

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.

City of San José Rules and Open Government Committee meeting.

>> Mayor Reed: Call the meeting to order. This is Rules and Open Government Committee meeting for February 17th. Any changes to our agenda order that we need to consider? No? All right, we will start with first item on the agenda, which is to review the February 23rd council meeting agenda. Anything on page 1? Page 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5? Page 6 or 7? Page 8 or 9? I have a --

>> Excuse me mayor. On item 3.2, the first quarter revenue collection strategic plan report, we are requesting deferral to March 9th on that item. Staff is preparing a supplemental report.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Anything else on page 8 or 9? We have the sign code ordinance update to kick another week, as we wanted to make -- this is going to be a busy agenda as it is. So that goes to March 3rd. Anything on page 10 or 11? Page 12 or 13? I'd recommend we have 11.3, the general plan amended request to change which is on for an early now, we ought to have that last, try to get the other things out of the way, I think we might get a crowd on that one. Get these other minor ones done. Anything else on 12 or 13 or 14, 15 is the joint financing authority, redevelopment agency, city council, the trifecta of the organizations, all three, supplemental education revenue augmentation fund financing plan to be heard concurrently with the redevelopment agency budget items. That's how we are hoping to finance the state take away of our redevelopment funds. So let me figure out how we hear all of the redevelopment stuff in what sequence. Because we have the redevelopment agency budget, we have the report on the convention center, the report on the CraF thing. Anything else? And the parking thing, we ought to hear those more or less at the same time. And hear them all before we approve the budget.

>> Right.

>> Mayor Reed: I think.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Yes, two of those are loans to the agency. They're part of the budget.

>> Mayor Reed: So whatever sequence we need to do those, I don't think it matters whether we do parking or convention center or CRAF first, second or third, but they all need to be done before the budget.

>> That's what we had discussed, we would go through the agenda in the current order, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, and then take the financing authority and then the RDA budget.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, that seems to work, get that all done before 7:00. Right?

>> Hopefully.

>> Mayor Reed: Right, because we have a 7:00 meeting.

>> City Attorney Doyle: I'll be ready to go.

>> Mayor Reed: I have a couple of requests for additions, commendations for Hartfield and Lembeck school students for being semi finalists and finalists in the 2010 Intel science talent search and presentation of commendation to LYCP for being civil rights organization for a long, long time, over a hundred years. Any other requests for additions? Those are both ceremonial items, one in the evening, one in the afternoon.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Move to approve.

>> Councilmember Constant: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve with the additions and the changes.

>> Abi Magamfar: Mr. Mayor, just to clarify as far as order of things are concerned, just when we go to redevelopment, we will hear 9.1, 9.29.3 and financing authority then we'll go back to the other items on the RDA agenda.

>> Mayor Reed: There are two or three other items after the budget gets approved.

>> Abi Magamfar: Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: All right, did I call -- did I get the vote on that? I can't remember. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved with the changes. Taking us to March 2nd draft agenda. Anything on page 1? Page 2 or 3? Item 2.5, report on open government initiatives, I think we circulate just put that with the other sunshine reform initiatives that we're going to be talking about anyway, and we'll either talk about this or not. Might as well take them all up at the same time in the 3s or wherever those others are. And on 3.4, actions related to card room ballot measures we'll probably have a sunshine waiver on that by the time we get ought the memos out, but we can do that next week.

>> We actually are planning on releasing this by February 23rd, which if we come back for the final approval on March 9th we'll have enough sunshine on that item.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Yeah, I think Mr. Mayor, that while it's agendized calling for the general election, I think that probably will be taken on the 9th. I think this is probably more of a first discussion but you'll

have that option. Either that or we can work with the language, just to leave it at a discussion and then plan to come back on the 9th calling for the election.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, well if we need to do a sunshine waiver we'll do that next week, right?

>> City Attorney Doyle: Right.

>> Mayor Reed: After we know when the memos will be out and what the schedule looks like then we can do that. Anything else on 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5? See we have our sign code ordinance update to be heard last, again as we have in the past, hopefully we can get through the rest of the sign code stuff in this meeting. Anything else on page 4 or 5? Or page 6? Short agenda but we have a couple hours of sign ordinance built in there. So there will be plenty of work to do. And I have a request to add a memo from me on the 2010-2011 clean tech legislative agenda. For March 2nd, and that memo will be out by Friday, so that will be -- that will hit the ten days. Request to add a commendation for Mi pueblo foods for raising money for the Haiti relief efforts. Any other changes or additions?

>> Councilmember Chirco: I just had a question. There was a note on 7.1, I guess during the Rules briefing there was a question, why isn't that going to the committee first? Question from D-3, district 3.

>> Ed Shikada: Perhaps I could lend a perspective. I believe this is our third, could it be, third annual report on the green vision update, and it's typically gone directly to council. I think part of issue here is that it really spans multiple committees while Green Vision is at its core an environmental program. It's also economic development, and we weave in many other dimension of the city's ongoing activities.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Thank you. It was a question that was noted and thank you for the response.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else?

>> Councilmember Pyle: Move to approve.

>> Councilmember Constant: second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve as amended. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Redevelopment agency agenda February 23rd. Anything on page 1? Page 2 or 3? Or page 4 which is the only thing on that one is the budget item which we've already talked about so in the sequence that we just discussed when we get the redevelopment agency agenda we would just take the budget and then come back and take these other items.

>> Abi Magamfar: That's correct.

>> Mayor Reed: Still works? Okay. A request for modification on the language for the description of the budget item, 8.1. To add --

>> Mr. Mayor --

>> Mayor Reed: You can tell me what the change is.

>> The only change for the agency apples budget item on the paragraph, we're adding the 2009-10 co-op agreement for operating expenses. We had the merged area but not the operating. And due to the reduction in rental payments, we need to amend that operating expenses agreement.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, any other changes?

>> Councilmember Constant: Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve as amended. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. March 2nd, draft agenda for the redevelopment agency. March 2nd, do we have a draft?

>> I'm sorry, the agency doesn't have any items at this time scheduled for March 2nd. If it remains that way we'll cancel March 2nd redevelopment agency meeting at next week's Rules and Open Government Committee meeting.

>> Mayor Reed: All right. Did we do anything else with times on the meeting? I don't think so. Nothing on upcoming study session agendas. Legislative update. State update. Betsy Shotwell is here.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the committee, Betsy Shotwell, director of Intergovernmental Relations. You have before you a recommendation to support a measure that is currently in circulation targeted for the November 2010 ballot. It would if it passed approved by the voters, close loopholes and prevent the state from taking local government funding including redevelopment, transportation funding and infrastructure funding that we're desperately in need of protecting. I was also asked to include in the memo some references to some other measures that are out there or floating or you may have heard of. I wanted to update the committee that the repair California leadership on Friday, which is the measure that would be calling the voters to approve a constitutional convention, they had disclosed on Friday that they don't believe they'll be able to move forward due to lack of funding. I read

one quote they need \$3 million by March 1st to continue the circulation for signature. To keep you up to speed and up to date this was finalized before that news broke on Friday. So ...

>> Mayor Reed: What about the California forward matters, the governor was pushing at least some of their initiatives trying to get the legislature to put them on. Last time I talked to the governor he said the legislature had not responded to his request to have them move through the legislature so I'm guessing that's still the case?

>> Betsy Shotwell: Absolutely. They're in play but I don't see them having the votes to move through the legislature their issues.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, Councilmember Chu, you want to speak to this, this is the league of California cities initiative.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you mayor and my colleagues under the Rules Committee. I just wanted to briefly report that I attended the league of California board meeting last week and the board had adopted a strategic goal for the 2010, which is very much in line with our priority, the first one is to protect local control and funding for the vital local services. The second one is support reform of structure, governance, management and finance of the state government, and the third is to promote economic stimulus, infrastructure investment and business development and job creation. So it's very much in line with our San José city's priority. And compared with other initiatives, like best management that this one put forward by the league of cities is definitely more focused on protecting the local funding for the local vital services. So encourage, respectfully encourage you to accept the staff recommendation and I also want to have a shout-out for Betsy and our lobbyist Roxann Miller working really, really hard in Sacramento so thank you very much.

>> Mayor Reed: I had a question about how this proposition, if it were in place, would relate to the governor's proposal around public transit funds which was to decrease one category and increase the other category that's not prop 42.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Well in would not allow that to happen. This would keep proposition 42's constitutional protection in play. Also this goes back if it's enacted to actions since last October. Other measures start after November election. This would go back to October if this measure passed.

>> Councilmember Chu: And if I may add Mayor, I think we also have the future protection. So in other words, if later on, they changed the funding for prop 42, and this restriction will carry with it funding.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. It's my experience that trying to deal with the legislature on these kinds of things is like trying to tie up Houdini. He'll stand there and you'll tie ropes around him all day long but somehow, he figures a way to get out. So we know that everything we do is temporary when it comes to state legislature, because they get to make the laws, but we at least need to take the temporary action that we can take to protect our local revenue sources and we'll worry about how they figure out of the box, next year, or the year after. Whenever that may come up. Other comments or questions? Councilmember Pyle.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you. I'd like to refer to page 3. With the key provisions of the measure. And I'm looking toward the last set of boxes. If the court finds the state has taken funds illegally, and now when you say court I'm assuming we're talking about the state Supreme Court or which court? Any court?

>> City Attorney Doyle: Whatever court had jurisdiction, it would start in the superior court. But I think you'd expect it to go to the Supreme Court for final decision.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Okay, that could be quite time consuming. Has taken funds illegally, repayment is continuously appropriated to repay amount taken illegally. What is the time limit on that? In other words, it's going to take a while to work through the courts. And here's what I'm fearful of, that they can say, okay, we need to take this money and then just as it's time for the time limit to put in place then they'll pay it back. In other words, it's a potential possibility that they could borrow funds for a year at a time and still be able to get away with it. It seems that we would need some kind of a time limit there.

>> Betsy Shotwell: It says continuously appropriated. I don't have the measure right in front of me. But my first reading is it's continuously appropriated, and that it wouldn't be held sort of in abeyance, maybe have to defer to it.

>> City Attorney Doyle: I think we'll have that answer to council if this gets referred to council because there's -- it gets back to the Houdini issue. The legislature if they decide not to do something, then you have another battle on your hands.

>> Councilmember Pyle: But this would be going before the voters, would it not? Yeah. So that was -- it's my question. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Vice Mayor.

>> Councilmember Chirco: While I agree with the mayor that you tie one hand behind their back they will find another hand, I will move approval because I think we need to move in this direction.

>> Councilmember Constant: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion would approve the recommendation, that would include getting on the council agenda for the 23rd.

>> Councilmember Chirco: That would be the waiver of sunshine. A one week turn around.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Yeah one week --

>> Mayor Reed: We've already covered the sunshine period.

>> Councilmember Constant: We recommend they change the ballot title to "keep your hands off our money act."

>> Mayor Reed: Probably can recommending that but it's too late. It is what it is. Any further discussion on that? All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you. One question before you go Betsy and that's for you or Councilmember Pyle, you took the delegation and went to Sacramento last week. I think we're going to have a standing item on our council agenda but we don't have it there yet, for reports or trip reports so I don't know if you want to do that here, or at the council meeting, or on the trip to Sacramento report.

>> Councilmember Pyle: What I'd like to do is do it before the whole council next week if I may or whatever week would be appropriate.

>> Mayor Reed: Why don't we, you could do that report as part of this item couldn't you? We're talking about the state or do we need a separately agendized --

>> City Attorney Doyle: You could weave it in in terms of the conversation you've in about not taking our money but otherwise it should be a standing item.

>> Mayor Reed: Under item H-1 the recommendation is to add a standing item to the council's consent calendar to allow verbal written trip report. Can't we just add one?

>> City Attorney Doyle: You can add it to the agenda, yes.

>> Mayor Reed: For next week?

>> Lee Price: Or for March 2nd. We'd have plenty of time to do it for March 2nd.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Or you could do it for this one. If the committee wants to add it. It's an oral report.

>> Mayor Reed: When would you like to add it?

>> Councilmember Pyle: March 2nd. It doesn't matter to me when we could get it together.

>> Mayor Reed: Let's make it March 2nd.

>> Betsy Shotwell: And if I could add, I'm finalizing an info memo on the trip which will summarize the meetings as well as have the attachments that were shared for the state delegation.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, March 2nd is probably a better time. I think that's it on the legislative update. Nothing on federal. Nothing on our meeting schedules. Public record, anything in the public record the committee wants to pull for discussion?

>> Councilmember Constant: Move to note and file.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to note and file. Just one comment. We do have a Santa Clara County cities association letter to me, that I assume the ESD staff will pick up on the single use carryout bags. All in favor? Opposed, none opposed, those are noted and filed. We have appointments to boards commissions and committees. We deferred last week making the decision between Nathaniel Montgomery and Patty Brooks basically for the one sheet that's open on the project diversity screening committee so we need to make a recommendation on that and move that on to the council agenda. We did approve and pass on to the council some other seats, which there was no competition I guess, because they were my recommendations.

>> That's right.

>> Mayor Reed: This is a spot for councilmembers collectively and we have two recommendations. Councilmember Constant.

>> Councilmember Constant: Well, since one of them's my recommendation I'll start there. I recommended Patty Brooks to be appointed to the project diversity screening committee. She is arguably one of our most active community members in District 1. Most active community members in district 1. She has been involved everywhere from forming a neighborhood organization to be an active

participant on our leadership organization. Has gone on to create a mentorship program in our district to help other neighborhood associations get up to speed. She has done just years and years of great work in District 1. I think she'd be a very valuable asset to the screening committee.

>> Mayor Reed: I had a question about Nathaniel Montgomery. Does he currently serve on a commission already?

>> Lee Price: No, he does not.

>> Mayor Reed: Got him confused with somebody else. Vice Mayor.

>> Councilmember Chirco: To the City Clerk, can you tell us the makeup of the project diversity committee?

>> Lee Price: Yes, Mr. Mayor. In terms of representation from the various districts, we currently have representation from all districts, but District 1, if I have the latest roster in front of me. The Patty Brooks, Councilmember Constant's nominee, is from District 1. Nathaniel Montgomery is from district 6. We do currently have a District 6 representative. In fact TTY's chair, Rick Partridge. Although it's not necessarily a requirement, I'm just letting you know from a quick look at the roster we have a pretty good representation citywide.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Then I would move Councilmember Constant's recommendation based on two good people, and to have it as citywide as possible.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Councilmember Constant: Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve appointment of Patty Brooks to the project diversity screening committee for the term ending December 31st, 2011. Further comments on that?

>> Lee Price: May we also request a one week turn around to put this on the 23rd so we can add this to consent.

>> Mayor Reed: Right.

>> Lee Price: We do indeed. I will have one more reappointment to bring back next week and then we will have the full project diversity screening committee up and running and they're ready to do their work next month.

>> Mayor Reed: All right. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, Patty Brooks is approved. Next appointment is approval of Johnny Khamis to the small business development commission.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Constant: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Any other comments? All in favor, opposed.

>> Lee Price: May I move that forward too as well? Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: That will go on the agenda for the 23rd. That's approved. Item H-1, just talked about this adding a standing item, a recommendation to add a standing item under our consent calendar at the council meeting so we can get written or verbal trip reports from mayor or councilmembers who go on either city paid for travel or city authorized travel even though somebody else is paying for it so there's a chance to report. We have existing reporting obligation under our travel policy but we don't have a way to do it at the council agenda other than just filing a report with the clerk.

>> Councilmember Constant: Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. So we could probably start that on March 2nd with the trip report we already talked about. Next item is a request to approve the designation of a District 5 opening reception for Bittersweet harvest, the Bracero program, as a special -- as a city council sponsored special event.

>> Councilmember Constant: Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion to approve, all in favor post office none opposed, that's approved. Third item is to accept the status update on Green Vision related participation and solicitation of proposals for future participation.

>> Ed Shikada: Mr. Mayor, I'll give a brief overview of that. If that would be okay.

>> Mayor Reed: Yes, go ahead.

>> Ed Shikada: In fact, I think there may be some value in just double checking on copies that were made as part of this package. I believe we had an issue with copying every other page in your package. So I believe there was an addition of distributions that were made.

>> Councilmember Constant: No wonder that didn't make any sense.

>> Ed Shikada: Mate even less sense than normal in this copying.

>> Mayor Reed: I thought it was a summary.

>> Ed Shikada: That too. If I can give you a thumbnail version of it. What we have provided in distribution, I think really serving multiple purposes, one is pursuant to the city council's approved demonstration partnership policy, opportunity is just to highlight some of the ongoing company outreach and partnerships that are being evaluated and hopefully will be brought to fruition with companies that have new products, pilots, opportunities and the like. Second connection is with our Green Vision in that as you'll see in the listing of companies that we're currently talking to that a number of them are pursuing Green Vision related initiatives, Green Vision related products and services. So that's a second connection and then the third is to tie back with our procurement process, which as you'll note, we've included what's being described as a request for interest. So that this report will actually be distributed and shared with our vendor community. So that if other companies have products, services again that ideally in many cases haven't even hit the market yet we'll let them know that we are interested in working with them. So that they can get back in touch with us, we can use the basic framework that we have from our demonstration partnership policy to see if there are areas that benefit them, benefit areas that we are interested in and as well can pursue it from there and it also streamlines our subsequent procurement efforts. So by letting folks know or letting companies know that we're interested in pursuing these kinds of partnerships, get the word out again from our normal procurement channel it also, as they respond will streamline some of our subsequent steps in not having to do another RFP to the extent that it fits within certain areas of interest and, again, our opportunities that we're interested in pursuing. So that's basically what we have. And the latest iteration on trying to let the world know that we're interested in pursuing innovative products and services.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Well, we got the entire memo because Peter caught it. So I would like to move approval.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve. I have a couple of questions. How will you circulate the request for interest demonstration participation document?

>> Ed Shikada: Perhaps I'll let Mark Giovannetti expand. Basically we're going to use our existing channel, I can never remember what it's called, so Mark --

>> Maybe that's not working. I'll just pin down --

>> Mayor Reed: Put your foot on it and then lift it. There you go.

>> Now we're good. We'll distribute it via the bid sync bid notification, and we'll go ahead and lift the commodity restriction, I think they have like a hundred commodity designation when you outreach, so we'll lift that and it will go out to a very, very vast nationwide vendor community.

>> Mayor Reed: I would ask that you distribute it somehow, electronically, to the incubators, especially the environmental incubator, as I was out there for a visit a couple of weeks ago, and there's 30-some companies in there and they all have a product that we might be interested in. They certainly think we might be interested in and this might be an opportunity to do that. And since we have management staff that manages all the incubators, we ought to be able to get it distributed pretty well, so that they at least know about it, either this or some link to this or some way to get them into it. And then, just a question about staff's perspective on the management, the administration of this since this is relatively new. And I'm guessing from the staff report that it seems to work. And it's a lot easier than the old-fashioned way of trying to do these relationships.

>> Ed Shikada: I think I can give you my perspective and other staff certainly feel free to weigh in. It certainly helped us to have a framework and a channel for the conversations. So that has been extremely helpful. And it's allowed us to figure out how to go with just the latest bright idea. I believe, and I've yet to I think hear some of the specifics of this, there have been some improvements that staff, from various departments, may suggest. And so as over the course of maybe the next couple of months we gain additional experience in putting this on bid sync and feedback there, we would certainly come back to council with any recommendations for revisions to the policy, if that makes sense or any other kind of process improvements that might be identified through the staff work.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Anything else on this? We have a motion to approve. All in favor? Opposed, none opposed, that's approved. I talk about this a lot when I'm out explaining to venture capitalists and others what we do in San José that might be of interest to their companies. And as far as I know, we're the only city that's doing something like this. It's helpful and very interesting to them and especially to the

smaller companies out there that are -- have a product, so I think it's very helpful. But I'm always interested in finding out how it really works. And I guess we'll to know after we have done a few of them.

>> Ed Shikada: And on behalf we really appreciate that.

>> Mayor Reed: Any additions to council committee agendas? I think none to talk about. Whoops, we do have one. Public safety, finance and strategic support work plan, to at annual procurement report and proposed amendments to a bunch of section of the municipal code on surplus personal property. Do we have a date to add that to?

>> I believe it's March 18th.

>> Mayor Reed: Whatever the date is in March.

>> March 18th.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, March 18th. Motion is to approve, all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. We have no open government initiatives to talk about except those that are on the council agenda that we've already discussed so that takes us to open forum. Mr. Wall, or I'm sorry you wanted to speak on another item but come on up.

>> David Wall: This will be separate and distinct from open forum.

>> Mayor Reed: Sure. You wanted to talk about the zero waste.

>> David Wall: I just have a slight concern separate and apart from open forum.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay.

>> David Wall: First of all will zero waste use more energy than it will produce? In so far as all the diesel trucks that will be coming into this place, with their resulting noise pollution, and also, air pollution. Will zero waste hold harmless and indemnify the City of San José for all their operations and resulting if they go bankrupt and leave. Will this operation destroy federally protected habitats for the clapper rail, the harvest field mouse and the pickle weed? Will the city of Milpitas hold harmless and indemnify the City of San José as a result from all these odors that will be produced by offgassing of the incinerator and this anaerobic digesting operation? Then we have a discussion and inquiry should be made as to the profit made by the competing property owners Owens Corning and Zanker Road Landfill and how they will benefit as third party beneficiaries. That discussion has not been made, and that concludes my statement on this particular issue.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Anybody want to reconsider our vote on Item H-3? No, okay, move on to open forum, Mr. Wall.

>> David Wall: Open forum. In yesterday's budget study session it was of interest to note for your consideration, not one high-level administrator offered to severely cut their pay, or reduce their structure in the organization, to save their employees. As a matter of fact, the term employees was not even used by these division heads or directors. Just FTEs, full time equivalents. That should be noted. I'm also very serious about the chance to modify the city charter. This is in keeping with a new service delivery model, in which you cut out tremendous levels of redundant systems within city management. You've already started down this path insofar as the Sacramento express, so to speak. And excellent idea that will bear fruit to come. We need to expand the use of City Hall TV to stimulate the local economy within the confines of your broadcasting parameters. And above all, I want to, after a morning of repentant and sins and thanking lord Jesus, awful famished. Go to the cafe San José at 1583A Meridian Avenue. For the record, I'm not on their payroll, and the only thing I got out of them was great food and goodwill, and I told them that I'd send you folks down there since you need to stimulate the local economy instead of talking about it. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Scott Soper.

>> Hello, first I'd like to ask if you're bringing a complaint to the city, should you submit it in writing? And come the following week, or what is the process for doing that?

>> Mayor Reed: Depends on the nature of the complaint. If it's a -- let the City Attorney speak to different forms of complaints and claims that can be made. There is a formal claims process under state law. It depends on what you're complaining about. If you just want to complain about something, you're in the right place.

>> I just want to complain about something. I'm not here to ask for money.

>> Mayor Reed: You're in the right place, then, go ahead.

>> We'll make --

>> Start with your name, sir.

>> Scott Soper. My complaint is regarding the fiscal and economic analysis for the HP pavilion that was issued nine months ago. When that analysis came out it did not conform to my memory of the events

around the construction of the arena. Subsequently, I had a look at the city files at that time library and there were things in the newspaper files that I then went with the public records access request to verify. And after quite a bit of cajoling over five months with redevelopment agency, I was able to learn that the city even now is still paying over \$10 million a year in interest payments on the arena, that was not reflected in the fiscal and economic analysis.

And also, apparently, out of the General Fund paid more than \$3 million in 2008-2009 for police and other services. Which apparently were also not reflected in that. And which were not -- from what I have and is included in there from the e-mails from the requests, was specifically designed not to include that. That's a lot of money in our General Fund, and these are the sort of numbers that should be included, I believe, in anything that's presented to the public and to the council for decision making purposes, as an economic analysis. Anyway, the specifics of what I've just said are in what I've submitted. And I -- and when you've had a chance to look at that I have some actions requesting a follow-on that. The first is that I'd like to see that analysis retransacted No. an equal study regarding a cost is compiled and then that they be presented together and be read together after that when using them to consider how we ought to be going forward specifically with the stadium. That's what it was commissioned for is a way to present the benefits that might be derived but without the costs how can that decision be made? In fact the numbers that I was given show that in 2007 more than \$10 and possibly as much as \$20 was paid in public subsidy for every single person who attended an event in 2007. Now I don't see how that can't be an important fact when --

>> Mayor Reed: I'm sorry your time is up. But you have given us the writing, so we'll circulate that. Anybody else under open forum? Seeing none, the meeting is adjourned.