

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- - JULY 16, 2024- -7:00 P.M.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft convened the meeting at 7:01 p.m. Councilmember Herrera Spencer led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, Herrera Spencer, Jensen, Vella, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 5. [Note: Councilmember Vella arrived at 8:12 p.m., was present via teleconference from: Lihue Airport, Baggage Claim A, 3901 Mokulele Loop, Lihue, HI, 96766 and left the meeting at 10:40 p.m.].

Absent: None.

AGENDA CHANGES

(24-436) The City Clerk announced that the Charter Amendment ballot measure [paragraph no. 24-456] would not be heard.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft announced that the Economic Development update [paragraph no. 24-457] would be called after the resolution of appointment [paragraph no. 24-455].

PROCLAMATIONS, SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

(24-437) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft read a proclamation honoring Lois Butler.

Ms. Butler made brief comments.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

(24-438) Andrea Ingraham, United Sovereign Americans, discussed concerns over the State election voter database and the 2022 election; submitted a proposed resolution regarding the election.

(24-439) Debra Gelber, United Sovereign Americans, read part of the submitted resolution; urged an election investigation be conducted.

(24-440) Mark Zulim, United Sovereign Americans, continued reading part of the resolution.

(24-441) Brian Kennedy, Alameda, expressed concerns over sanctuary cities.

(24-442) Hunter Cobb, United Sovereign Americans, continued reading part of the resolution.

(24-443) Richard Idria, United Sovereign Americans, concluded reading part of the resolution.

(24-444) Tod Hickman discussed a shift in Council; expressed concerns over a bond survey; discussed a displayed photo.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she does not know who is depicted in the displayed photo apart from a younger version of herself and former Councilmember Oddie; the photo shown was from 2015; noted that she poses for photos with many people; expressed concerns over accusations made by Speaker Hickman.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether all Councilmembers are able to respond to public comments.

The City Attorney responded members of Council can offer responses to comments through the Chair.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that it is important to clarify the truth and provide truth to comments made.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired who makes the decision to allow Councilmembers the ability to respond to public comments, the City Clerk, City Attorney, or the Mayor.

The City Clerk responded the section of the Rules of Order does not prohibit Council from commenting under the public comment section of the agenda.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she has not heard that Council has the ability to respond to public comment; she wanted to confirm that all Councilmembers would be given the opportunity going forward, not just the Mayor.

The City Clerk stated since public comments address matters not on the agenda for discussion, Council cannot have a full discussion of the matter; a brief response is allowable.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that her response to public comment is rare and she would not step up and speak out unless the subject was egregious; noted that she would allow Councilmembers to respond to other direct egregious comments.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed support for the opportunity to respond to public comments; inquired whether she is afforded the opportunity.

The City Clerk responded brief comments can be made, however, Council cannot enter into a discussion.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft expressed concern over outbursts and interruptions continuing in

Council Chambers; stated matters need to be discussed in a timely manner.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether Councilmembers can respond to public comment.

The City Attorney responded that the rules do not prohibit a brief response.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the photo presented indicates Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft with former Councilmember Oddie and Andy Duong; noted there has been recent publicity regarding Mr. Duong.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Herrera Spencer request final passage of the Building 25 lease [paragraph no. 24-461] be removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft requested the aquatic center agreement [paragraph no. 24-459] be removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

In response Councilmember Jensen's inquiry regarding the California Wood Recycling agreement [paragraph no. 24-451], the Public Works Zero Waste Specialist stated staff has talked to Alameda Unified School District (AUSD); many schools do not use compost and do not have green spaces; AUSD has a few, small, onsite gardens; staff has looked at other options, which are in the proposed agreement.

Councilmember Jensen stated that she understands one of the larger AUSD fields will soon be turf and will unfortunately need less compost and mulch; inquired whether the Alameda County Industries (ACI) franchise agreement requires the City to accept compost.

The Public Works Zero Waste Specialist responded in the negative; stated the City is not required to take anything from ACI; two cubic yards of compost or mulch are allotted annually per the franchise agreement; the City does utilize some of the yardage for the Alameda Recreation and Parks Department (ARPD); ARPD has indicated the need for a higher quality compost; the City receives a lesser amount of higher quality compost due to associated costs.

Councilmember Jensen stated the City would have to distribute the required amount received due to Senate Bill (SB) 1383; expressed support for the passing of amendments to SB1383.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated there are associated penalties if the City does not perform; inquired whether the City has taken any action to change the obligations.

The Public Works Zero Waste Specialist responded there is no way to get out of the procurement targets; stated the State has identified the targets for each county; the

targets are population based; the City's target is 0.08 tons per person, which equates to 6,700 tons of material annually; the City, as an island, does not have the space to apply that much material; failure to meet the requirement could result in a \$10,000 per day penalty.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the City has the excess hauled to other cities, which creates greenhouse gas emissions.

The Public Works Zero Waste Specialist responded the action is taken by a broker; stated the material being hauled to farms is generated closer to the area and is not coming directly from Alameda.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer noted the materials are still being hauled.

The City Manager stated Assembly Bill (AB) 2346 would change some of the provisions and make the requirements more reasonable from the City's perspective; staff has written a letter of support for AB2346.

The Assistant City Manager provided a brief introduction to the Dignity Village supportive housing [paragraph no. 24-453] matter.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer requested clarification for the related misconduct resulting in the recommended new agreement.

The Assistant City Manager responded there is an active Police investigation; stated that she is limited in what can be divulged; there has been financial mishandling.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the residents will be made whole.

The Assistant City Manager responded Five Keys has verbally confirmed full restitution for residents; stated that she has discussed the matter with Five Keys staff and legal team to finalize a process in which residents will be able to provide verification; the process should be in place in a week.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the City is pursuing the matter to the full extent possible in order to hold the offenders accountable.

The Assistant City Manager responded that she has spoken with the Police Chief; stated each individual can file a police report; one resident has filed a report so far; City staff are working with residents to provide assistance filing.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the allegations are related to residents of supportive housing being taken advantage of; inquired the process followed for recommending the new service provider and whether staff knows if residents will be treated better than under the prior provider.

The Assistant City Manager responded City staff has met with Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS) at length and wanted to move as quickly as possible to recommend a new service provider; a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a new long-term service provider will be issued in a week; staff wanted to ensure a new provider is in place during the interim period until a long-term service provider is selected and brought to Council for approval; staff visited several BOSS sites and researched any potential past issues; staff found nothing negative when reaching out to references while performing due diligence; staff is recommending BOSS for the limited interim period.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired how the process differs from the selection of Five Keys.

The Assistant City Manager responded Five Keys responded to the previous RFP process; stated both Five Keys and Dignity Moves submitted responses; staff will issue another full RFP; the current sole sourced recommendation is an interim solution.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether additional complaints against Five Keys have been received from residents.

The Assistant City Manager responded in the affirmative; stated a variety of concerns have been raised by residents.

In response to Councilmember Herrera Spencer's inquiry, the Assistant City Manager responded resident complaints are often heard by Council; complaints against Dignity Village were raised at a community meeting; staff was working to address issues as they arose and implemented a Resident Advisory Board with Five Keys, as well as a Town Hall and other opportunities within Dignity Village in order to help provide a voice and place for resolution and solutions for residents.

Discussed the Police policy update [paragraph no. 24-448]: Tod Hickman.

Discussed Dignity Village and expressed concerns: Shelby Sheehan.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed concerns over side discussions occurring during public comment.

Expressed concerns over Five Keys service and breach of information: Alex Johnson.

Expressed concerns over being tarnished by Five Keys, not being housed, and corruption: Alicia Lane.

Discussed a breach of his personal information by Five Keys; expressed concerns over Five Keys personnel hiring: Joe Kibdo.

Discussed her experience with and concerns about BOSS; stated that she is fearful of BOSS providing unsupportive services; urged Council to reconsider: Annette Gormley.

Discussed his experience with Five Keys; stated there is good and bad from Five Keys: David Cleghorn.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated there is a pending investigation; the matter is extremely unfortunate; people affected by the actions are part of a vulnerable population seeking a supportive environment; urged staff and Alameda Police to be extremely thorough and frequently report back to Council; stated the field of providers and staff for wrap-around services is stretched thin; vetting is important; the City needs to ensure the needed services are being provided.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she would record a no vote on the California Wood Recycling agreement and the Dignity Village agreement and termination of agreement; expressed concerns over the program operations and costs.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Councilmember Jensen seconded the motion, which carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Herrera Spencer: Aye; Daysog: Aye; Jensen: Aye; Vella: Aye; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 5. [Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(*24-445) Minutes of the Special Joint City Council and Successor Agency to the Community Improvement Commission Meeting and the Regular City Council Meeting Held on June 18, 2024. Approved.

(*24-446) Ratified bills in the amount of \$8,948,463.39.

(*24-447) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Agreement with JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. to Provide Primary Depository Banking Services for the City of Alameda Commencing July 17, 2024 at an Estimated Annual Cost of \$15,217, for a Five-Year Period with a Not-To-Exceed Total Amount of \$85,000, with One Five-Year Option to Renew. Accepted.

(*24-448) Recommendation to Authorize Updates to the Existing Alameda Police Department Policy Manual to Conform to Best Practices and to Ratify Policies that Have Been Updated Pursuant to Legal Updates, Significant Liability Issues, and Imminent Safety. Accepted.

(*24-449) Recommendation to Accept the Work of JMB Construction for the Storm Drain Pump Station Electric Upgrades Project, No. P.W. 9-19-48. Accepted.

(*24-450) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Five-Year Agreement with Chrisp Company for On-Call Street Safety Improvements Project, No. P.W. 03-24-10, in a Total Amount Not-to-Exceed \$750,000. Accepted.

(24-451) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a One-Year Agreement, with the Option of Four One-Year Extensions, for a Total Five-Year Agreement with California Wood Recycling Inc. (dba Agromin) for Procurement of Senate Bill 1383 Eligible Compost and/or Mulch on Behalf of the City of Alameda in Outside Jurisdictions in a Total Amount Not-to-Exceed \$288,240.16. Accepted.

Since Councilmember Herrera Spencer recorded a no vote, the item carried by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Daysog, Jensen, Vella and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 4. Noes: Councilmember Herrera Spencer – 1.

(*24-452) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Five-Year Agreement with Precision Emprise, LLC, dba Precision Concrete Cutting, for Sidewalk Trip Hazard Removal in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$2,500,000 Accepted.

(24-453) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a One-Year Agreement with Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency to Provide Interim Supportive Housing and Property Management Services at Dignity Village in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$2,026,715 and to Terminate the Agreement with Five Keys Schools and Programs. Accepted.

Since Councilmember Herrera Spencer recorded a no vote, the item carried by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Daysog, Jensen, Vella and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 4. Noes: Councilmember Herrera Spencer – 1.

(*24-454) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a One-Year Agreement, in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$125,000, with Alameda Family Services for Student and Family Mental Health Services. Accepted.

CONTINUED AGENDA ITEMS

None.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

(24-455) Resolution No.16190, “Appointing Jamie Gloyne to the Transportation Commission.” Adopted.

Councilmember Vella moved adoption of the resolution.

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

The City Clerk administered the Oath of Office and Mr. Gloyne made brief comments.

(24-456) Recommendation to Consider Amending Charter Section 3-10 to Eliminate the

Supermajority Vote Requirement for Leases Longer than One Year and Sales of City Real Property; and

(24-456 A) Adoption of a Resolution Calling for the Holding of a Consolidated Municipal Election in the City of Alameda on Tuesday, November 5, 2024 Submitting a Proposed Charter Amendment Revising Section 3-10 Pertaining to Leases [and Sales] of City Real Property, Establishing the Policies and Procedures for Such an Election, Requesting that the County of Alameda Conduct Such an Election and Authorizing City Councilmembers to File Written Arguments For or Against the Measure. Not heard.

(24-457) Recommendation to Accept the Economic Development Status Update and Provide Feedback and Direction Regarding Economic Development Efforts and Activities.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director gave a Power Point presentation.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the reason for the matter being heard before the submerged parcels [paragraph no. 24-].

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft responded that she explained the reason for the change in the beginning of the meeting.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director stated the move had been made as a courtesy to the Economic Development Manager as it is her last meeting.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed concern over the members of the public waiting to hear the submerged parcel matter and over the current matter's inclusion of life sciences; stated leases with life science uses, including animal testing, were previously discussed; inquired whether the City is soliciting companies that perform animal experimentation and which animals are allowed to be tested upon.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded in the affirmative; stated staff is recruiting life science companies which come in a variety of types, including many that do not perform animal testing; staff is not evaluating whether or not companies perform animal testing.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether companies in the City perform animal experimentation on animals other than rats and mice, to which the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded that staff is aware of companies that perform other experimentation.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the types of animals being experimented on.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded staff has not performed extensive research, but is aware of a company that tests on rabbits.

In response to Councilmember Herrera Spencer's inquiry regarding transparency, the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director stated staff does not collect data since the City does not regulate animal testing.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether Council could provide direction to staff to survey the companies and find which are performing animal experimentation.

In response to Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's inquiry whether animal experimentation relates to the matter, the City Attorney stated that he assumes the Councilmember is inquiring about whether animal testing impacts economic development.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she would like to understand the City's approach to soliciting companies.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the Council would vote on the related inquiries at the current meeting.

The City Attorney responded staff is looking for Council to provide direction regarding the plan to engage in economic development activities and Council could provide direction on the types of businesses the City wishes to attract or not attract.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether a majority of Council would have to agree to provide staff with the proposed direction, to which the City Attorney responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether Council could provide direction to staff in their approach of attracting companies' that perform animal research.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded in the affirmative; stated staff is seeking direction on the workplan; staff has provided recommended priorities; if Council provides alternative direction on priorities for the workplan, staff will shift accordingly.

Vice Mayor Daysog stated other cities are contemplating a retail vacancy tax; expressed concern over and inquired whether the City is also contemplating a vacancy tax, to which the City Manager responded in the negative.

Expressed appreciation for the support provided by City staff; stated staff is responsive and proactive: Kathy Weber, Downtown Alameda Business Association.

Expressed concerns over the staff report, business activities, the status of small businesses and Alameda Point; urged Council not to accept the update: Tod Hickman.

Expressed concerns over Site A, Alameda Point, Spirits Alley, permitting, supportive housing, hiring, and special events: Shelby Sheehan.

Discussed his candidacy for State Assembly District 18: Andre Sanford.

Councilmember Jensen stated a tremendous amount of work has been done to support businesses; more work needs to be done; the City is moving in the right direction; some needs from businesses in Alameda are not being met; part of the reason needs are not being met is in part due to the City not being able to place a bond measure on the ballot to improve infrastructure; the City is doing what it can with what it has; she is encouraged by the matter; Alameda has robust and thriving life sciences; Harbor Bay Business Park has a number of pharmaceutical and medical device organizations that provide outstanding and life changing products and services for residents and the community; encouraged the Base Reuse and Economic Development Department to keep the related businesses in Alameda and seek additional businesses; expressed support for the 2019 Economic Development Plan and the Strategic Plan.

Vice Mayor Daysog stated that the term economic gardening comes to mind, which is a process of encouraging local residents and entrepreneurs to promote or expand businesses; the approach helps make Alameda wonderful; many business owners are locally known; economic gardening is not only for small businesses, but also large businesses; he would like to continue to see a focus on assisting local entrepreneurs to expand; expressed support for the staff report including information on tourism and hospitality; stated tourism can include people arriving on business or inviting people to Alameda from near or far; Alameda has local elements that the City can draw into as part of a strategy to leverage local elements and draw people in; discussed the recent increase in the transient occupancy tax (TOT); stated the revenues from TOT are put into the General Fund; expressed support for a portion of the TOT being placed into a tourism/visitor serving strategy; stated the burgeoning green energy sector at Alameda Point should be expanded; there are concerns about life sciences at Alameda Point; the City should encourage life sciences in other parts of Alameda; he will continue to have concerns over animal testing at Alameda Point, however, private sector businesses should be allowed their prerogative; expressed support for the City improving its infrastructure; stated that he looks forward to the day the City can bring back its infrastructure bond measure to help economic development activities; his support for the bond hinges on informing people of the specific projects that will be addressed by the bond measure funds; infrastructure and economic development are vital, core elements.

Councilmember Vella stated the matter is timely; expressed support for staff having a roadmap for economic development planning before the election; stated that she would have liked to have had some of the infrastructure needs funded instead of relying on negotiations with potential new tenants and developers; expressed support for the new Council providing input on the matter in the new year.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the status of a proposed shuttle at Spirits Alley.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded staff is planning to reinvigorate the shuttle pilot; stated the plan is to launch by the end of July to connect to the water shuttle program.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed concern over the timeline; inquired the reason the shuttle would not operate during the summer.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded the Transportation Management Association (TMA) and City have been focused on getting the water shuttle launched, which has been a very time-consuming effort; stated staff wanted to ensure the water and Alameda Point shuttles were coordinated.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she strongly disagrees with the approach; businesses at Alameda Point have not been supported for years; the approach is a continuation of staff continuing not to support businesses; people need to be able to catch the shuttle; the end of July is too late; it is unfortunate that the City has not prioritized the shuttle; some businesses are in direct conflict with Spirits Alley; it is important for staff to remain neutral regarding all businesses; inquired whether information on Spirits Alley is already being provided.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded in the affirmative; stated staff is providing marketing materials at major events, such as the antiques fair; information regarding Spirits Alley will be provided so people from out of town will head down Monarch Street; the traffic flow from Main Street does not send people by Monarch Street; staff is trying to redirect cars.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the timeline for the marketing materials being provided, to which the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded within the next month.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the timing is too late; the summertime is when businesses at Spirits Alley need to make money; inquired the reason for delay in wayfinding signage, to which the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded staff has been working with the designer to finalize the signage.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the timing is too late; the City lost Hangar 1 Distillery and Rockwall Winery; the City still has Faction Brewing; a block exists with Almanac Brewing and Humble Sea; inquired whether Almanac and Humble Sea are owned by Joe Ernst.

The City Manager responded Humble Sea is owned by Storehouse Lofts, not Joe Ernst; stated Almanac and the Rake are owned by Joe Ernst.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the area of Almanac and Humble Sea appear to be receiving focus and synergy due to being part of the same block.

The City Manager stated the area is owned by private owners that have invested in the properties.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated there seems to be an emphasis on the block, which takes away any emphasis on Spirits Alley and is a problem; the shuttle should have been operating at the beginning of summer; the concerns raised over the City dropping the ball are legitimate; the focus is being spent on the new block owned by Joe Ernst and Storehouse Lofts; the new block is thriving; the new road construction is separate from the bond measure; requested clarification for the approach of infrastructure improvements at Alameda Point being neutral through the sales of buildings and property.

The City Manager stated there is a fiscal neutrality policy related to the ongoing fiscal impacts related to new development that staff follows moving forward with new development; the reuse area infrastructure has been financed by the sale of buildings; new development areas are financed with private investment from new developers; there are different approaches to different areas.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she would like the fiscal neutrality policy further explained.

The City Manager stated the new development take land out of public ownership and puts it into private ownership, which generates tax revenues; new development has costs; the revenues received from property and sales tax are compared to ongoing costs to analyze whether new development pays its fair share and does not end up as a negative adverse impact on the City's operating budget.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired when the fiscal neutrality policy began.

The City Manager stated that she does not know the exact date.

Vice Mayor Daysog responded the policy was instituted in 1995 or 1996; stated specific strategies to achieve fiscal neutrality were established in 2003 to 2004 starting with Community Facilities Districts (CFD); owners in Bayport pay \$1,000 or more per year; the district is the financial instrument by which revenue is collected to pay for some of the ongoing operational costs.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated there is over \$800 million in infrastructure needs; inquired how many millions of dollars are from Alameda Point.

The City Manager responded that she does not have the amounts available.

The City Attorney expressed concern over the topic not being focused on economic development as a broad topic.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated it is important to provide the facts regarding the

matter and economic development is paid for at Alameda Point; inquired how the City is proposing to support Spirits Alley.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded staff has provided a number of activities; stated there is a local business passport, marketing materials which highlight Spirits Alley, a San Francisco Business Times insert, and staff is providing ongoing marketing efforts; staff plans to have A-frames at major upcoming events on the Taxiway and throughout Alameda Point directing people to the businesses.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the status of the signage directing people to businesses at Alameda Point.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded Spirits Alley signage was installed earlier in the year.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the lettering of the signage is very small; there is no contrast with the coloring; the signage does not show up; inquired whether there is a reason the signage could not have been made as big as some of the other businesses in the area.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded the lettering on the signs is consistent with other wayfinding signage; stated the same design was used.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she does not find the signage to be sufficient; expressed support for a staff member helping with signage; stated the signage is an ongoing complaint; expressed concern over people getting lost and navigation at Alameda Point; stated construction makes it difficult for people to find businesses; expressed support for the long-standing businesses receiving support from the City; stated that she does not support views being blocked at Alameda Point; expressed concerns over fencing and signs being used to block views and public access; stated the businesses that are a part of the report are the culprits blocking the views; questioned whether there has been discussion about deterring or trying to discourage shipping containers in the area that block views.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded discussions have occurred in the context of individual leases; stated the decision falls upon Council at the time of approving the lease.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated businesses hang signs from fences, which block views; questioned whether the approval of hanging signs falls upon Council.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded that she does not know as she is not the Director of Planning, Building, and Transportation.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed support for the work being done with the

business districts; stated the districts all have their own directors; expressed concern for Alameda Point not having a business district director; stated that the City should represent the businesses at Alameda Point; some of the businesses have been encouraged to participate in the Alameda Chamber of Commerce (ACC); expressed concern over ACC pitting larger businesses against smaller businesses, which is not the representation that is needed; inquired whether a business district for Alameda Point has been considered.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded ACC has an Alameda Point business coalition that meets quarterly.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft discussed the Mayor of Union City visiting Alameda Point and the Alameda Naval Air Museum; stated that she hoped the City would be further down the road with projects; the Base Reuse and Economic Development Department is very busy; she would like to ensure all business districts are being helped; expressed support for staff meeting with small business owners and for adding Base Reuse and Economic Development Department staff when needed; discussed a meeting with Daisy's owner regarding working with the City as a part of a mentoring program for new small businesses; stated vacant buildings can be incubator spaces for new businesses; directors of business associations are present and listening; urged businesses to reach out to local talent; stated the City is fortunate to have passed the TOT; discussed the previous Council votes for the TOT; stated the Oakland Hilton will likely close by the end of the year and surrounding hotels will be needed; the City must keep an eye on many goals; Alameda is fortunate to have two historic downtown areas; expressed support for the report.

Vice Mayor Daysog expressed support for the Economic Development Manager's service.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft called a recess at 9:17 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

(24-458) Introduction of Ordinance Declaring Six Submerged Parcels on the Alameda Side of the Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal Surplus Property; and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Purchase and Sale Agreements, Deeds and All Other Necessary Documents Between the City of Alameda and Various Purchasers to Sell the Submerged Parcels at Fair Market Value. Introduced.

Special Counsel gave a Power Point presentation.

Councilmember Jensen inquired whether the owners of the proposed parcels were part of the original discussion in 2016 regarding the public access improvements.

Special Counsel responded that he was not present for the discussion; stated several

different attorneys have handed the matter over the years; the public's access to the easements both on the land and water sides were discussed; the Army Corps placed a moratorium on the improvements to the submerged parcels until the property was sold or transferred; he is not aware of any owners requesting to perform work during the time the City has owned the parcels; if the matter proceeds, the City will want to work with the property owners to ensure permitting processes are followed.

Councilmember Jensen stated that she would like information regarding the actual pathways and public access; she understands the parcels have always been available, but were not clearly marked or being used; homeowners were using the public pathways for their own use.

Special Counsel stated there was confusion about whether the City had an easement on the properties; the title was complicated; the submerged parcels were retained to resolve the complications.

Councilmember Jensen stated the public access adjacent to the submerged parcels has been part of the confusion; upkeep, ownership and liability has not been clear historically; expressed support for the clarification provided; stated the appraisals are fair market value; the initial appraisal was recently updated.

Special Counsel stated in 2016, the appraiser looked at the whole area and came back with a value based upon 92 lots; the amount was divided by the 92 lots, which yielded \$10,000; 84 property were sold; when the current matter came forth, Council requested another appraisal; staff directed the appraiser not to take the value of any improvements or docks within the submerged water and parcels into consideration; the value from the appraiser is the staff recommendation.

Councilmember Jensen inquired whether any of the 84 property owners declined to purchase the submerged parcel.

Special Counsel responded that he understands all property owners purchased the submerged parcel.

Councilmember Jensen inquired whether a property owner could retain their dock or any related structures if purchase is declined.

Special Council responded the City would retain ownership of the parcel and would have to determine whether or not the structures could remain.

Councilmember Jensen stated it sounds as though there is interpretation that the City owns the structures on the parcels; inquired how many affirmative votes are required for the matter to pass, to which the City Attorney responded four affirmative votes due to being a sale of property.

Vice Mayor Daysog stated the remaining 6 parcels are valued; taking inflation into

account, \$10,000 in 2016 dollars is roughly equivalent to \$12,500 today.

Special Council concurred with Vice Mayor Daysog.

Vice Mayor Daysog stated Council received emails regarding the \$10,000 payment issue; inquired whether Council is allowed to lower the \$14,000 amount to \$12,500.

Special Council responded in the affirmative; stated coming up with a sales price that is reasonable and not a gift of public funds is within the Council's discretion; Council could decide upon a range of amounts.

Vice Mayor Daysog stated that he would prefer the \$14,000 parcels to be reduced to \$12,500, which equates to four parcels being sold at \$12,500 and two at \$10,000.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the public access pathways were previously present; stated previous fire access pathways were maintained by the City.

Special Counsel stated a map recorded in 1920 indicated some kind of pathway; how to characterize the areas has been controversial; the recorded map indicated a rectangle with a bulb at the end; eventually, a decision was reached to have an easement owned in fee.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the purpose of the easement, to which the Special Counsel responded the easement is for public access.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the matter has anything to do with fire access.

Special Counsel responded the matter has to do with public access, which could be for fire, emergency, or public access; the term is broad.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether there was a path for people to access the water.

Special Counsel responded the area was improved, but the source of the improvement is unknown to him.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the City has a contract to have improvements maintained, to which the Assistant City Manager responded in the affirmative; stated the Public Works Department manages public right of way landscape and the pathways are included.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired how often the pathways are maintained and what maintenance is included.

The Assistant City Manager responded that she does not have the exact information

regarding pathway maintenance.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she was Mayor when the matter was brought forth in 2016; she understands the property owners could not own, maintain, or obtain permits from the City or Army Corps and were not allowed to perform maintenance on their docks.

Special Counsel concurred with Councilmember Herrera Spencer; stated when the Army Corps owned the parcels, a moratorium was placed on the parcels until the subdivision and sale occurred.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the moratorium was lifted on the 84 parcels that the City reached agreement with, to which Special Counsel responded owners of the 84 parcels could make improvements to their docks post-sale.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the property owners of the current parcels are still in a holding pattern of the moratorium applying.

Special Counsel responded in the affirmative; stated that he is not aware of any owners asking the City for permits to perform improvements; the approach is consistent with 2016; transferring the property to the owners makes sense if they desire to make improvements.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the reason someone would make improvements on a property that is not owned.

Special Counsel responded the instance of deterioration could be cause for obtaining a permit for improvements.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated parties wanting to obtain permits were denied.

The Assistant City Manager stated that she understands prior to 2015-16, the Army Corps had the moratorium, not the City; in order for owners to obtain a City permit, regulatory agency permission and sign-off is required; the moratorium was not implemented by the City, but from the Army Corps; the City could not issue a permit without an Army Corps permit.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the result would be the same, where property owners could not obtain permits.

The Assistant City Manager responded the moratorium was one of the many things that precipitated the transaction; the issue is not the City prohibiting residents from obtaining permits; after 2016, the lots were sold from the Army Corps to the City; the City retained some parcels, including the current six and the open water space; 84 lots were sold to residents.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether property owners obtain permits to perform updates on property that is not owned; noted the City still owns the property.

The City Manager responded the property owner has to sign the application for a permit.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated there has been a delay of eight years; requested clarification for the cause of delay.

Special Counsel stated there have been ongoing discussions between the City and property owners to try and resolve the ownership of landside pathways; once the matter was resolved in 2021, the City moved ahead with a subdivision to create the six parcels; the parcels came before the Planning Board in 2022 and Council in 2023; Council approved the final map in 2023.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the 84 property owners that paid \$10,000 were able to obtain permits and improve their docks; inquired whether the other six property owners have been denied the option since they do not own the parcel, to which Special Counsel responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that the six property owners have not been able to have and enjoy the full use of their property and docks for eight years.

Special Counsel stated that he does not know whether they have been denied the use of their docks; the property owners have not been able to obtain permits.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated derelict docks could not be improved since permits could not be obtained, which has caused unsafe conditions; the \$10,000 sale price was an average price, not based on individual appraisals; some of the parcels have large docks and some are smaller; inquired whether owners still paid \$10,000 regardless of dock size.

Special Counsel responded the square footage of the submerged parcels that were transferred differed between the previous 84; the parcel sizes differ between roughly 2,300 and 4,500 square feet; the parcels are not all the same; the City took improvements into consideration.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether a group created desired for all parcel owners to pay \$10,000.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired when Special Counsel came to work for the City of Alameda, to which Special Counsel responded 2013, however, a previous Assistant City Attorney worked on the bulk of the matter; stated that he has been working on the matter for about a year after the Attorney left the City; he does not have the historical knowledge.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed concern over interruptions, repeating questions, and speaking time; stated that she recalls a group being created by the 90 parcel owners that worked with staff to come up with a resolution and a purchase price of \$10,000 for all; inquired whether the details for the group can be recalled by staff.

The Assistant City Manager responded that she recalls a loose, not formal, Homeowners Association (HOA); stated the primary goal was to ensure all neighbors were on board with the concept of paying the \$10,000 since the City was requesting that all-or-none purchase the parcels.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired why it would be appropriate for the City to now request the remaining parcel owners to pay an increase in price than the other owners.

Special Counsel responded the issue is currently before the Council; stated the appraisal was performed; Council has the discretion to approve a lower purchase price if it would prove to be more equitable.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the City already made a deal of \$10,000 per parcel with the group.

Special Counsel responded the expectation at the time was that issues would be resolved quickly; stated given the length of time, the appraisal indicated the value has increased; Council needs to decide the reasonable sale price.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether the City did not previously appraise each parcel individually.

Special Counsel responded the previous appraisal was a bulk appraisal.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the difference in price based on the current appraisal report, which includes two parcels listed at \$10,000 each, two at \$12,500, and two at \$14,000; the two parcels listed at \$10,000 have the largest percentage of the easement areas on their property; the parcels also have the widest path; the two at \$12,500 have a public easement area which constitutes 16% to 18% of the lot area as opposed to the 31% to 32% of the previous parcels; the easements have public access pathways; the last two properties appraised at \$14,000 only have view corridor easements with narrow paths at 11% to 13% of the lot area; inquired whether the breakdowns were factored into the parcel prices.

Special Counsel responded in the affirmative; noted appraisers use comparable sales to determine value.

Stated Council should follow through with the commitment of the \$10,000 purchase price; expressed concern over the increase in the purchase price; stated property owners were ignoring encumbrances regardless of property size and type; the proposed

six parcels were included in the original calculation; she would like the City to work with owners for an exemption to the California Surplus Lands Act (SLA) or disclose all issues with the parcels upfront: Dona Fisher, Alameda.

Discussed the history of the parcel sales; stated a HOA was formed to be a voice for the community; the HOA worked to gain consensus from all 90 owners; expressed concern over the increased costs and for the delay; urged the City to move forward: Kevin Peterson, Waterfront Homeowners Association.

Stated the matter has taken eight years; the remaining parcels were not stealing park land; expressed concern over the increase in purchase price, his dock being in disrepair, the associated repair costs, and liability; stated that he has been patient and is irritated; urged Council to keep its previous price commitment: Rob Barics, Alameda.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she supports equity and appraisals; the City dropped the ball; it has been an eight year delay; there is a three-tiered proposal; expressed support for stepping away from the proposed pricing; requested clarification about closing costs.

Special Counsel stated the other property owners paid \$1,000 towards closing costs with the City paying the additional costs; there has been a slight increase; the City would likely pick up another \$1,000 to \$1,200 per closing; the City would not be buying title insurance; property owners would pay \$1,000 and the City would pay \$1,200 to remain consistent with the original transactions.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft proposed the City turn the clock back to 2016 and have all six property owners pay \$10,000 per parcel plus the first \$1,000 in closing costs with the City picking up the remaining costs; stated the amount is not huge and is not a gift; she is mindful of the years spent being unable to perform work on docks causing an increase in repair costs; expressed support for staff looking into the SLA exemption.

Councilmember Vella moved approval of all six parcels purchase price being \$10,000, with property owners paying \$1,000 toward closing costs, and having staff look into the SLA exemption.

Councilmember Jensen seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Special Counsel stated due to the matter including City property being sold, a finding must be made that the property is no longer necessary for City use; staff looked at whether the matter could qualify for an exemption and looked at all of the SLA exceptions; staff concluded the matter does not qualify for an exemption; typically, a small size exemption would apply, however, the parcels do not qualify for an exemption since the parcels adjoin recreational open space; staff will proceed under the SLA and will make it clear to housing providers, as well as school and recreation districts, that there are substantial improvements on the properties with no access; it is difficult to believe any entity would be interested in the property.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the timeline for the SLA is 60 days, to which Special Counsel responded in the affirmative; stated following second reading or the ordinance, the matter should be completed by the end of the year.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the second reading cannot occur due to the Council break in August; inquired the likelihood a public provider would obtain the parcel for affordable housing.

The Assistant City Manager responded the parcels are for submerged lands; stated there is no building on submerged land and the likelihood is low.

Special Counsel stated that he is not worried about housing providers looking to obtain the property; the possibility might be a recreational district would look into the matter; the City is not obligated to sell the parcel to any of the entities; the City's obligation if any, is to negotiate in good faith.

Vice Mayor Daysog stated that he is always a stickler for evaluating the time value of money taking into the effects of inflation; this case represents a total of \$13,000 and Council can deal with the amount; expressed support for turning back the clock and approving each parcel purchase at \$10,000; stated the matter has spanned too long.

Councilmember Jensen expressed support for the patience of the residents and property owners.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed support for the \$10,000 amount and the residents being patient; stated that she is sorry that property owners were put through the process.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by the following roll call vote: Councilmembers Herrera Spencer: Aye; Daysog: Aye; Jensen: Aye; Vella: Aye; and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft: Aye. Ayes: 5.

(24-459) Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Agreement with ELS Architects, Inc. for City Aquatic Center Schematic Design Services and Community Engagement through December 31, 2024, in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$503,687.50.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the matter approves a new agreement for schematic design services and community engagement of the aquatic center; a stop work notice has been issued to stop construction; outlined staff report page two and Exhibit 1; inquired whether the events leading up to the stop work order can be shared; noted that she received an anonymous letter regarding the matter.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded staff found out that Blach Construction had pending litigation with a previous client over charges that were not normal in

construction contracts; the lawsuit was tied to an issue regarding fraud; staff issued a stop work order.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the litigation involving Blach Construction and San Mateo Community College District was disclosed in their RFP response.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded in the affirmative; stated the RFP requests that all teams submit any ongoing litigation; it was an oversight on his part; the information was disclosed in the RFP.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she received an anonymous letter regarding the litigation; inquired why the contract was not terminated the moment the letter was received and why the contract has not been terminated yet; expressed concern over the final cost of the San Mateo Community College aquatic center being much higher than the original bid.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded staff was collecting information about the case; stated a pending July 11 court date could have potentially removed Blach Construction from the litigation; staff put a stop work order in place with the intention of bringing termination to Council in September.

The City Manager stated staff cannot terminate the contract administratively; the intent is to bring the contract termination forth and issue another RFP.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the current meeting is the last before the August recess; many people are eager for the project to move forward; expressed concern.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed support for the public meetings held regarding the aquatic center project; inquired whether the company leading the meetings will stay on for the project; questioned how the change will impact any of the public communications.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded the intent for continuity is to keep the design team that has conducted the last two community meetings and the conceptual design will come to Council in September; the next phase will be the schematic design; the new team will be selected from an RFP that is based on the Council-approved design; the community will see the same design team, project and project goals.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she attended the two community meetings; inquired the topic for the upcoming community meeting on August 3.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded the topic will be presenting the design options of both a 30- and 50-meter pool.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether any final decisions have been made for two versus one pool, to which the Recreation and Parks Director responded in the

negative.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she received an email indicating the decision was made; expressed support for the clarification provided; inquired whether the public can still provide input regarding the configuration or proposal details.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded in the affirmative; stated staff will be collecting input at the community meeting and will combine the responses with all others when presenting the staff recommendation to Council.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired how members of the public can provide input if they cannot attend the meeting.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded another public survey will be distributed across social media, email blasts and a list of about 35,000 people; staff will also make QR codes available on the City and Recreation and Park Department websites.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft expressed support for the work being done with the community; stated the climate impacts section of the staff report indicates all buildings associated with the aquatic center will meet a minimum certification pursuant to the City's building ordinance with additional funding options explored, such as full electrification systems of solar or wind energy generation; expressed support for the facility being heated and cooled with a solar electric heat pump; stated Alameda Municipal Power's (AMP) portfolio is a combination of clean, green energy; the City cannot be a polluter emitting greenhouse gas emissions with gas powered heat pumps; there may be ways the City can partner with AMP.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the request for electric-only power is part of the reason why the building is three stories high.

The Recreation and Parks Director stated the proposed building is not three stories high; the building is one-story and has a two- to three-foot parapet which allows the equipment to be hidden on the roof; the building will be a single-story structure.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired the highest point for the building structure.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded it is conceptually too early to tell the exact height for the building.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the proposed diagrams appear taller than a single-story building; inquired whether an all-electric building will only add four feet to the building height.

The Recreation and Parks Director responded three- to four-feet will be added to the roof surface in order to cover the heat pumps on top of the building to mask the units from being visible.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the illustrations show a big, mostly cement building, which has raised concerns; the illustrations appear to show more than a single-level building; expressed support for finding out the differences in heights and building dimensions for electrification and non-electric options; stated that she heard input about a community meeting room in an existing building at the park as opposed to expanding the structure to accommodate a community meeting room; some would prefer the building to be as small as possible.

Councilmember Jensen inquired whether the matter is regarding the project design or approving a contract agreement for a design firm.

(24-460) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated a motion is needed to consider the Building 25 lease ordinance [paragraph no. 24-461] after 11:00 p.m.

Councilmember Jensen moved approval.

Vice Mayor Daysog seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 4. [Absent: Councilmember Vella – 1.]

In response to Councilmember Jensen’s inquiry, the City Attorney stated the matter is to approve a contract to authorize the continuation of a public outreach firm; Council could provide related direction, but should not have an extended discussion about design.

The City Manager stated a recommendation regarding the pools and conceptual design would return to Council on September 17th.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the recommendation will be made after the community meeting in August, to which the Recreation and Parks Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed support for the upcoming community meeting.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer moved approval of the staff recommendation and approval of the agreement.

Councilmember Jensen seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 4. [Absent: Councilmember Vella – 1.]

CONSENT CALENDAR - ITEMS REMOVED FOR DISCUSSION

(24-461) Ordinance No. 3375, “Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Lease Amendment for a Portion of Building 25 with Alameda Point Beverage Group, a

California Corporation Located at 1951 Monarch Street, Hangar 200, at Alameda Point, Alameda, California, for a Term of Twenty-Five Months.” Finally passed.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the matter is time-sensitive.

The Base Reuse Manager responded the existing lease will expire; stated that it would be nice to understand whether the City will extend the lease for another 25 months; the lease will roll month-to-month in the event Council does not approve the ordinance, which is not ideal.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft expressed concern over Council approval requiring four affirmative votes; inquired what would happen in the event the matter is not successfully approved.

The City Attorney responded Council approved the matter unanimously at the previous meeting.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that it is important to share information with the public; inquired the reason a longer lease is not being offered.

The Base Reuse Manager responded the 25-month lease is being offered since Building 25 is part of a plan and Council direction related development of Depave Park; stated the plan is to align the leases within Building 25; Buildings 25 and 29 sit within the footprint of the park plan; staff would like to keep the building occupied since it helps keep the City’s asset secure; leases would generate revenue until the time comes to fund and develop Depave Park.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated that she does not support demolishing Building 25; expressed support for working with the business long-term in order to compliment the park; stated direction was provided to work with the tenants long-term; inquired whether there is a plan to work with the tenants to have space in Alameda after the lease has expired.

The Base Reuse Manager responded in the affirmative; stated staff wants to retain businesses in Alameda; Building 25 has been in Alameda since 2014; staff has been meeting with members of Building 25 and 29 on other options.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether there is a plan to return to Council and when the update will occur.

The Base Reuse Manager responded the next point will be part of a Depave Park update.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer inquired whether any delays to Depave Park would result in the possibility of a lease extension for Building 25, to which the Base Reuse Manager responded in the affirmative; stated keeping a building occupied helps it remain secure.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer expressed support for a long-term plan being provided.

Councilmember Jensen moved final passage of the ordinance.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 4. [Absent: Councilmember Vella – 1.]

CITY MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS

(24-462) The City Manager announced the City would be initiating bargaining with two safety groups: the International Association of Firefighters and the Alameda Fire Chiefs Association on salaries, benefits, and terms of employment; stated negotiations will begin in August; Alameda Police Department continues to make AB 41 notifications on its website immediately after deployment; announced the launch of the Oakland-Alameda Water and the Alameda island-hopper shuttles, a closure of the Webster-Posey Tube, and the third annual Fiesta Alameda celebration.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

(24-463) John Lewis, Unified Sovereign Americans, continued reading its proposed resolution regarding the upcoming election.

(24-464) Gerald Peckenuk, Unified Sovereign Americans, concluded reading the resolution; urged Council agendaize the proposed resolution.

COUNCIL REFERRALS

None.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

(24-465) Councilmember Herrera Spencer announced upcoming Bay Station sunset strolls; discussed attending the Fourth of July parade, a 5K walk-run to support Midway Shelter, the Coffins and Cars event, a Zoom meeting with APD staff and community members, and a zero-waste meeting at the Alameda Library.

(24-466) Councilmember Jensen discussed her sons as a child having concerns for her safety as a member of the Alameda School Board and as staff for the City of Oakland in relation to gun violence; stated gun violence recently occurred in Alameda; children are wondering how the event will affect their family and safety; urged everyone to think about and listen to their children, help their children talk about incidents and be able to move forward from the recent tragedy.

(24-467) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft discussed the memorial vigil for the family members

killed the previous Wednesday to gun violence; stated there is an upcoming two-year anniversary for the 9-8-8 number to call for those struggling and impacted by mental health issues; the event meant much to those who attended and spoke; disseminating information is a good first step; announced that she attended at a Naturalization Ceremony at the USS Hornet and the Fourth of July parade; discussed the recent Grants Pass case regarding people living on the streets; announced that she attended the Mayor's Conference meeting in Newark and at the League of California Cities Board of Directors meeting in Pasadena.

(24-468) Mayor's Nominations to Various Boards and Commissions.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft nominated Ashley Rybarczyk to the Historical Advisory Board.

ADJOURNMENT

(24-469) There being no further business, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft adjourned the meeting at 11:14 p.m. in a moment of silence in memory of Wesley, William, Brenda Natali Morales, Marta Diaz Morales, and Miguel Angel Carcamo Ramirez.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

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

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- -JULY 16, 2024- -7:01 P.M.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft convened the meeting at 11:14 p.m.

Roll Call – Present: Councilmembers Daysog, Herrera Spencer, Jensen, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 4. [Note: Councilmember Jensen left the meeting at 11:54 p.m.

Absent: Councilmember Vella – 1.

The meeting was adjourned to Closed Session to consider:

(24-470) Conference with Labor Negotiators (Government Code § 54957.6); City Negotiators: Jennifer Ott, City Manager, Jessica Romeo, Human Resources Director, and Doug McManaway, Deputy City Attorney; Employee Organizations: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW); Under Negotiation: Salaries, Employee Benefits, and Terms of Employment

Following the Closed Session, the meeting was reconvened, and the City Clerk announced that staff provided information and Council provided direction by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Daysog Jensen, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 3. Noes: Councilmember Herrera Spencer – 1.

Councilmember Herrera Spencer stated the closed session was started after the regular meeting to accommodate a Councilmember who did not attend; the meeting should have been held before the regular meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft adjourned the meeting at 11:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

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