

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
TUESDAY- -DECEMBER 20, 2005- -7:30 P.M.

Mayor Johnson convened the Regular Meeting at 7:38 p.m.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

AGENDA CHANGES

None.

PROCLAMATIONS, SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Johnson announced that the recommendation to accept the Quarterly Sales Tax Report [paragraph no. 05-579], the recommendation to accept the Annual Review of fees [paragraph no. 05-582], and the Resolution to Apply for a Bicycle Transportation Account Grant [paragraph no. 05-585] were removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

Councilmember deHaan seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5. Note: Vice Mayor Gilmore abstained from voting on the Special Joint City Council and Recreation and Park Commission Meeting.

[Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(\*05-577) Minutes of the Special Joint City Council and Recreation and Park Commission Meeting held on November 30, 2005, and the Special and Regular City Council Meetings held on December 6, 2005. Approved.

[Note: Vice Mayor Gilmore abstained from voting on the Special Joint City Council and Recreation and Park Commission Meeting.]

(\*05-578) Ratified bills in the amount of \$2,152,381.22.

(05-579) Recommendation to accept the Quarterly Sales Tax Report for the period ending September 30, 2005, for sales transactions in the second calendar quarter of 2005.

Councilmember deHaan stated that there has been a drastic 16.5% reduction in tax revenue generation; requested a forecast for the upcoming quarters.

The Finance Director stated that the sales tax consultant advised her that sales tax receipts were not reported for the transportation and business-to-business categories during the third quarter; the non-reporting occurred throughout the State; sales tax receipts should be reported in the next quarterly report for businesses headquartered in the southeast Gulf area; the report should be received the first part of January.

Councilmember deHaan stated there was an 80% reduction in the commercial production, an overall 21.8% reduction in business-to-business, and retail dropped 16.5%; inquired what attributed to the 16.5% reduction in retail.

The Finance Director stated that the reported geographic areas show downturns on Park Street and Webster Street as well as areas south of Lincoln Avenue; the decline could be attributed to construction activity as well as businesses coming in and out; stated that one, specific business was not inordinately impacted; impacts were across the board.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the sales tax for the area north of Lincoln Avenue dropped immensely because of the economy.

The Finance Director stated that she did not know why there was a decline in the area; under-reporting could have occurred.

Mayor Johnson requested more information on under-reporting.

The Finance Director stated that reports were late in coming to California for some businesses such as a multi-state business headquartered in Mississippi.

Mayor Johnson inquired when the report would be available, to which the Finance Director responded the first part of January.

Mayor Johnson requested an update when the final figures are received from the State.

The Finance Director stated that the figures would be included in the next quarterly report.

Mayor Johnson requested that the update be provided in January.

Councilmember deHaan stated that a trend could be developing which could have a major impact on the overall budget and general funds; inquired whether adjustments could be made to put the money into the right quarter.

The Finance Director responded in the negative.

Councilmember deHaan inquired what was the forecast.

The Finance Director responded that the forecast looks on target but would need to be reviewed after the next quarterly report.

Councilmember Daysog requested background data on comparing second quarter 1999 to second 2004.

The Finance Director stated data is available.

Mayor Johnson requested an analysis be provided every six months; stated that businesses have suffered during the construction process; the goal of economic development is to generate more revenue; the Bay Area experienced a 2.3% growth and there was a 4.5% growth Statewide; Alameda is not keeping up; redevelopment projects should help increase revenue in Alameda.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he would not be surprised that construction along Webster Street and Park Street influenced the downturn.

Councilmember deHaan requested that the analysis be provided every quarter with an eye on the forecast; stated that he could not pinpoint any particular reason for the decline; a decline appeared in areas that were not under construction.

Councilmember deHaan moved approval of the staff recommendation.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

(\*05-580) Recommendation to appropriate in the General Fund the 2005-2006 Citizen's Option for Public Safety Program (COPS AB 3229) Grant Funding to supplement frontline police services. Accepted.

(\*05-581) Recommendation to award Contract in the amount of \$386,969.05 to Libramation, Inc. for a Materials Security Inventory System including five years of maintenance for the Alameda Free

Library. Accepted.

(05-582) Recommendation to accept the Annual Review of the Citywide Development Fee and the Fleet Industrial Supply Center Catellus Traffic Fee.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that the Work/Live developer fees were listed under residential units in the report and should be listed under commercial units.

The City Manager stated that the correction would be made to the report.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of the staff recommendation with a correction to list the Work/Live Citywide Development Fee (CDF) under commercial [non-residential building space] instead of residential.

Councilmember deHaan seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

(\*05-583) Recommendation to appropriate \$49,000 from San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) Grant and \$21,930 in Urban Runoff Funds for removal of existing dock and placement of riprap adjacent to Bridgeside Center Project, No. P.W. 10-05-01. Accepted.

(\*05-584) Recommendation to appropriate \$40,000 in Measure B Funds, adopt plans and specifications, and award a Contract in the amount of \$87,000, including contingency, to Richard Heaps Electric, Inc., for Pole-Mounted Radar Speed Display Signs Project, No. P.W. 06-05-05. Accepted.

(05-585) Resolution No. 13914, "Applying for a Bicycle Transportation Account Grant to Enhance the North Approach to the Bay Farm Island Bicycle Bridge, Appropriating Measure B Funds as Local Match, and Authorizing the Public Works Director to Execute all Necessary Grant Documents." Adopted.

Councilmember deHaan stated that the bicycle route is the primary force in applying for the grant; inquired whether approved, solid plans are in place.

The Public Works Director responded detailed plans are not in place; an illustration has been developed to provide a cost estimate; time would be spent on design after the grant is received.

Councilmember deHaan inquired what was the timing for applying for the grant, to which the Public Works Director responded by the end of the month.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether specifics could be worked out later.

The Public Works Director responded that some granting agencies allow more flexibility than others; changing basic items such as limits and width might not be possible.

Mayor Johnson stated the bike path is important; many children ride bikes from Bay Farm Island to east end schools; inquired whether a more detailed grant application would place the City in a better position to receive the grant.

The Public Works Director responded that he did not think more detail was needed; the agency wants to have a basic description of the project and cost estimate; stated he would look into the matter; an explanation of the benefits is required.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the grant could be used for other projects, what is the scope of the project, and whether the public has been involved.

The Public Works Director stated that the Public Works Department does not have the money to pay for staff time until a project is identified; he assured a concerned resident that the loading and unloading zones at Lincoln Middle School would be preserved and that staff would meet with residents to seek input once the grant is received and there is a preliminary design.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether the improvement was part of the Master Bike Plan, to which the Public Works Director responded improvements in the area are included in the Master Bike Plan.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the Lincoln Middle School Safe Routes to School project had funding.

The Public Works Director responded the project received a grant; the same process is being followed for the proposed project whereby the City applied for the grant and then met with the school and the residents.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the two projects would dovetail together.

The Public Works Director responded that the two projects would

blend together and build on each other; the Safe Routes to School project would come to the Council early next year; construction should start in the summer of 2006; the proposed project would follow.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the public process would be the same, to which the Public Works Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan stated that it is important that the two projects dovetail together and marry in the proper way.

The Public Works Director ensured that the two projects would work together.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the grant could be used for another project.

The Public Works Director responded that the grant is not portable; changes can be made based on constraints discovered while working on the design.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there were any other proposed bike projects that would require grants.

The Public Works Director responded that the proposed project is one of the higher rated projects in the Bike Master Plan.

Mayor Johnson stated that the proposed project was determined to be a top priority based upon the Bike Master Plan; requested that a process be established to allow the Council to prioritize projects which could receive grant funding; stated the area is dangerous and the proposed improvements are important.

Councilmember deHaan moved adoption of the Resolution with the caveat that the project be dovetailed together with the Safe Routes to School project.

The Public Works Director stated that the projects would have different schedules; the proposed project would fall behind the Safe Routes to School project.

Councilmember deHaan stated the problem needs to be cured in trying to get the children to school safely, mitigating on-going problems at Lincoln Middle School, and getting the community involved in both projects so that the decision has continuity.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether there were discussions regarding

field space being taken away at Lincoln Middle School.

The Public Works Director responded the School District discussed the matter, not the City.

Mayor Johnson stated that the City received the grant; the Safe Routes to School project was very controversial; it would take a lot to convince her that there is a need to take open space away from schools; she was concerned about how much grant money was spent in considering whether field space should be taken away or not.

The Public Works Director stated that consideration for taking away open space was never envisioned and that staff did not discuss the matter in depth.

Councilmember deHaan stated that he would like to review the financial portion of the Safe Routes to School grant at a later date.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether both projects would be seamlessly executed when the grant was received, to which the Public Works Director responded in the affirmative.

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

(\*05-586) Resolution No. 19315, "Amending the Alameda City Employees Association (ACEA) Salary Schedule by Establishing the Salary Range for the Classification of Plan Check Engineer." Adopted.

(\*05-586A) Resolution No. 13916, "Amending the Management and Confidential Employees Association (MCEA) Salary Schedule by Establishing the Salary Ranges for the Classifications of Development Services Division Manager, Golf Services Manager, Golf Course Maintenance Superintendent, and Building Official." Adopted.

(\*05-586B) Resolution No. 13917, "Amending Exhibit A-1 of the Executive Management Compensation Plan Established by Council Resolution No. 13545 and Amended by Resolution Nos. 13626 and 13689, to Establish a Five-Day Workweek Alternative with Corresponding Salary Ranges for the Classifications of Assistant City Manager and Planning and Building Director." Adopted.

#### REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

(\*05-587) Recommendation to authorize a letter of welcome to

Asuchio, El Salvador Civic Leaders.

Stewart Chen, Social Services Human Relations Board (SSHRB), stated that the Sister City workgroup was established a year ago to explore and expand Alameda's involvement in a global friendship movement; the community and St. Philip Neri's parish are interested in establishing a relationship with Asuchio, El Salvador; stated that an invitation to visit is the first step in formalizing a friendship.

Rob Bonta, SSHRB, stated the key to a successful relationship is having existing energy and support within the community; the goal is to establish a non-profit organization that is run by community members.

Mayor Johnson thanked Mr. Chen and Mr. Bonta for their hard work.

Councilmember Matarrese thanked Mr. Chen and Mr. Bonta for bringing the matter forward; stated traveling to Asuchio was rewarding to him; members in the audience have made trips to El Salvador; there is a good nucleus in gaining something for Alameda as well as Asuchio.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of the staff recommendation.

Councilmember deHaan seconded the motion with the caveat that he likes the idea of the City of Alameda having relations with a more needy city.

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

(05-588) Consideration of a proposal for the City of Alameda, as a participant in the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, to partially fund a survey to be used in analyzing the feasibility of increasing the County Service Area fee for lead abatement education and services.

Mayor Johnson stated that representatives from the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) were present to answer any questions.

Councilmember Matarrese requested a better explanation regarding whether there was any legal problem in agreeing to ask only questions that directly relate to determining the viability of an increase in the fee to fund the Lead Program; stated the thrust of the last Council discussion was to only pay if the survey was restricted to lead-related questions.



Mayor Johnson agreed that the Council was looking for a commitment on the matter.

Mark Allen, Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program Board stated the will of the Authority was to establish the requirement in the Contract.

Mayor Johnson requested Mr. Allen to describe which Alameda programs would be facing funding reductions and which programs would be funded by the potential fee increase.

Mr. Allen stated cuts have already been implemented which would have a negative impact on Alameda; free risk assessments have been cut; the assessments were provided to the Housing Authority and Development Services Department for free over the past five years but now the City has to budget for the service; additional services at risk are: technical assistance to property owners with an identified lead poisoned child, free home renovation classes, reduction in the number of lead safe painting kits, and elimination of a one-day lead safe work practice workshop; stated the survey would indicate what fee the property owners or the general electorate would be willing to bear; a \$10 to \$15 increase might provide the cities with risk assessments.

Councilmember deHaan inquired what amount was being requested as Alameda's share.

Mr. Allen responded \$5,000; stated the City of Berkeley's share was \$10,000 and the City of Oakland's share was \$14,999; Alameda County and SEIU Local 616 contributed \$11,000 each; the City of Emeryville contributed \$3,000.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the consultant has been selected, to which Mr. Allen responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the County would go forward with the survey without the City's contribution.

Mr. Allen responded not necessarily; further discussion would be needed if one of the cities chose not to contribute; stated a Contract has not been signed.

Mayor Johnson inquired who would approve the Contract, to which Mr. Allen responded the Board of Directors.

Councilmember deHaan stated there was concern regarding the use of the data and whether the data would be public information.

Councilmember Matarrese stated the data could be used for anything if the data was public information.

Mr. Allen stated that some of the work product could be kept confidential; the final product would be public.

Councilmember Matarrese stated the County is a public entity and the data should be public.

Mayor Johnson stated the Contract would identify ownership.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether other cities have expressed concern regarding ownership.

Mr. Allen responded other cities have agreed with the concerns raised by Alameda.

The City Attorney noted that the memorandum from the County stated that information collected would be subject to the Public Records Act.

Mayor Johnson stated the Authority would be subject to the Public Records Request Act but not the consultants.

The City Attorney stated the data should be publicly available.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the data could be provided to the participants.

Councilmember Matarrese stated there was concern that a consultant could ask a broad spectrum of questions, gain personal advantage in running a County survey, and use the data for something else; a condition should be that the data be published along with the report.

Mayor Johnson stated that some information has been provided on the election; inquired whether the Authority would pay for the election.

Mr. Allen responded that the election cost would be paid by the Authority as a straight charge from the fee.

Mayor Johnson inquired what would happen if the proposed assessment did not pass, to which Mr. Allen responded the cost would come out of the Authority's budget.

Mayor Johnson inquired what was the election cost estimate.

Mr. Allen responded the survey would determine the type of election; stated that Oakland paid \$125,000 to conduct a Fire Prevention Assessment District election; the election covered 25,000 households and was a mail ballot to the property owners; a countywide election would cost approximately \$1 per voter.

Mayor Johnson inquired how many households would be included in an election covering the existing households only, to which Mr. Allen responded considerably more than 25,000.

Mayor Johnson stated the cost is big for the Authority; inquired whether anything would prevent the Authority from legally paying for the election.

Mr. Allen responded in the negative; stated the survey would determine whether there is interest in entertaining a more in-depth discussion and strategy.

Councilmember Daysog stated that the report provided is very thin on JPA's budget problem; funding for supplementary services has been lost; services are cut when funding is lost; remaining funding is used to provide core services; people in Alameda feel overtaxed; more information should be given.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether Councilmember Daysog wanted more information on the cuts.

Councilmember Daysog responded that he would like more information on what happened to precipitate the need for money.

Mr. Allen stated that the County has gone through three budget processes identifying problems.

Councilmember deHaan inquired what voice Alameda would have after the survey has been conducted.

Mayor Johnson responded there are four member cities have voting representatives; the County has non-voting representatives; people in the County area are not part of the program.

Mr. Allen stated that property owners in the County of Alameda's unincorporated area do not receive any of the services; the JPA passes the budget for the program on an annual basis.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there was a way to satisfy Councilmember Daysog's concerns.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he would like to know what

precipitated the need for the requested funding and what type of cuts have been made to deal with the current situation.

Mr. Allen stated that the \$10 fee has not increased since 1992; operating costs have increased; the fee was new and did not include cost escalation; \$19 million has been leveraged from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding into the four County Service Area (CSA) cities; last year was the first year that the program did not have a full year of HUD funding; six out of thirteen rounds of grants have been received from the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control; program income has been generated from no-interest loans to property owners; payment is made when the property is transferred; the loans need to be recycled for the same type of activity; services were carried for three years on program income; six people were laid off last year because all program income was used; efforts are being made to identify whether there is a mechanism to correct the fact that there has not been an increase in base funding since 1992; the budget has been reduced from \$5 million to \$2.5 million over three years; audits are performed every year; the program has won National awards.

Councilmember Daysog stated that the loss of HUD funding has dropped the annual budget by \$3 million; the policy question is whether the residents should pick up the loss of the HUD funding.

Mr. Allen stated that the policy question is whether or not property owners should have a say in whether they value the service enough to increase the fee; questioned how the level of service can be maintained when the service has exceeded \$10 per year.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether programs that have been funded through HUD could not be funded because of funding source limitations.

Mr. Allen responded yes and no; the program cuts from HUD took place in one year; a \$3 million HUD grant was received the next year; the CSA fee is restricted to property owner services; HUD dollars are used for project remediation and tenant education; State funding is received from the Department of Health Services for case management of lead poisoned children; one fund does not fund other categories.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether the increase in the CSA fee would pay for more assessments, not remediation and health treatment; whether there would be a problem in bringing the matter back in January, to which Mr. Allen responded in the affirmative to both questions.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he understands the argument that the 2005 \$10 fee does not buy the same services as in 1992 and that there were some shifts in HUD priorities resulting in loss of dollars; taxes are an overwhelming concern; he is not convinced that there is a strong argument for residents backfilling the shortfall instead of the Board making cuts that others make when funding is lost.

Mr. Allen stated the survey would ask the people whether they feel the service is valuable enough to consider placing an increase on the ballot; the survey is to test the waters and see if people feel the service is worth the contribution; every other government has raised fees since 1992.

Councilmember Matarrese stated the request is whether the City should put \$5,000 into asking a question to determine whether or not increasing the assessment fee should go on the ballot; the program is valuable enough to invest \$5,000.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of allocating \$5,000 for the survey with the conditions that the JPA Board use an open bidding process [or provide an explanation if there are impediments in using the bid process], and that the data and final report be a matter of public record.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the open bidding process would cause problems, to which Mr. Allen responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Johnson stated that the Contract has not come to the Board; the process has been very different; there would be no problem under normal circumstances but there could be a problem in this instance.

Vice Mayor Gilmore inquired whether a written explanation could be provided regarding why the Board could not go out for an open public bid before the Contract goes to the Board for approval.

Mayor Johnson responded that the Board has not been involved in any process to select a consultant.

Vice Mayor Gilmore stated her preference would be to request that the process go out to open bid if the Board has not gone through a process to either select a contractor or approve a Contract; she would also like to know if there is some impediment in doing so.

Councilmember Matarrese concurred with Vice Mayor Gilmore; stated \$5,000 is a small amount to pay to ask the question.

Councilmember Matarrese amended the motion to include Vice Mayor Gilmore's caveat [that the process go to bid or the JPA provide a written explanation if there is an impediment with using the open bid process].

Councilmember deHaan stated the Council is safeguarding itself with the financial review process.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following voice vote - Ayes: Councilmembers deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 4. Noes: Councilmember Daysog - 1.

#### ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

None.

#### COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

(05-589) Councilmember deHaan stated that the opening of the new Alameda Towne Centre Safeway store was very successful; sale estimates are between \$40-50 million for the proposed Target; Target states that 85% of all transactions would be coming from Alameda which is the leakage the City is trying to capture; close to a million \$38 to \$50 transactions would need to occur per year to achieve \$40 million in sales; Target states that the store is a one-stop shop; transportation and corridor impacts could be derived from the one-stop shop concept; past studies indicate only 65% of the transactions would be recaptured; Alamedans would need to make over 900,000 transactions per year which means that every household would have approximately 30 to 31 transactions per year; questioned whether said number of transactions is reasonable; stated a consultant was used in the past; everyone needs to understand the dynamics of what is happening; Target knows exactly what is happening but does not always provide information to the public; an independent consultant is needed to establish some of the facts and figures; every household in Alameda would have to spend close to \$1200 per year for a 85% recovery; the money would not be new money but would be drawn from elsewhere.

Mayor Johnson stated that figures show that Alameda residents spend millions of dollars at Target; new money would be residents spending millions of dollars in Alameda rather than elsewhere if the project goes forward.

Councilmember deHaan stated that \$4.3 to \$5.6 million is spent at Target stores; the community is questioning the impacts; the Council needs to ensure that the community's concerns and questions are answered with an impartial consultant.

Mayor Johnson stated the matter would need to be placed on an agenda in order for Council to give direction.

The City Manager stated that the matter would be brought back to Council in terms of an analysis and could be placed on an agenda if Council action is needed.

Councilmember Daysog stated multiplying 900,000 trips against the \$50 transaction comes within the envelope that Target expects in terms of store sales; the Board of Equalization's website provides a breakdown on the typical per capita for sales of general merchandise, which is \$1200.

(05-590) Mayor Johnson stated that a lot has been accomplished in the past year; wished everyone a happy holiday and happy New Year.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Johnson adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger  
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
TUESDAY- -DECEMBER 20, 2005- -5:31 P.M.

Mayor Johnson convened the Special Meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Roll Call - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

The Special Meeting was adjourned to Closed Session to consider:

(05-573) Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation; Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 54956.9; Number of cases: One.

(05-574) Conference with Labor Negotiators - Agency Negotiators: Marie Gilmore and Frank Matarrese; Employee: City Attorney.

\*\*\*

Mayor Johnson called a recess to hold the Regular City Council meeting at 7:30 p.m. and reconvened the Closed Session at 9:15 p.m.

\*\*\*

Following the Closed Session, the Special Meeting was reconvened and Mayor Johnson announced that regarding Conference with Legal Counsel, the Council received a briefing from Legal Counsel; regarding Conference with Labor Negotiators, the Council gave direction to negotiators.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Johnson adjourned the Special Meeting at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger  
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.



MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND  
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION MEETING  
TUESDAY- -DECEMBER 20, 2005- -7:25 P.M.

Mayor/Chair Johnson convened the Special Joint Meeting at 7:37 p.m.  
Councilmember/Commissioner Daysog led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call - Present: Councilmembers/Commissioners Daysog,  
deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and  
Mayor/Chair Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember/Vice Mayor Gilmore moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Councilmember/Commissioner Matarrese seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

[Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(\*05-575CC/05-057CIC) Minutes of the Special Community Improvement Commission meeting and the Joint City Council, Community Improvement Commission and Alameda and Reuse Redevelopment Authority meeting held on December 6, 2005. Approved.

(\*05-576CC/05-058CIC) Recommendation to accept the Community Improvement Commission Annual Report and authorize transmittal to the State Controller's Office and City Council. Accepted.

AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor/Chair Johnson adjourned the Special Joint Meeting at 7:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk  
Secretary, Community Improvement  
Commission

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.