

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>>> Any changes to the agenda order? All right. Let's take up the first item, may 3rd council meeting. Few changes on page one. We've got a note to defer the baseball buddies foundation commendation to may 10th. Anything else on one? Page 2 or 3? [Inaudible]

>> Haven't seen one in years.

>> Anything on page 4 or 5? I have a note that the recommended date to initiate proceedings for annexation and reorganization of downer number 11 should be May 24th, not may 17th.

>> That is correct. It will be noticed for 1:30 because there's no evening meeting that day.

>> Blossom hill road somewhere, south crest way. Anything else on 4 or 5? Page 6 or 7? I have a note we should defer item 4.2, the north San Jose residential activity up until changes to reservation allocation process to may 10th.

>> Yes. It already appears on that agenda. We also have two cross-references under strategic support from TSPS. The disability audit and other audit. Those will appear on the amended agenda.

>> May 3rd?

>> Yes.

>> Anything else 6 or 7? Page 8? Page 9 is the financing authority agenda with actions related to the SIROP payment to the state. Any other additions? I have some requests.

>> Is that going to be right after the ceremonial?

>> Our recommendation is is at the end of the meeting since there's no redevelopment agency meeting and it's a joint item.

>> Okay. Additions, request to add a proclamation for safety driving month.

>> Mr.áMayor, just on my item two, my staff had said that there was some kind of waiver requesting that. We can just defer it. There's no need to have it on the 3rd.

>> I think they may have meant the second twoX on the bottom, right, Nadine?

>> Right.

>> Okay. In that case, forget that.

>> So we have actions related to councilmember's Constance travel to add. Setting a public meeting for proposed increase to downtown fiscal year 2012. That's one in which we need a sunshine waiver to set June 7th as the date for a meeting.

>> Yes.

>> We're talking about a date for a meeting over a month out. Okay.

>> Yeah. That's two dates, June 7th and June 21st.

>> Any other changes? Additions?

>> So motion to approve with a couple of cross-reference items and the additions.

>> Second.

>> And sunshine wafer.

>> Second.

>> We will take the financing authority payment to the state last. Okay. Further discussion? All in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Opposed? That's approved. Anything on page 1 of the may 10th agenda? Page 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5? We have had those items which previously were mentioned to be added, probably already on there.

>> Yes.

>> Any other additions or changes?

>> Motion to approve.

>> Second.

>> Motion is to approve, all in favor? Opposed? None opposed. That's approved. Redevelopment agency May 3rd, no agenda items.

>> That is correct. We would recommend canceling that meeting. We have no items with may 3rd with the exception if there's something for the closed agenda and the SRAF agenda joint with the city.

>> Motion to cancel without exception.

>> Second.

>> All in favor? Opposed? None opposed. That's approved. May 10th, redevelopment agency agenda, anything on page 1? Or 2? And no adds?

>> That is correct is, Mr. Mayor.

>> Approve?

>> Notion MOEGS to approve, all in favor? Opposed? None opposed. That's approved. Upcoming study session agendas. We're having one tomorrow, if anyone wants to show up. We'll have Internet access again, I think safety is back in business. I assume that will be web cast, broadcast as the usual study sessions are. And what are we talking about tomorrow? The dirt on stationary plan. All morning long, anybody wants to join us. Legislative update. Anything from the state of California as part of the world? Betsey.

>> Thank you. I just wanted to give a very brief update. Numbers coming in on the personal income tax have been positive. At the beginning of the month they were \$2.8 billion higher than the governor's finance office had estimated. As the last Friday, if you were to compare to a year ago Friday, they were over \$6 billion up in personal income taxes. Corporate was down about \$600 million. So the controller's office is indicating they really are not going to celebrate this information quite yet, as far as the positive side. Their numbers will be finalized around May 10th and our state lobbyist informed me they may revise so the governor will be issuing on Monday, may 16th so you can see how things are sort of all lining up here. And still, of course, the matter dealing with the remaining \$15 billion state deficit, which I'm sure will be the focus of the May revise, obviously. Any questions?

>> Mr. Mayor?

>> Yes.

>> Will the may 10th, may 16th revise also contain capital gains that the state gains from people selling stocks or anything else?

>> I would imagine. I have read some analysis saying that that might be a part of these numbers, and I'm not an accountant, but the losses that people had the year prior would be offset with the gains so that may notá-- but that will be in the analysis.

>> I think everybody does their taxes by April 15th so the state has an idea outside of extensions what loss and gains are on people's returns.

>> Exactly. That analysis is forth coming. Folks in Sacramento are scratching their heads with these numbers with unemployment being so high in the state.

>> Considering the fact that a handful of taxpayers pay half of the income taxes, if those handful are doing well, the income taxes could go up, notwithstanding a lot of people are unemployed.

>> Exactly.

>> It's not completely out of the question. But it's not going to go up enough to solve the state's budget problems.

>> That's right.

>> We don't get any of those income taxes, in case anybody's keeping score.

>> Good point.

>> But we're getting ready to write \$13 billion out of our redevelopment funding. That's on the agenda for May 3rd. Anything else from state?

>> No.

>> Federal?

>> No. Congress is in recess.

>> Anything on that? All right. We'll move to the next agenda item. The public record, the got some testimony? Public record, Martha O'Connell, David wall.

>> Should pick up once you start talking. If not, we'll do something. Just start talking.

>> All right. First of all, I'd like toá--

>> Okay. It's not on. Not picking up. We'll just double-check. Now go.

>> First I'd like to acknowledge and thank Juan for wanting me to pace and stand in the back of the room because I threw my back out and I can't sit. I thank him for his sensitivity to a disability. I'm here to talk about my letter L, bring to your attention once again that we need title 9 revised to allow mobile home residents on a voluntary basis to share their garbage and recycling carts with the neighbor. We've been trying to make this happen for over two years. As I'll quote councilperson constant who once told me, on any given Tuesday an ordinance can change. So it is possible to change an ARD in answer and this is one we do need to change because no NAERT what we do, we have no control over these fees. I put out two tiny bags, I'm single, of garbage a week and I'm paying \$27 a month. That is slated to go up 27% in the next three years. And these folks, the working poor and seniors are pleading with you to help us with these things that are no longer included in our rent and I'm begging the city

council to take a look at this because judicious use doesn't help. The fees are set. So please consider lowering them and letting us share our garbage carts. Thank you.

>> David wall?

>> First off, I'm not satisfied with any cuts within the attorney's office, Mr. Mayor. You as an attorney--

>> Get a little closer to the microphone.

>> Is this good enough?

>> That's perfect.

>> As a lawyer, Mr. Mayor, would appreciate that. Let's turn to page 9 of item C from the water district. We note that nice little slide for advanced water treatment, potable backup. Now, this is really one of the first times I've seen them admit that this is going to be for potable water use. Lately it's been just for irrigation as a matter of fact, councilmember Liccardo Tuesday asked them directly about ground water recharge with reference to potable water use, and they weren't really forthcoming with it being truthful with reference to this admonition and declaratory little slide. So I think we need to come out with a more forthwith that people are going to be dealing with toilet water turned into tap water in the very near future. Whether or not they like paying for that. Item number O, Mr. Mayor, the communication people, God bless them, they're good people, they've got talent, but when I look at the costs for these types of positions, do they help me on the street in neighborhood watch? Or do the police officers or firefighters help us? When it comes to city business, do these positions help with good management with reference to retaining auditors and attorneys? I don't think so. And each one of the people here listed, you, the city manager, and our good aviation director, you speak very well. And I can't see four or five years from now when you're back in law practice hiring a communication person to stand before a Judge and plead your case. So I think we need to review this and reinstate some attorney and other more important positions. I think that will be enough for today.

>> That's the public comment on the public record. Anything the committee would like to pull for discussion?

>> Slate comment.

>> Okay.

>> I'm on the recycle advisory committee. We are moving forward with advanced water treatment, which is different from recycled water for irrigation or industrial use. It is taking waste water so it's potable. It would be actually cleaner than present day tap water or bottled water. That will be done in June 2012 with running tests and education for the public. Won't be waste water to potable water that day. It will come after years. Thanks.

>> Also, we get half of our water through the delta, much of that water has already been through a treatment plant somewhere upstream. Anything else on the public record?

>> I'd just make a motion to note and file with the comment that we already did asked staff to look into the garbage situation. So we'll have an answer at some point soon, I hope.

>> Second.

>> All in favor? Opposed? None opposed. That's approved.

>>> Work plan. We have an elections commission work plan for fiscal 10/11, 11/12. City clerk?

>> Thank you, Mr. Mayor, members of the committee. Mike Smith chair of the elections committee, is here as well as Lisa Harris, senior deputy city attorney. The elections commission is submitting its work plan for the balance of this fiscal year and for next fiscal year, given the time of year we just felt it was appropriate to do it over a longer time horizon. And be happy to answer any questions that you might have on the work plan.

>> Motion to approve.

>> Second.

>> Motion, any public comment? None. No questions?

>> I just want to confirm that IRB is dropped from the work plan.

>> We're reporting on that issue today.

>> Okay. That's a separate item on the agenda. Thank you.

>> Motion to approve the work plan. All in favor? Opposed? None opposed. That is approved.

>>> Next item is a request to fly the reuse policy of Hass kin community center or incorporate the unique services clause if appropriate, councilmember constant and Oliverier on that.

>> We have a simple memo put forward to manage our current economic crisis in San Jose. The memo acknowledges the fiscal environment we operate in but also acknowledges we have a facility as other facilities in San Jose have put into what's classified as reuse. We've been able to open facilities with a third party and/or what we did with the aquatics program last summer by using the unique services clause. This is a facility that is closed, like four others as well as the police substation, but there's an opportunity here to if we can bring in a third party, someone to provide services to community residents but at no cost to the general fund, then we should explore that much as we've done with others. I think it was a new facility so therefore you might have someone like the YWCA or something like that that might be interested for a period of years much I understand there's some bond covenants on the property that someone will explain that throws a little into it. But at the end I think this enables us a way to provide services but also acknowledges its unique position. This facility is right next to a large county

pocket. Residents don't pay into the city for tax base but might be inclined to use it. Even a for-profit third party might make sense. Ed in addition it's on the Campbell border so pulling residents from Campbell might make sense. That's really the simplicity of it. I'll let councilmember constant make any comment.

>> I would just add that given our fiscal reality, there's no way that I could in good conscience say let's open up the library in the city center and let the city operate it. We have too many challenges in front of us, too many competing priorities and very essential services that we're struggling with maintaining. However, a partial activation of a building is much better than no activation, and if there is a way for this to work, I'd love to see it happen. If there's not, there's not. But I think it's important we at least take a look at it. We've got an established process we've used in other areas and I'd much rather see the community get limited use versus no use.

>> Couple of questions. Private use restrictions because of tax-exempt bond?

>> Exactly. These are general obligation tax exempt bonds. Like we have with other analysis, it's always case-by-case. Any proposal we would have to do that analysis to make sure we don't run afoul the IRS rules.

>> We had that issue with any of the other reuses? I think those were old and paid for.

>> What's unique about this is it's brand new, financed with tax-exempt debt. Whether it's a qualified management agreement or however we structured this, that's going to have to do that work.

>> So, Rick, just to be clear, for the public, you have a city facility that's already built that's been existing providing services for 20 years, the city runs out of money but it's paid for. You have a new facility built by bonds so the uses or the third party to use the facilities are different.

>> Yes. The IRS or the federal government in allowing you to use the benefit of tax-exempt money cheaper borrowing money, it sets forth restrictions so it doesn't benefit private parties. It's truly a public benefit. So how you

structure any private operator or use of the facility you'd have to meet certain guide lines. We usually work with bond council, tax council on this issue.

>> A private operator would be able to pay its rec leader teaching a basketball league, they'd probably be able to pay that person's salary providing the league.

>> Right. It doesn't preclude the private operator-- their operation is the city's relationship and in what types of-- if there's a profit, if there's-- there's a whole host of issues and tests that need to be looked at, percentages of private use that are allowed. Again, that's something that we do case by case. We have the same issue with the convention center and team San Jose. We've been able to meet that test. It's not something that's not doable. It's case by case. We'll do that as part of the analysis.

>> Assistant director of parks recreation and neighborhood services. If I could add, Rick explained it very well, the analysis for the private use though is for the entire bond series. So you need to take that whole \$100 million and every public asset that went in there and then apply the private use test. So it's a little complicated. We'll be working closely with the attorney's office to do that. So it's not really a site by site analysis it's a whole series analysis.

>> The good news is that can work to your advantage because it's a larger pool. It depends on what other uses are out there.

>> I like when you say "advantage," Rick.

>> Not making any hard commitments here. Haven't done the analysis. Couple of things, one is the way I read the memo, it's just adding it to the list we're already doing, not necessarily going to the front of the line, having staff drop the work already going on, but here's another one with additional opportunities that may be out there.

>> I think I've been in that building but I can't remember for sure.

>> No, you haven't mayor.

>> The community center part of itá--

>> No, you have not.

>> Maybe I was wearing a hard hat.

>> There's a community center and library part.

>> Right. They're built to be run completely separate. You can have separate restrooms, separate locked doors.

>> The address is 1000 south bassKim.

>> So our other new facilities, at least one other, is configured the same way. I've been in some of them.

>> Right. Seven trees is a combined facility with a community center and library. We're currently operating the community center while the library portion remains closed.

>> Anything further?

>> Mayor, what we could do during the CSA presentation during the budget show this as on the list because we're going to be updating you on where we're at with the other reuse facilities, maybe have a little more intelligence by then about any of the private activity issues, at least lay out what the path forward might be. So that's one thing that Julie and I talked about this morning.

>> And the reason we're having this conversation is because the council has approved the list of the 23 or 32 or 19 or however many there are.

>> 41. Yes, sir.

>> Oh, my goodness.

>> It will be 42.

>> What I'm hearing from the management side of the FENGs is that you want to incorporate this into the budget process, produce what's called an MBA document, you would bring that to council to vote on the entire budget. That would come with staff recommendations, working with the legal team on what some of the options would be. And then after the current reuse list has been managed, then the team would go to work on this facility.

>> That's correct. We could produce an MBA, which would talk about the challenges but also talk about the opportunities, outline timing and put the facility and any other facilities if you so chose at that same time onto the reuse list and put it in the queue so we could start on it at the first of the fiscal year.

>> Are there others in the category that we haven't just identified yet? That would probably be part of the analysis. Anything else to add to the reuse list.

>> Yes. There are others we're convict plating in the proposed budget.

>> Are those undefined at this time?

>> No. We have a definition, but given the budget keeps moving around, it will be in the published lists on Monday.

>> So we'll know on May 2nd.

>> Yes, absolutely.

>> So far our purposes today, recommendations to direct the administration STO include it. If we do that, it just comes back to us in about three weeks I guess or two weeks in the budget process?

>> Yes. It may not make it into the published document, but it certainly will be in the CSA presentation, the first week of those hearings and then we will also develop an MBA and show you the path forward.

>> Okay. We have a couple of people who want to speak to this. Michaela Rocha and David wall.

>> Good afternoon, mayor and councilmembers and. I'm here today in favor of this recommendation by councilmembers Oliverier and constant. I thank you both. I think this is another tool that you can put in your tool box that will help open up a facility for the youth and users in the community it will help tremendously, and I encourage you to move it forward and put it on the May 17th agenda for action. Thank you.

>> David wall.

>> Is this the one over there by Sam's barbecue?

>> Yes.

>> Gave me an idea when I saw this last week. First of all, it's a great idea. But it should be applied to all because all community centers never were sustainable from the day they were envisioned, no fault of the administration. They're given a lot of grandiose programs from you guys and they do their best. But the idea I had, if you could make money from this place, what could you use to subsidize the other community centers. I'll tell you bluegrass music over at Sam's, they have an overflow capacity. I'm not representing them. I've just been there a

few times. I like the music. And that place could make a lot of money, and could that money be then used within the analysis to pay for other community centers and what have you? But great idea. Try to apply it to all the rest of them.

>> That concludes public testimony. Motion?

>> I will move the memo forward.

>> Second.

>> Motion to direct the administration to include this in the reuse facility as outlined in the memo. All in favor? Opposed? None opposed. That's approved. Next item is a response back to the committee, referral from us about incident runoff voting. City clerk.

>> Mr. Mayor, Lisa HAISHG is here today. She's been working with the elections commission and Dennis to talk about the instant runoff concept that's been out there for some time. I'll let her and Dennis take the lead on this.

>> Councilmember Oliverier's point, we were here last May when the elections commission finished its work on studying instant runoff voting, also known as ranked choice voting, and they came to the rules and open government committee unable to really make a recommendation about instant runoff voting. And I have included that memo with this memo so that it could refresh your recollection about the reasons why and also some other suggestions that the commission made at that time, a couple of which spring to mind the plurality voting and appointing unchallenged incumbents, for example. So there were some other ideas that the commission had. But at that time the committee directed staff to do three different things. One is look at the jurisdictions that had enacted and then repealed instant runoff voting and give some information to the committee about why that happened. Discuss with the county's registrar of voters the process for certification in Santa Clara county for the county's voting equipment, and to implement instant runoff voting and the costs associated with that. The costs associated with implementation go beyond just the actual voting appointment. There's also a tremendous amount

of voter outreach and education that goes on when you're implementing instant runoff voting. And on that point, a third point to make, the third piece of information to bring back to the committee, was the outcome of the instant runoff voting elections in Alameda county. Berkeley, oakland and San Leandro all held instant runoff or they were called choice ranked voting elections this past November. Fortunately, the Alameda county registrar of voters put together a very nice report for, I assume, its board detailing the kind of outreach that they undertook and their report from putting on an election standpoint. So we've included those with the memo as well and then I tried to summarize them in the memo. But just very briefly, there are four jurisdictions that I've been able to determine that have enacted and then repealed instant runoff voting or ranked choice voting. In Ann arbor, Michigan, it was preferable voting. Ann arbor, Michigan, Burlington, Vermont, aspen, Colorado, all across the country. And from what I can determine, I think the reasons why IRV was repealed after holding some elections really boil down to several different arguments. I think the proponents argue that outreach and implementation were not well executed by the officials running the elections. OENTDs of ranked choice voting or IVR tended to argue that voters were confused and there were surprising results, results that people didn't expect, results that people thought would have been different had there been a runoff and more time for thoughtful discussion between the primary and the runoff. There's obviously a lot of difference of opinion between the proponents and opponents. And we saw that here at the elections commission as well. I think if you take this up you'll get the same sort of public comment that just runs the spectrum. As far as what we have learned from the register star of voters, as I mentioned in our memo, it also states we are awaiting federal certification, that's apparently in process, whatever that means. And once that happens and we have our golden ticket, federal certification, the county's voting system vendor will go to the California secretary of state and seek certification there. I will mention that both San Francisco and Alameda counties somehow leapfrogged from federal certification and didn't even go through that process and they have provisional certification through the secretary of state. I've asked our registrar of voters, is that something that we could do as well and I haven't been able to get a definitive answer about that. All I know is that we are-- our county is in the process of trying to undergo the federal certification or succeed and get that federal certification. The cost of certification, the RAJ STRAR tells us, will be passed on to any jurisdiction that wants to implement instant runoff voting, and beyond the implementation costs of getting through the hearings and what have you that go on in Sacramento, to get the state certification, the tremendous outreach and education that would take place, those costs would be passed through, on to any jurisdiction that

wants to implement instant runoff voting, ranked choice voting. As a practical matter, we're the largest jurisdiction in Santa Clara county so if we want to do it, that seems like it will fall on the city's shoulders. The Alameda county registrar of voters spend \$1 million, Oakland kicked in \$100,000 for the outreach and education beginning months before the November election, I understand. It would be different in Santa Clara county for a couple of reasons. We have a few more voters, registrar of voters estimates we have 15% more voters registered voters in San Jose than in those three cities combined in Alameda county. Also, we have an obligation under the federal voting rights act to translate our ballot materials into other languages beyond just Spanish and Chinese, which is what Alameda county is required to do. So getting to what Alameda county did, theyá-- it's tremendous, realliment the report, if you have the chance to review it, they did a lot of work. Over 200 meetings, a variety of different written materials that went out in sample ballots, permanent absentee ballots, handed out at meetings, advertising on buses, in movie theaters, webinars, the news media was tremendously helpful during this time. And then they also put Alameda county added one additional poll worker per each precinct in the cities that were doing instant runoff voting for the November election. The Alameda county registrar of voters reports very high valid ballot rate, over 99%, and valid ballot is essentially meaning that people understood the process enough to not vote in such a way that their ballot was completely invalid and uncounted. Now, there are differences of opinion in terms of whether or not at a certain point in ranked choice voting there gets to be something called an undervote where your first choice or second, third choice may fall off and so a particular voter may not have had his or her vote counted. But that is different than whether or not the ballots are valid or invalid. So that is the report that we have to give back to you, and then just await direction as to what to do next.

>> Vice mayor?

>> Thank you. Thank you very much, Lisa and thanks for the report, your verbal report and analysis. I must admit when this idea came to me a couple of years back I wasá-- I simply thought it would cost us less money to pole something like this. After getting a lot of information from both opponents and proponents of this voting system and reading the report and seeing what's happening around the municipalities, around our county, for me it'sá-- it has a mix of both advantages and disadvantages, and whether or not it's a good or not so good system is not the issue at hand at this point. I think that the fact of the matter is that our current budget deficit forces us to look at

other programs that will help decrease the deficit and this is actually contributing to the deficit. So maybe in the long run it would save us money, but in the short term it's not looking that way. And soá-- the other thing is that I am a little skeptical about switching to an instant runoff voting system. I think when it comes to voting it should be very simple. You cast a vote. The person with the most votes win. Done. There's no confusion. The fact that the education now reads in the implementation, it's really confusing to a lot of people and we've been hearing from a lot of people that actually have been engaged in this kind of voting system. So I'm ready to make a motion that we do not take further action with this issue, we should stop what we're doing and we don't need to waste any more staff time on that issue.

>> Second.

>> We have a motion to take no further action. Support the motion. We thank the staff for their excellent staff work. And the clerk's office and attorney's office as well as the election commission because I think we got good, solid analysis that I think pretty much fully supports the motion to take no further action. The work has been done. Good analysis. Appreciate that. One request to speak.

>> Comment, mayor?

>> Yes.

>> I just want to say the last city to consider this at an election was Ft.áCollins, Colorado, rejected by nearly two-thirds. I attended the league of women voters event here in Santa Clara county. They hosted a debate and league of women voters came out against instant runoff voting. And they do a pretty in-depth analysis, almost as much as yours. Thank you for the staff of the clerk and city attorney.

>> David wall?

>> The instant runoff voting was first championed by I believe his honor councilmember Liccardo and you, Mr. Mayor, I believe, in recollection. This really only benefits well-funded campaigns. Democracy is not being cost-effective here. You have to really give the voters a lot of time to digest who they want to vote for, digest the issues, and instant runoff voting from that standpoint shouldn't be allowed to begin with. This also represents another frivolous amount, serious amount, of attorney time and staff time to appease what I believe is just elected people in their quest to become reelected. Democracy itself is threatened by these instant runoff voting mechanisms. I'm glad that there is some silver lining in a very bad budget situation because that's what killed this thing. If we were flush with cash, I think there would be a lot more impetus to go forward, and that attacks democracy. But I want to make certain, once again, every time you task the attorneys and whatnot with these frivolous type programs, you take away from them doing really much-needed work and much-needed funding for other areas. So you shouldn't do this.

>> Thank you.

>> One more question. Lisa is obviously-- if council wanted to save money and avoid runoff elections and say, for example, switch from 50% plus one to 45%, does that require a charter change? Think your head nod already answered my question.

>> Anything else on this? We have a motion. All in favor? Opposed? None OPZed. It's approved. Thank you for your work. Our last action item is to request or approve the festival. Motion is to approve so we did accept donations and materials. All in favor? Opposed? None opposed. That's approved. Open forum? That's the last item. Mr. Wall?

>> I would like to thank the administration with reference to code enforcement in my neighborhood. There is a problem that you're going to be facing, specifically in my neighborhood, with these legal nonconforming shacks. These really slums. There is a-- there is impetus in district 3 from councilmember Liccardo to show mercy to these shacks, slums. Now, he can speak for himself on this issue. I would like the city to become really focused in closing down these antiquated structures to prevent fires and other types of problems. With reference

in my neighborhood, there was significant San Jose police and San Jose fire department time spent on this property. I thank you, madam city manager, for the director of code enforcement and his staff to help out in my neighborhood. This ongoing request for security at water pollution control should not be underestimated. You have practically unlimited funding out there. You're losing police officers and security detachment from the city. It would behoove you to create a hybrid model or some kind of security model out there, Mr. Mayor. You should do this with great dispatch. The other thing I've heard, madam city manager-- I do not know if this is true-- is that I hear there may be a creation of a third deputy city manager. I don't know if that is true or not. But what I do not like, Mr. Mayor, categorically I do not like is a reduction of the attorney staff. And I don't understand why you don't protect the city more in that regard. Because without the attorney's help and the police, and you're losing both of them, to fund in theory one project, the Mexican heritage plaza, for 600,000 a year for three years, that, Mr. Mayor, is a reckless disregard--

>> Time is up. Martha O'Connell?

>> I'd like to talk on boards and commissions. Dennis again and art commission specifically. For those councilmembers who missed last week, I encourage you to read the transcript because it is ridiculous that the mayor had to engage this woman to talk about minutes about how they should be taken and the mayor finally said, why can't you just do it? And at that point she said, we're just going to do it, Mayor Reed. Absolutely. It's absurd. We have 43 board and commissions. I attend a whole lot of meetings. I think this council needs to take a look at which commissions are important and which commissions are taking action, and the arts commission has two subcommittees, Mr. City clerk, that meet twice a month, and they meet every month-- I'm sorry. Ten out of 12. And the senior commission is restricted to quarterly meetings for both our standard committees and subcommittees. Why I'm here is to say we're still waiting for the report, but I think there should be some kind of ranking and some kind of really looking at which commissions we want to invest precious time in. And I know nobody wants to be the bad guy. That's been the problem, in my opinion. If there's no need for a commission, get rid of it. If it's duplicating, get rid of it. If there's two commissions that should be combined, get rid of it. Save money but keep the commissions that we really need. And I would argue that one of those is the senior

commission, and I think it's appalling that the arts commission is meeting so frequently and the senior commission is not. Thank you.

>> Concludes the open forum. That concludes our meeting. We're adjourned.