

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.

>> Mayor Reed: For April 14th, 2010. Any changes to the agenda order that we need to take up? Nope. Okay. First thing will be to review the April 20th council meeting agenda. Anything on page 1? I'd just like to note that for next week I'd like to start talking about the ceremonial items and invocations just so we can find out what's going to happen, how long they're going to take, so we can squeeze them into the time frame that we have. I don't want to take those up today but if we could let councilmembers know that on next week's agenda we'd like to know who's going to speak, how many speakers, how long it's going to take, that kind of information, it will be useful to try to keep the ceremonials within the first half hour of the meeting, that would include the invocation too. Anything on page 2 or 3? Or 4 or 5? Requests to try to figure out when we might take up 4.1, the envision San José 2040, selection of preferred land use scenarios, I would suggest last on the agenda. My guess is, depending on what else is here, it's 3:00 or 3:30. But just put it last. That way people don't have to come at the beginning of the meeting because I think we'll have some interest in public testimony.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Time certain, there were people who wanted to attend.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else on 4 or 5? Page 6 or 7, I have a question about 7.3, the plant master plan update for April 2010, and do we really need a presentation on that? Because it's -- we have had other preliminary presentations, and this is not anywhere near the final of the work on it. I don't know if the committee, this went to transportation and environment committee, so some of us have already heard it. I just don't know why it's up for a presentation to the council. And how long that might take.

>> We can redistribute it as an information memo if that's the preference of the committee. It's already been out there was a committee --

>> Mayor Reed: Right. But I just don't think -- I don't feel the need to have a PowerPoint presentation explaining what it's all about. That's already been done. Unless the council asked for this to come back which I don't remember.

>> City Manager Figone: Mr. Mayor, we could also just put it on consent if that makes more sense.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, let's do that if any councilmembers have any questions about it, it will be there, but we're still a couple of years away from making decisions based on what I know bit. Anything else on 6 or 7, page 8 or 9, are the joint city council financing authority redevelopment agency agenda, the trifecta, all three agencies relating to commercial paper program and the other things we have to do to pay the state the \$62 million which is due on May 10th. I have some requests for additions, anything on page 10 I guess was the other page. Some requests for additions, a proclamation for earth day, commendation to Monsignor Boyle for his lifetime commitment to social justice, in addition to appoint Councilmember Oliverio and myself to the Diridon joint policy advisory board and those are the written requests. Any others for additions or changes?

>> There was the one that was deferred yesterday, the PDO/PIO.

>> Mayor Reed: We did have a deferral for one week to articulate about the in lieu fees for park land dedication.

>> Lee Price: That will show up on your amended this week.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else? I guess we'll take a motion. Motion is to approve as amended. All in favor? Opposed, none opposed, that's approved. We will turn to the April 27th agenda, anything on page 1? Or Page 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5? Page 6 or 7? I had one comments on 7.2 the status report on cooperative efforts between the city and the Santa Clara Valley water conflict. We have a whole bunch of things to be covered, I know there will be some specific council interest in the trail issues which is on the list to be discussed, but we always tend to have questions about that every time we deal with the Water District so I'm sure --

>> City Manager Figone: Mr. Mayor, if I could just remind the committee that I believe that is the same day that it will be heard at the Water District or in close proximity to the council's hearing it so the staffs will be both at the board discussion and as well as the council discussion.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, anything else on 6 or 7? Page 8 or 9 which are the general plan hearings and land use hearings? Or page 10 or 11? Some requests for additions, a commendation to granger company, for helping local businesses, commendation to Bill Wilson center, some excused absence requests, one for Councilmember Campos due to a trip to Washington, Councilmember Chu due to illness on April 12th. Councilmember Chu, community budget meeting in San José. Request for excused absence from the Public Safety finance and strategic support meeting, April 14th, that must be the evening meeting, because the budget meeting is in the evening. Any further requests for additions or changes? Motion is to approve. All in favor? Opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Taking us to the redevelopment agency agenda for April 20th. Anything on page 1? Page 2 or 3? That's it. Any other addition or corrections?

>> Mr. Mayor, there are no additions just the two items that were deferred from yesterday's meeting to this date.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Move for approval move approval.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve, all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. April 27th agenda, anything on page 1, page 2 or 3, or 4? The item 8.2 is the issuance of the redevelopment project revenue bonds.

>> Mr. Mayor, I'm sorry. We may have a different copy. There's only the single item under the joint section 8.1 which is the approval for purchase and sale agreement for the Acatee properties. There was an earlier version that had an 8.2, but that item is being moved out one week so we can prepare all legal documents.

>> Mayor Reed: Any other changes? None?

>> Councilmember Pyle: Move approval.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Next item is legislative update State of California. We have a recommendation on proposition 16.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the committee Betsy Shotwell director of Intergovernmental Relations. You have before you a request to -- staff request to oppose proposition 16, and for the record, that has been retitled by the attorney general's office which would impose new two-thirds voter approval requirement for local public electricity providers. This is -- this would be an amendment to the state constitution to require local governments. Whether they were starting new electricity services, expanding electricity services, on going into what is known as community choice aggregation efforts to buy power at wholesale rates. It is on the June ballot and again the request is for the city to oppose, and I'm here to answer any questions that you might have.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I would like to move disapproval, force PG&E to disclose who's advertising on television. I've seen tear ads and there's no indication who's funding it.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Would second it.

>> Betsy Shotwell: A bill idea for 2011? The whole issue of mailers slate mailers of course has been batted around in Sacramento for a quarter of a 03 and it's a dilemma where independent committees can spend moneys and have titles that are misleading or insignificant.

>> Mayor Reed: My guess if you look at those commercials there's some fine print somewhere that's so small you can't possibly read it.

>> Councilmember Chirco: That's probably my bifocals.

>> Mayor Reed: That does some kind of a disclosure, and it takes about that long on the screen.

>> Councilmember Chirco: That long? I thought it was quicker.

>> Mayor Reed: I haven't studied it, but I know there are disclosure rules at some times that are observed in the breach but that's certainly a state regulatory matter. I had just a couple of questions. First, in case anybody gets any ideas, we're not going into the municipal electricity business. That has nothing to do with anything we're planning either in our Green Vision or any other thing so this doesn't affect anything we're trying to do because we're not trying to get into the electricity business. The time to do that was 100 years ago when Santa Clara got into it. I don't think is a good time now but we're not doing anything in case anybody thinks this has some connection to anything we're planning. I do have some concern about the scope, if approved, of this with regard to our smart grid efforts, and I've been told that it's PG&E's position that it wouldn't affect what we're trying to do with our energy improvement districts and other ways to do things. That might be an independent reason not to be supportive of this. But as I understand it it's really about local control.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: And once again we have the state of California tell us what we can or cannot do and that's really I think the reason most of the local governments have signed on in opposition to this. Any further discussion on this? We have a motion to approve the recommendation.

>> Councilmember Chirco: And the motion does include the one week turn around.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Next week's council agenda. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you very much. And I am working on a federal report with Patton Boggs which I will be bringing to the Rules Committee very soon, where we are in April, with the second year of the two-year session in congress.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you. On the state level, I did look at the controller's web page yesterday and looked at the breakdown of the changes in revenue projections at the state. The only real good news is it's a little bit positive instead of a little bit negative.

>> Betsy Shotwell: That's true.

>> Mayor Reed: Even though its projections weren't very much to begin with. So better than bad news but it's clearly not going to solve the state's budget problems.

>> Betsy Shotwell: That's true. I know the estimates in property -- excuse me corporate tax sales tax and personal income taxes are higher than expected, but they of course were projections from last year. So last year we all know, fully, how things were going. And we're in a different year. But it is a few billion dollars more than they anticipated last year, but it still remains to be seen what the state will be receiving in the next two or three weeks and it's going to be very critical.

>> Mayor Reed: At least it's the first time I think in two if not three years, when the projections are not as good as the revenue, because every time we looked at it over the past couple of years the projections were way more optimistic than revenue. So I don't know if the state is doing a better job of projections perhaps or maybe the economy is getting a little bit better but it's only a couple of billion dollars out of a projection next year of 18 or \$20 billion gap so I think we can expect them to continue to look at local government revenues as a sort of funding for state level. So Roxann will not be out of work for a while.

>> Betsy Shotwell: No. Okay.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else? One more question.

>> Councilmember Pyle: If this is going to be fair, I'll back off but have you heard anything from Patton Boggs in reference to the VAT tax?

>> Betsy Shotwell: I can check into that. I know I saw a headline to that effect some --

>> Councilmember Pyle: It was over the weekend I think.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yeah, over the weekend, that it's coming whether you like it or not. It was some op ed piece. Let me check on that and see if that has any legs, if not this year, then perhaps next year.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Appreciate that, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: That includes the legislative update. Next thing is the public record. Anything on the public record that the committee wants to pull for discussion? Item I, which is a letter from the association of retired San José police officers and firefighters, it recommends that we take a look at doing -- on medical benefits that one of the auditors recommendation of offering retirees a chance to take payment in lieu of insurance might save some money. And I know that we are already aware of that since the auditor had it in the report. I assume that that, all of that discussion would be contended upon the bargaining units being willing to talk about the retirement benefits as early as January perhaps.

>> City Manager Figone: Yes, and it is on our list. And what I would need to confirm is whether or not we could just proceed with the retirees or if we do have to go through the bargaining units. My sense is probably the latter, but we will take this as a referral, and just confirm with the council the appropriate level of travel.

>> Mayor Reed: We do appreciate the suggestions that we're getting from place like that. Anything else in the public record anybody else wants to talk about?

>> Councilmember Chirco: I don't see anything. Move to note and file.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to note and file. All in favor? Opposed, none opposed, so ordered. Next item, is regarding donation of two surplus fire vehicles under council policy 1-20 to initiate the notification and outreach process in order to ultimately be able to donate two vehicles. Cumulative estimated value of \$5,250. Sounds like they're pretty worn out at that price tag.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Move approval.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion to approve. Do we have any cards on that one? I don't know if the cards are for other items, okay. I do want to make sure the staff is in contact with the people who have in the past been interested in the surplus vehicles. I can remember spring valley and metro ed I think got some. They probably don't need anymore. I know that there are other volunteer fire departments that may have an interest in it. Like I think Uvas and Loma Prieta. I don't know how the notification outreach process will work but volunteer fire departments ought to be a category in which we're trying to reach people. Anything else? Nancy.

>> Councilmember Pyle: I just -- may sound like a silly question but I notice one of the mileage on at least one of the vehicles is 135,000. How does it track with fire engines, in reference to life of the vehicle?

>> Mayor Reed: Come on up to the microphone.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And that would directly affect the other station being requested.

>> Sure. My name is Robert Culver, I'm the captain for the San José fire department that manages the apparatus program. And the way that mileage is tracked for our engines in particular is a combination, the total mileage component is a combination of both the road miles and also a component of what the engine hours are. And the engine hours relate directly to how long the pump is operated. You could potentially put an engine in park, run the

pump all night long, and you have that different wear component on the engine. So the total useful mileage calculation calculation is your road miles plus 31 miles per every pump hour that's on the engine.

>> Councilmember Pyle: So it's, the 135 is effectually much higher?

>> Well, on this record, this is probably just the road miles on this particular apparatus. And the reason I say that is because all of these 1990s and 1986s and 1988s that you see they haven't been -- the pump hasn't been factored into the road miles. The newer apparatus actually convert the pump miles into road miles on the odometer as it rolls. On these older apparatus they've had replacements so it's proper higher than this.

>> Councilmember Pyle: But as far as getting the vehicle into condition where they could be used, is it -- is it costing more to fix that be --

>> It is in this case in fact in this case with these two apparatus us, there are two issues, the fact is they're mechanically obsolete. There's extensive repairs on both apparatus that both approach, meet or exceed the total value of the apparatus. That's the first thing. But in terms for the other volunteer departments like UVIS or any other volunteer departments, they are also operationally obsolete for a couple of reasons. The first that they have there's a safety obsolescence component. They have open cabs and there was a standard passed in 1991 that doesn't allow you to build apparatus with open cabs past that date, and these are 1990, the most recent of them. So you would probably have less success recruiting volunteer fire departments to take these on as operational pieces of equipment.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, appreciate that.

>> Mayor Reed: They're old enough to be potential museum pieces. They're both 20 years old or older.

>> They certainly are, and we have some representatives from the fire museum to speak their historical value. But from our perspective they also represent a generation of apparatus from that era, that's why they're valuable that way.

>> Mayor Reed: Judy.

>> Councilmember Chirco: As a matter of fact, I just had a question about the letter from the fire museum. I don't know if this question would go to Rick or to Lee. I know we redid the policy on donations of equipment. And I can't remember if there was a strategy for donations to the fire museum, or if it was just to agencies. I can't remember that.

>> City Attorney Doyle: I think Mark, you're here on this issue, and it really is administered staff level and he can probably best tell you the -- how was this policy, it was amended, it was amended to get a clear protocol but the application or our implementation is done at staff level.

>> Mark Giovannetti from finance purchasing. The policy states that priority -- and let me know if this doesn't answer your question, I believe this will answer your question -- should be given to organizations on the basis of how likely the donation of surplus personal property will benefit city residents. It goes on to say a general preference should be given to governmental agencies and volunteer fire departments over nonprofit organizations.

>> Mayor Reed: Given the state of these vehicles, fire museum people might be first in line. Given their age and conditions.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Will that all come back to the council? When these piece of apparatus have gone through the process of how to dispose of them?

>> Yes, comes back to the council per the policy.

>> City Manager Figone: So my assumption if I can jump in mayor, Mark, is that the fire museum will be put on the outreach list with the other agencies that we would typically outreach to and be factored in, based on the responses that we get and the policy criteria, correct?

>> That's correct.

>> Councilmember Pyle: That's the answer I was looking for. Thank you. I wasn't framing my question very well.

>> Mayor Reed: City Manager has had a lot of experience trying to figure out what question we're asking.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Helpful.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else on that? We have a motion to approve, all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Item number 2 is, request to -- memo from Councilmember Liccardo and Oliverio to approve negotiations to meet with Sobrato organizations regarding suspension of some portion of its park land in lieu fee obligation from the Campbell Avenue development. There are a couple of people who want to speak on that, see if there questions from committee first. Judy.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I didn't necessarily think this was a bad idea. I was more concerned bit being a precedent. Because the only fund we have for capital purchase is the PDO/PIO to the best of my knowledge. And I know there's a nexus between development and park area. And my concern was, does this in any way, one, is it a precedent on how we begin to look at maintenance of parks? But which I'm not against but I also know, and especially going through the general plan process, what a shortage of open space, park land we're going to have. And if this becomes a strategy to maintain them, how do we protect the ability to build additional parks? So I was just wondering if this might be more appropriately sent to a committee so that there can be some discussion, at like the NS & E before it comes to council.

>> Mayor Reed: I think we ought to at least refer it to City Attorney and let him bring it back to us and figure out -

>> City Attorney Doyle: Vice Mayor, just briefly, the PDO, the Quimby act which is state law sets forth restrictions on use of park fees. And this approach is to try find or to provide for essentially what would be some kind of relief from the total park fees, whether it's -- we do have some incentive programs with respect to we don't -- we charge now 50% for properties for affordable housing units. Downtown development has a lesser amount, and try to come up with some creative way to maybe take into account lessening that burden, if we get a maintenance agreement of some term, where the city gets that benefit. It's really try to accomplish building a park and maintaining the park. So there are some legal issues associated with that and we could certainly bring it back to the committee the if the Rules Committee wants a presentation, it's your call as to how you approach it.

>> Mayor Reed: Why don't you come back here and if we want to send it to the neighborhoods services committee, there may be.

>> Councilmember Chirco: We could do so without running afoul of the Quimby act but I'd like a more thorough explanation of that.

>> City Attorney Doyle: We do have C&C tax moneys that help pay for parks so there's a third source, but this is really our principal source.

>> Councilmember Pyle: I attend -- I agree with Judy and the other component that it really doesn't set well with me is not less than 20 years. What happens at the end of the 20th -- we won't be around to worry about it but -- I don't know. A specific time frame is somewhat problematic and so maybe that could be worked out.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Yeah, those are policy questions that you need to reconcile.

>> Councilmember Pyle: .

>> Mayor Reed: Okay so shall we send this to City Attorney to bring it back to us? Back to Rules?

>> Councilmember Chirco: How long for public comment?

>> City Attorney Doyle: At least a incumbent of weeks, bring it back by either may, it's mid April, so early May.

>> Mayor Reed: We'll take public comment until we decide what to do. Robin Reynolds and Lisa Charcontier.

>> Thank you, Mayor Reed. Councilmembers, staff, my name is Robin Reynolds. 1140 Sherwood avenue in the Newhall neighborhood association and representing the neighborhood. We appreciate the work that's been put forth come up with creative financing of the proposed Newhall park. Campbell avenue has undergone great development with Pulte, two Robson homes, a Sobrato development that have doubled the population in the Newhall neighborhood area. And there's more to be built there. There is not space to basically add more park land, other than the one spot that is cleared and growing weeds, and it's a great opportunity, both councilman Oliverio and Councilmember Liccardo has worked great with the neighborhood to try and come up with a way to get this park through. So we appreciate the work by staff and we support the plan as far as being able to fund it, during this budget crunch time, without extending an overdue burden on the city. So we appreciate your time and we appreciate this idea and we look forward to it helping the park move forward. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Just one of the park users.

>> Mayor Reed: Potential park user.

>> This is one of your future park users asleep on my shoulder. My name is Lisa Charpontier, and I also live in the Newhall neighborhood. I was part of the committee that was designing the park. We worked on the design of the park in collaboration with the city for two to three years. Neighborhood was extremely involved, we were extremely excited about this project. And just when it came time, we're actually in the CD phase right now just working out the final details, so literally as councilmembers Liccardo and Pierluigi Oliverio said, shovel-ready. We appreciate the work they put, it's really been a collaborative effort all the time. When news came that the park might not be able to be built on schedule, everybody was disappointed but we worked together. We understand the City's problem, we understand that everybody has financial hardships right now and we just ask them please can we work together and find a creative solution to this problem. When this topic right here, that we're discussing on the agenda, came up, Sam Liccardo was concerned that it might set a precedent, as you two ladies have suggested. And so he talked with an attorney, I'm not sure if it was the City Attorney or another attorney, before he even wanted to present it any further. And so I'm imagining that his conversation gave some hope to making this work out. And as far as setting a precedent, I don't know if maybe presenting it in a way that it could set a precedent for solving problems, as opposed to setting a precedent for losing park land. So if we could look at it that way we'd really appreciate it. The nearest park to our neighborhood right now is a 45-minute walk so basically most families get in their car and they have to go to the park if they want to. There's a lot of children in our neighborhood. And there's a lot of people who are new residents in our park who -- I'm sorry about that -- who don't --

>> Mayor Reed: Sorry, your time is up. Staff will take that microphone so you don't have to figure out how to --

>> Okay, thank you very much.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes the public testimony on this item.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I'd make a motion to bring it back to Rules after the attorney gets a chance to look at it.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to send it to the attorney and bring it back to Rules and then we'll decide if it needs to go to a committee or the council. All in favor? Opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Next item is the auditor's office monthly report of activities for March 2010.

>> Sharon Erickson: Sharon Erickson City Auditor. You have before you our report. We issued three reports during the month of March. You have them listed on your copy. It is semi annual follow up report on outstanding audit recommendations. We did try in this report to put out in any potential budget impacts early in the process this time. We also issued a verification of performance costs of the sewer line cleaning program and review of community center staffing. I did want to alert you that the office won the silver knighten award, we got beat out by Long Beach, from the association of local government auditors for our audit of pensionable earnings and time reporting. We have also issued the RFP for external audit services for the City's annual financial statements. The results of that should be released soon. We're hoping to go to the city council and redevelopment agency boards on May 4th. Finally we hired Kenny Ramirez as a volunteer student intern. He's a native San Joséan. It is a program through the University of Santa Cruz, where he's a student and actually getting course credit for working in our office which we think is a great great thing. Assignments in office include two reports that are going to the Public Safety committee tomorrow, that's the City's licensing and permitting of card room owners and employees and then the airport park management agreement audit. The last thing I wanted to alert you to is our annual financial scan of community based organizations is progressing, there are 30 organizations on the list so you can imagine it's a little bit of a anchor to get everybody all onto the same page. We are still hoping to issue that report in April so that you have it prior to any budget consideration. However we may be back to you on May 5th to the Rules Committee to submit that instead of the last meeting in April. Just to give us a little more time to make sure the organizations have time to review what we're going to say about them before it goes public. And with that I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> Mayor Reed: Questions, Nancy?

>> Councilmember Pyle: I don't really have a question. I would just like to tell you I have read the audits that you put out from cover to cover. I enjoyed it. I never thought I'd enjoy reading about an audit. It's done with such great graphics, it's very easy to understand. It's crystal clear and I think you're to be commended for all the hard work that your team has been doing. They seem to have a good time together, too.

>> Sharon Erickson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Pyle: They're high spirits and they're real go getters, really creative ideas as well, so thank you for that.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else?

>> Councilmember Chirco: I would move to approve the auditor's monthly report.

>> Mayor Reed: All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Next we have requests to approve a district 9 sponsorship of a reception honoring historic landmarks commission photo contest as a city council sponsored special event, and to approve a district 8 senior health fair event as a City council sponsored special event. I think we can take both of those up at the same time. Any questions or comments? Those are all -- they come to us we have a policy, we're just following the policy.

>> Lee Price: Dennis Hawkins is here, if you have any questions, otherwise we just appreciate your support.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I would move to approve both item 4 and 5.

>> Councilmember Pyle: I second that enthusiastically, and want to say there's been quite a lot of excitement stirred up, especially over the photo contest. So congratulations, Judy.

>> Councilmember Chirco: And that's to the historical commission, and it was their idea, and I think it's a fantastic concept.

>> Mayor Reed: I do have a question about the policy, we've been doing this for a while. I was wondering if the City Clerk, either Lee or Dennis, have any comments about how the policy's working, whether we're having trouble with implementation, council offices following the rules or anything that you might want to take another look at the policy or fix anything?

>> Lee Price: I'll let Dennis answer the question.

>> Thank you Mr. Mayor, Dennis Hawkins assistant City Clerk. We're actually working with the administration and the attorney's office in bringing forward some recommendations on a new special events policy which will update the practices and as well as clarify some of the costs and benefits of special events. That should be coming to the committee shortly.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. We have a motion to approve both of these items. All in favor? Opposed? None opposed, those are approved. We have nothing under the other items, or standing items, so we will move to open forum. David Wall.

>> David Wall: I'm just here today to first of all thank fire station number 1. This Friday we had a unique situation in the neighborhood, with a landowner, property owner who's translated his house into an illegal boardinghouse. We had first three San José police officers there Friday night to do welfare check on the residents. Around 11:30 at night we had three fire engines and a battalion chief there. For an alleged dispute concerning a falsely reported gas leak. The next night, the same incident again. It gets to the issue of what would be the City's deterrence for property owners, because of whatever reason that they want to make a profit off of a residential house, to create a boardinghouse, in this particular case, a duplex is taken out, interior wise, rooms are created for the express purposes of making money for a business enterprise with no permits, no business license, nothing, and yet tremendous assets from the city are being diverted to this particular residential property, at a loss to the city, and potential conflagrations and all sorts of other problems. So I think you should discuss this in your own time and place, on how you will want to pursue this as far as creating a level of deterrence. That is significant to deter, not to just Band-Aid the problem and just pass it on to the next generation of councilmembers. Other than that, we see the effects of wearing a shirt and tie, with Councilmember Constant yesterday. He's not with us.

>> Mayor Reed: It's the weight loss.

>> David Wall: I keep thinking it's --

>> Mayor Reed: He's actually here.

>> David Wall: Bib overalls.

>> Councilmember Chirco: It's the tie.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes our meeting.