators and had the law changed; he would like to continue participating on the League of California Cities.

Mayor Spencer inquired if Councilmember Daysog would like to continue as the liaison as opposed to the alternate, to which Councilmember Daysog responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she attended East Bay Division monthly meetings with former Councilmember Tam; she would be happy to continue as the East Bay Division representative.

Mayor Spencer stated she is not sure about the East Bay Division and requested the voting delegate be discussed first.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated the East Bay Division was mentioned; she would support Councilmember Daysog serving as the League voting delegate at the State level; she was indicating that she attends the locals meetings.

Mayor Spencer stated an alternate is needed; inquired whether anyone is interested in being the alternate.

Councilmember Daysog inquired if the East Bay Division is different than the League of California Cities, to which Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft responded the League of California Cities East Bay Division is informed about pending legislation; she and former Councilmember Tam brought matters back to Council a couple of times; however, it is not the same as going to Statewide meetings and having a vote at the State level, rather it is the local version of the State League.

The City Clerk stated former Councilmember Tam served as both; the City has had one League representative; the League is looking for an East Bay Division representative; the City also needs to have a voting delegate for the annual conference; Council has to decide whether to have one person or whether to break it into two different representatives; in the past, the City typically has had one person; former Councilmember Tam served as both.

Mayor Spencer requested staff to explain what Council is being asked to do because said information is contrary to what staff told her.

The Assistant City Manager stated Council needs to designate a voting delegate to represent the City of Alameda at the annual conference.

The City Clerk stated the Annual Conference is in September.

Councilmember Daysog stated Council should iron out the East Bay matter when needed; the voting delegate is the question on the floor.

Mayor Spencer stated staff discussed a representative being needed with her; she wants to make sure the City is doing what needs to get done; she was told the East Bay Division is separate.

The Assistant City Manager stated as far as he is aware a Council vote is not needed to have a representative attend East Bay Division meetings.

The City Clerk stated the East Bay Division asked who would be the City's the voting delegate.

Mayor Spencer stated there are dinner meetings; the East Bay Mayors also have monthly dinner meetings.

The Assistant City Manager stated according to the email, it is the East Bay Division of the League, not the State; the next meeting is the 29<sup>th</sup>.

The City Clerk stated the League is asking who would be the voting delegate.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether the voting delegate is for the annual conference, the City Clerk responded the City always had the same person and never broke it into two people.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she would attend meetings with former Councilmember Tam; the League may want to know who would be the voting delegate now even though the conference is not until September because there are often emails sent about pending legislation; the League does a very good job of keeping in touch with the Council throughout the year.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he is happy to serve as the voting delegate and the practice could continue the way in which Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft worked with former Councilmember Tam; he and Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft could work together.

Mayor Spencer stated that she would want a role in the East Bay Division.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated Council can work that out.

The Assistant City Manager stated the City should get clarification.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft inquired if the matter should be brought back, to which Mayor Spencer responded in the negative; stated Council needs to make a decision; a vote is needed for the League of California Cities voting delegate; she was informed the City has a liaison and an alternate.

The City Clerk stated the email indicates an election of Executive Committee members would be held at the January 29<sup>th</sup> East Bay Division meeting; in order to be on the Executive Committee, perhaps a Councilmember would have to be the voting delegate.

Mayor Spencer moved approval of appointing Councilmember Daysog as the

representative and Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft as the alternate.

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

Councilmember Daysog stated he would make sure to maintain the relationship the way that Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft worked with former Councilmember Tam.

### REGULAR AGENDA ITEM

(15-078) Discuss City Council Rules and Procedures for City Council Meetings and the Possibility of Holding a Future City Hall Open House. (Mayor Spencer)

Mayor Spencer gave a brief presentation.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft noted the Sunshine Ordinance would be discussed tonight; stated if three meetings in a row go past 11:00 p.m., Council must add extra meetings for the rest of the year; Council may want to think about economy of time.

Mayor Spencer stated staff tried to come up with all the different resolutions and ordinances and the Brown Act which support the Council meeting workings; she wants to discuss actually making the agenda.

Councilmember Oddie inquired about the open house.

Mayor Spencer responded that she does not believe Council has to vote on the matter.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft questioned why the matter did not come as a Council Referral because she is just hearing about it now and does not have information and the public does not know what is being discussed or have any background; stated that she would like to discuss whether all members of the City Council should have to go through the Council Referral process.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated that he had a similar concern about not having any detail on the matter; agendas are full; an open house should be done at the appropriate time, which would probably mean a workshop; inquired whether the intent is to have the Council make a recommendation on the matter tonight; stated in order to direct staff to do something, staff needs Council direction.

Mayor Spencer stated her intent is to allow Council to have an open discussion if people have ideas about how to work together.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she recently reread the Sunshine Ordinance; she does not dispute the topics are very interesting; however, she feels Council is doing so without the benefit of any context.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he also has a few concerns; the open house is not a bad idea; however, Council gave staff a lot of work today and yesterday; he is not sure he wants to give staff more work tonight; if Council asks staff to do something, staff are will give 110%, which takes a generous amount of effort; perhaps the matter would be tabled and brought back in the summer time; the first discussion point is submission of matters, which refers to a Municipal Code section; order of business, rules of order, start time and length of meetings, and continuation of items also refer to Municipal Code sections; teleconferencing refers to the Government Code Brown Act; the public does not have notice if Council is going to consider changes; there is not an opportunity to hear staff's in depth analysis of impacts; two readings are required to change an ordinance; that he is not sure the intended outcome of tonight's meeting.

Mayor Spencer responded that she thinks reviewing the matters is important so the Council knows the process, such as for referrals; today, Council went through the referral process, which was not necessarily as clean as it could have been; she would like to review how to hold meetings under the Brown Act and the exact protocol; from the School Board, she is used to calling an agenda item, having a staff presentation, clarifying questions, public comment, discussion, and then the motion, which is the way she has been running meetings.

Councilmember Oddie stated the Council has its own procedures; the School Board's procedures are different; Mayor Spencer's comment about being able to explain a no vote is in the School Board procedures, not Council procedures.

Councilmember Daysog stated the agenda item seems appropriate and does not have any specific actions that alter any of the ordinances; his interpretation of what Mayor Spencer is seeking to do is have a conversation about the submittal of matters, not saying Council is going to alter the ordinance tonight, rather Council is going to discuss it; Council is not going to take specific actions to alter anything; Council is not precluded from having such discussions; he is fine with the idea of a future open house.

Mayor Spencer stated that she is happy to bring the open house back as a referral; having this conversation is important.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft concurred with Mayor Spencer that having the conversation is important; stated that she is concerned members of the public might like to be included in the conversation; inquired whether Mayor Spencer would consider tabling the matter to the next Council meeting; stated the agenda for the first meeting in February is still light; there would be time for a staff report to be generated with more information.

The City Clerk noted the February 3, 2015 meeting packet would be published tomorrow.

Councilmember Daysog stated the matter is properly described in the very first background sentence: the Mayor is requesting to give the new Council and members of

the public an opportunity to discuss the existing practices and protocols on the conduct of City business, which is a straight forward description; Council is going to discuss existing practices and protocols in the referenced ordinances; there is a frame of reference for discussion; his sense is that the mayor put the matter on a Wednesday night because there are not going to be any substantive outcomes.

Stated that she was excited to see the matter on the agenda; expressed support for an open house; encouraged greater participation on boards and commissions: Carol Gottstein, Alameda.

Encouraged the Council to impart an appearance of fairness; discussed calling speakers; stated important issues should not be addressed late: Elizabeth Tuckwell, Alameda.

Mayor Spencer stated tonight is a workshop; she appreciates the audience informing the Council how meetings can be held to encourage participation and be transparent; she wanted the meeting on a special night because Council is not going on a retreat; a retreat would be a similar event; the Sunshine Ordinance limits the way business is done in front of the public [requires broadcast]; that she appreciates Councilmember Daysog and Ezzy Aschraft's comments; she worked with staff; quite a bit of time was spent drafting the information so that the public would be aware of what would be discussed; the objective is to help Council move forward; noted she calls speakers in the order submitted.

Stated people watch meetings at home; Power Points should be shown on the broadcast and there have been audio issues: Richard Bangert, Alameda.

The City Clerk stated staff is working on a split screen solution for Power Point presentations; addressed audio transmission issues; encouraged contacting the City Clerk's office when issues occur.

Vice Mayor Matarrese noted the video went dark last night at 1:00 a.m. on Comcast; stated the open house presentations by departments should happen outside a regular meeting; adopting Robert Rules of Order to keep order could benefit the rules; suggested establishing a Council rules subcommittee similar to a previous Charter review subcommittee.

Mayor Spencer stated that she is used to working with a modified Roberts Rules of Order; concurred with Vice Mayor Matarrese; it is very important; her understanding is the motion is to be done immediately under Roberts Rules of Order, which is different than the way she has been doing it; tonight is an opportunity for the Council, with input from the public, to address what procedural aspects of meetings should look like; she would support the recommendation and could bring a referral forward to have the discussion.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated anyone interested in bringing the matter forward could



submit a referral; the public would be informed; that he would like to have background information and know other possibilities.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether members of the public present are interested in the Council using Roberts Rules of Order or if the public likes the way meetings are going; stated members of the public should feel free to give guidance.

Stated if Council is not comfortable, the matter is up to the Council to decide: Ann Richter, Alameda.

Mayor Spencer stated that she is allowing the audience to clap at meetings; the audience has been very respectful of each other; that she thinks the meetings have flowed well; the School Board allowed clapping; allowing clapping is a change, which has not slowed down the meeting; tonight is supposed to be a discussion.

Ms. Richter expressed support for Vice Mayor Matarrese's suggestion to implement Roberts Rules of Order.

Stated that she appreciates the friendliness in the way the Mayor runs the meeting; people feel welcome; people are encouraged to speak and are not harassed for going over the time limit; people should be able to express enthusiasm and applaud; she likes the structure of Roberts Rules of Order, which is a good suggestion: former Councilmember Karin Lucas, Alameda.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she would like to hear from the City Attorney; noted there are 10 members of the public present.

The City Attorney stated staff pulled together a series of resolutions and ordinances that were adopted by previous City Councils addressing how business should be conducted; one of the resolutions references using Roberts Rules of Order as a guide; people use a condensed version of Roberts Rules of Order; if Council wants to establish a subcommittee, said things could be considered; the idea tonight was to review what is being done and determine if what is being done complies with previous resolutions and ordinances; guidance could be provided about where the Council wants to head and the desired way in which to proceed; staff could return with something if Council provides guidance or a Council subcommittee could be appointed; the Council can change ordinances and resolutions.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft questioned whether there is a problem that is trying to be fixed; stated there has been a progression, for example Oral Communications is now at the beginning of the agenda and at the end if the speakers could not fit into the allotted 15 minutes; that she would be hesitant to change things, such as the order of business and meeting start times, because the procedures work well now and have been thought out by a number of Councils; she tries to be mindful of how much is being requested of staff; the rules of order could benefit from being consolidated, perhaps by a rules subcommittee; Council should be mindful of staff's time when considering scheduling

extra meetings, such as an open house; suggested tackling the most important matters first.

Discussed the election results and the prior Council; stated creating a welcoming atmosphere is important; that she would not suggest adhering to Roberts Rules of Order; stated meetings should not be scheduled with the public input at 11:00 p.m.:  
Elizabeth Tuckwell, Alameda.

Mayor Spencer stated the meeting is achieving her goal; she loves having members of the public tell the Council what is working and not working and how the Council can best serve the public's needs; that she appreciates that Councilmembers can follow up with referrals and have an opportunity to work with staff more closely; it was not known that additional items would be continued to tonight when the special meeting was called; the meeting has gone beyond the intended time.

Councilmember Oddie expressed concern over the meeting turning into a session to criticize the former Council; stated the City needs to move forward; the election is over; how meetings are run and speakers are called is the Mayor's prerogative; the Council could discuss the items in the report.

Mayor Spencer stated the intent is being taken out of context; that she always welcomes public participation; the meeting has been very productive for her.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft provided an example of her daughter working with people from other countries risking their lives to participate in the democratic processes; read from the Sunshine Ordinance regarding access to government; stated the benefits of a democratic society are taken for granted; expressed concern over criticizing past Councils; stated Councilmembers are doing the people's business and should do so in the best way possible.

Mayor Spencer stated it was not disrespectful to call the meeting; the meeting was called to discuss the items and that is what has occurred.

Councilmember Daysog stated the intent of the workshop is right on; it is about letting people understand the way in which government works and opening the doors of City Hall even wider; the intent is noble; that he is fine with the way the Council does things.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he did not state holding the meeting is disrespectful; concurred with Councilmember Daysog that the Council is doing fine but Councilmembers should feel free to raise suggestions; sharing the information was valuable.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated the election is over; moving forward is important and sends the message that the Council is here to work; if Council wants to consider having an open house, there should be a vote and consideration for staff; stated the longer the time between when a motion is made and the second occurs, the motion might get

better or become unintelligible; Roberts Rules of Order or some other system gets the motion on the table with a second so there can be discussion and something real can be modified, which is why Council should consider adhering to some specific points of Roberts Rules of Order, which has some practical parts; the Council has to walk the line between freedom of speech and practical policy applications; noted having a rules subcommittee would take less staff time.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated the City has procedures for making motions, which perhaps have not been followed; the City Attorney could provide a workshop or a write up; on the Planning Board, she had a guide on how to handle motions; consolidating the rules would be good; she would be happy to work on a rules subcommittee with Vice Mayor Matarrese; stated Council should consider the number of Council Referrals that can be included on an agenda; having seven to eight every time will cause meetings to be long; her preference would be all members of the Council use Council Referrals to get items on the agenda, which is more informative to the public and staff.

Mayor Spencer stated her understanding is that in the past, the Mayor worked with the City Manager to submit items directly and did not submit referrals; stated that she wants to adjourn the meeting, which has gone on longer than she intended and the meeting last night ended at 1:30 a.m.; stated that she appreciates everyone's input.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether a motion to adjourn is needed, to which Mayor Spencer responded in the negative.

Councilmember Oddie noted the Council Communications section of the agenda still needs to be heard.

In response to a public speaker, the Assistant City Manager clarified that staff does not put controversial items at the end of the agenda to limit the ability of the public to speak.

### COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

(15-079) Councilmember Oddie reported that he attended the League of California Cities new Mayor and Councilmember training.

(15-080) Councilmember Daysog reported that he attended the League Housing Community Development Policy Committee meeting last Thursday.

(15-081) Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft reported that she recently attended the signing of a memorandum between Bay, Ship and Yacht and the College of Alameda for a joint training program; applauded Bay, Ship and Yacht for providing job training and employment opportunities.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Spencer adjourned the meeting at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger  
City Clerk

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