

From: [Erin Smith](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Cc: [Irma Glidden](#); [Ashley Zieba](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Yibin Shen](#); [Jennifer Ott](#); [Amy Wooldridge](#); [Elizabeth Mackenzie](#)
Subject: Questions and Answers for City Council Agenda Items: Meeting of January 3rd, 2023
Date: Saturday, December 31, 2022 4:45:31 PM
Attachments: [Public Access and Open Space Plan.pdf](#)

Madam Mayor and Councilmembers,

Vice Mayor Daysog submitted questions on various agenda items for January 3rd. The questions and answers provided are noted below. The City Clerk will post this additional information to the agenda items as well.

Thank you,

Erin

+++++

Item: 2B Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of a Joint City Council/SACIC Resolution Approving the Development List of Affordable Housing Projects and Funding Request for Such Projects as Requested by the Alameda Unified School District; and Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Submit the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) and Administrative Budget for the Period from July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024 to the Countywide Oversight Board

1. Please briefly summarize projects funded by or related to ROP 56 (2014 Bond Series A & B), 57 (2014 Bond Series A & B required reserve), 58 (2017 Bond), and 59 (2017 Bond required reserve).

The 2014 Bonds refunded the prior 2003 bonds to provide interest rate savings to the City and other taxing agencies. Proceeds of the original 2003 bonds were primarily used for the Alameda theater and parking garage project on Central Ave that included renovation of the historic theater, streetscape improvements to Park and Webster streets, to pay off a pre-existing obligation related to Marina Village, and to refund a prior bond issue.

The 2017 Bonds refunded a 2011 bond issue to achieve interest rate savings. Proceeds of the original 2011 bond issue were used to fund the Alameda Islander affordable housing project.

2. How does Exhibit 1 PDF page 1 of 8 relate to PDF page 5 of 8? Other than the reference on PDF page 1 of 8 to "other funds" in 23-24A amounting to "53,594", which also shows up on PDF page 5 of 8 at CELL "F2", I'm not quite sure how page 5 of 8 relates to page 1 of 8. In other words, I see how PDF page 2 of 8 relates to page 1 of 8, since the top-line numbers on PDF page 2 of 8 match numbers on PDC page 1 of 8. But the numbers between page 5 of 8 relates to page 1 of 8 differ except for "53,594" -- and both are labeled as ROPS 23-24.

3. Is the idea that the table on Exhibit 1 PDF page 5 of 8 will be updated as a result of the decisions expressed on PDF pages 1 through 4 of 8?

Page 5 of 8 is the cash balance form that DOF requires all successor agencies to complete each year. The page 5 cash balance form is backward looking to fiscal year 20-21, showing starting cash as of June 30, 2020, revenues, expenditures, and ending cash as of June 30, 2021. The purpose from DOF's perspective is to identify available monies that could potentially be used to fund the current year ROPS, prior to requesting additional RPTTF funding (former tax increment). As you noted, the \$53,594 in other funds is the only item from Page 5 that appears on Page 1 through 4. This is because these are the "other funds" generated during FY 2020-21 that are available to be used to fund obligations appearing on ROPS 2023-24. There is less of a connection between Page 5 of the form and pages 1 through 4, mainly because Page 5 relates to FY 20-21 and pages 1 through 4 are about

the upcoming 23-24 fiscal year.

4. On PDF page 3 of 8 of Exhibit 1, the table references the Guyton Settlement as a "\$35,583,947" "obligation": I do not recall that the Guyton Settlement ever prescribing a dollar settlement amount, let alone \$35,583,947. Please clarify \ explain the \$35,583,947 as an "obligation", within the meaning of this ROP process, stemming from the Guyton Settlement.

There is no specific dollar obligation under the Guyton Settlement. Payments are equal to the amount due under the pass through agreement with AUSD, which are restricted to affordable housing, and are subject to the terms of the Guyton Settlement. The primary factors that allowed the California Department of Finance (DOF) to approve the combined pass through agreement and settlement agreement as an enforceable obligation stem from the following facts about the AUSD pass through agreement:

- It remains effective following dissolution of redevelopment;
- It restricts a portion of payments to affordable housing purposes; and
- It is subject to the terms of the Guyton settlement agreement.

Each fiscal year, the Successor Agency is obligated to prepare a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS), which lists all enforceable obligations payable and the source of their payment for that twelve-month period. For purpose of the ROPS, DOF requires inclusion of an estimate of the total dollar amount outstanding. Therefore, at the time the first ROPS was prepared in 2012, an estimate was included on the ROPS based on the remaining number of units required to satisfy the settlement agreement and an estimated per unit subsidy. As payments under this ROPS item occur, they are deducted from the original ROPS estimate of the outstanding amount.

In January 2022, when we brought ROPS 22-23 budget to SACIC/CC, this line item showed a total outstanding obligation of \$37,058,000 of which \$1,474,053 was allocated, leaving a balance of \$35,583,947. At some point, it may be necessary to adjust this estimated outstanding amount up or down because it is intended as a general guide only and payments are expected to continue as long as the Successor Agency remains in existence, since they are driven by amounts due under the pass through agreement, which are on-going.

+++++

Item: 5-D Recommendation to Authorize the City Manager to Accept the Improvements Completed by Alameda Marina, LLC, for Alameda Marina - Lot 4, EVA Corridor Utilities (PWD20-0022).

1. The staff report says that the project will contribute to "the City's Climate Action and Resiliency Plan goals to reduce the city's greenhouse gas emissions": do we have readily-available numbers that quantify how much, and in what areas, GHG emissions would be reduced? If numbers are not readily available, then perhaps a very succinct narrative on how GHG reduction would accomplished via this project?

The development constructed the separated bicycle path and pedestrian improvements on Clement Avenue along the project frontage to promote alternate modes of transportation. Within the development numerous bicycle and pedestrian paths are planned to promote access to the waterfront. See attached "Public Access and Open Space Plan" from the approved Master Plan.

The Transportation Demand Management plan approved by the Planning Board on 3/9/2022 has the following components aimed at reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled and total vehicle trips (please note that not all components are able to be quantified):

TDM PLAN COMPONENTS	

TDM Strategy	Description	Estimated VMT and Vehicle Trip Reduction
Infrastructure Improvements	Public Improvements to Clement	N/A
Transit Passes	Provide one AC Transit EasyPass per residential unit and per employee	3-5%
Limited Parking Supply	Project provides about 1.3 off-street parking spaces per unit, less than auto ownership in the project area.	1-4%
Unbundled Parking	Residents of Wraps A and B are required to pay for a parking space separately from their monthly rent	
Residential Parking Management	Restrict on-site parking to a maximum of two parking space per unit, thereby discouraging multiple car ownership	
Maritime and Commercial Parking Management	Prohibit the use of the maritime and commercial parking facilities by project residents	
Carshare Parking Spaces	Offer to dedicate on-site carshare parking spaces	<1%
Water Taxi Dock	Offer to dedicate for free a dock for a public water taxi	N/A
Carpool and Ride-Matching Assistance	Assist project residents and employees in forming carpools	<1%
Bicycle Parking Supply Monitoring	Monitor usage of the bicycle parking facilities and increase supply if necessary	<1%
Guaranteed Ride Home	Residents and tenants to register for the free program	N/A
LDM Coordinator	Coordinator responsible for implementing and managing the TDM Plan	N/A
Marketing and Education	Active marketing of all non-automobile travel choices	N/A

+++++

Item: 5-E Recommendation to Authorize the Purchase of Three Vehicles Consistent with the Revised Vehicle Replacement Policy in Amounts Not to Exceed \$404,162.72 from Downtown Ford for One Versalift Bucket Truck and One Crane Truck and \$422,043.26 from Weco Industries for a Multi-Conductor Camera Van. (Public Works 60141581)

1. Since the vehicles come to us from distance, are these delivered to us, or do we go and pick them up and drive them home?

The vehicles are delivered to the City's Fleet Services garage.

+++++

Item: 5-I Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the City Manager or Designee to Enter Into a Special Use Agreement, Substantially in the Same Form as the Attached, with the East Bay Regional Park District for the City of Alameda to Operate a Dog Park at Robert Crown Memorial State Beach (Crown Beach) in the Area Known as Washington Park Dog Park.

1. Presumably the prior contract ended on August 31, 2022, since this new contract begins on September 1, 2022: has the City of Alameda been the licensee since September 1, 2022 until now (January 3, 2023) under provisions in the current agreement similar to either Sections 22 (month-to-month) or 23 (mutual consent modifications) of the proposed agreement?

Yes, the provisions of this new contract are the same as the previous contract. The City has continued to operate and maintain under a month to month basis of the previous contract.

+++++

Item: 7-A Public Hearing to Consider Approving the Housing and Community Development Needs Statement for the Community Development Block Grant Annual Plan for Fiscal Year 2023-24.

1. The staff report references "14 community service providers and organizations", while Exhibit 4 shows 13: who is the one other?

While we are unable to locate the reference to "14 community service providers" in the staff report, we can confirm that Exhibit 4 contains the written responses that we received from the nonprofit organizations.

2. In Exhibit 3, the 5-year goal for "public safety net" is "23,000", while the one-year 2020-2021 number was 770: did we mean possibly mean five-year goal is "2,300"? And did we possibly mean 2023-2024?

Exhibit 3 contains the goals from the Consolidated Plan. The 5-year goal for "public safety net" is 23,000. The reference to the 770 persons for fiscal year 2020-21 is superfluous at this time. When we return to City Council in May, we will present the goals for FY 2023-24.

+++++

Item: 7-B Recommendation to Select a Name for the New Park Known as Alameda Marina Park.

1. Is any of the park on land involved in the tideland trust transfer? Or is that land closer to the Encinal Terminals project?

A portion of the park is in Tidelands but is not part of the Tidelands trust transfer that has been considered for Encinal Terminals.

2. Do we know how many Riveter's parks there are in the Bay Area?

Rosie the Riveter Memorial Park is in the City of Richmond and at that same location is the Rosie the Riveter WWII / Home Front National Historical Park.




Exhibit 3.2 b - Conceptual Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation Diagram

Legend

- ← Bicycle & Ped. Path ← Ped. Path Only ← Alameda Cross City Bicycle Trail
- ← Proposed Bay Trail <-- Visual Corridor Only |||| Crosswalks

Legend

*Information from City of Alameda
Bicycle Master Plan Update (2010)

- Existing Class I bicycle lane
- - - Proposed Class I bicycle lane
- Existing Class II bicycle lane
- - - Proposed Class II bicycle lane
- Existing Class III bicycle lane
- - - Proposed Class III bicycle lane




Exhibit 3.2 a - Existing & Proposed Bicycle Circulation