

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. Rules and Open Government Committee meeting.

>> Mayor Reed: Meeting to order. Excuse me. Rules and Open Government Committee meeting for March the 24th, 2010. Any changes to the agenda order for today's meeting?

>> Lee Price: Mr. Mayor, you do have a memo from the City Manager's Office recommending you drop item H.1. It says 3.1, but it should say H.1.

>> Mayor Reed: H.1, that's a staff report on the public calendars, okay, we won't get to that one. We'll get to it, but it will be dropped. Yeah, so, specifically we'll drop that, that way staff can leave. We will not be discussing that, that's the recommendation.

>> Okay.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, motion is to approve, all in favor, none opposed, okay, let staff go back to work. We'll take the March 30th final agenda first. 9:00 a.m. closed session?

>> City Attorney Doyle: Yes. We have a personnel matter, we have the IPA discussion.

>> Mayor Reed: That's a follow-on discussion of the IPA. Which takes place after the community panel has interviewed and the council will be deciding who the council wants to interview, I believe. That's --

>> City Attorney Doyle: Correct.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Anything else on page 1? Page 2 or 3?

>> Councilmember Constant: Just had a quick question. On the council travel reports I know you can do a verbal one. If we wanted to do just a memo does it have to meet the ten day rule or can it be a supplemental since it's just dropped in here? Is there -- I feel to do one, I'm just trying to figure out the timing.

>> Mayor Reed: It's not agendized for discussion, just a report. You can do the memo any time.

>> Councilmember Constant: Okay, thanks.

>> Mayor Reed: Since the travel reporting requirement I don't even has a time frame on it, it's just that you have to do the report so it would not be time sensitive. Anything else on page 2 or 3? 4 or 5? I think item 4.2, the medicinal use of cannabis, ought to go last on the agenda. Let's get the community center reuse and the aquatics program stuff out of the way.

>> Excuse me mayor, 5.2, the aquatics item we are recommending deferral to April 6th. The item went out yesterday in the early distribution packet for April 6th.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. So 4.2 could go to the end of the agenda. Anything else on page 4 or 5? So 5.2 is on April 6th agenda. Anything else on 6 or 7? I have one request for an addition, that's a welcome home Vietnam Veterans Day in San José to be added as a ceremonial item. And anything -- City Manager request, to add South Bay information sharing system information memorandum of understanding. It says Santa Clara county sheriff's office South Bay region node member agencies, et cetera. Any other additions?

>> And we will need a waiver of sunshine on this add.

>> Mayor Reed: What is it, then?

>> Staff is here to talk about it. I know there's some timing issues and MOU needs to be signed by March 31st.

>> Yes, ma'am. Mayor, Dave (inaudible) --

>> Mayor Reed: Can you get a little closer to the microphone so it picks up. We have thousands of people watching us at home. I don't want to make you nervous or anything, but you need to pick up on the microphone.

>> It the system that takes all the law enforcement records management systems and connects all those systems together in four counties, Santa Clara County, Monterey County, Santa Cruz County and San Benito County. It's funded through the UASI grant system, and there is a UASI deadline of March 31st to have this MOU signed, and that s the urgency with the time.

>> Mayor Reed: We're just authorizing the Manager to sign it on our behalf.

>> Yes, sir.

>> Mayor Reed: Well, I think we don't have to worry about the sunshine issues on that one, but we need a waiver to be included in the notion.

>> Councilmember Constant: I'll make the motion to approve the agenda as amended with the sunshine waiver for that one item.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve as amended with the sunshine waiver on the UASI grant memorandum. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Taking us to April 6th draft

agenda. Closed session, 9:30, I can't remember what the sequence is going to be after the council decides on the 30th how many people to interview. When we'll do the interviews of the IPA?

>> City Attorney Doyle: I think it's -- we need to keep the 6th open. And then any date after that it really comes down to availability on what the council wants to do after the 30th. So --

>> Mayor Reed: Well depending how many people the council wants to interview it could be as many as five people we might want to start at 6:00 a.m.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Next Tuesday you have a Rules Committee before council so you may want to make that decision then. We'll know more next week I think.

>> Mayor Reed: Right, it's likely the time will change depending what the council decides on the 30th. Anything else on page 1? Page 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5? That's the end of the agenda. I have no written requests for additions. Any others to add other than the one we just talked about which was on the draft, that's the citywide aquatics program? Is had anything else we bounced out of yesterday's meeting that goes to this one? I don't think so.

>> Thank you. I think it was for the 13th.

>> Mayor Reed: Yeah, they would all be on here already, nothing that we added. Motion is to approve. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Redevelopment agency March 30th.

>> Pardon me, for the redevelopment agency, we have no items for the March 30th and we would recommend the committee's concurrence, but we'll issue a cancellation for the afternoon session. And if there's anything for the closed session or the joint session in the afternoon we'd be there for that.

>> Mayor Reed: All right, motion to cancel?

>> Councilmember Constant: So move.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to cancel the 30th redevelopment agency portion of the meeting.

>> And Mr. Mayor members of the committee if I could April 6th we also have no items but we would come back next week if there's a need to cancel that meeting date.

>> Mayor Reed: All right, keep it open for now so on the March 30th cancellation all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. We don't need to talk about the sixth, nothing on there. Nothing on study sessions upcoming, legislative update we have a report from the staff on AB 8X 7 which the X 7 is the special session number 7.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Many special sessions this past year. Mr. Chair, members of the Committee, Betsy Shotwell, Director of Intergovernmental Relations. You have before you a request to reaffirm city's position of support for this measure which would preserve many local recycling programs and under the California bottle bill. And also, would allow California to access an estimated \$145 million in federal-state water pollution control revolving funds. Again this is one of those measures, we had a very short window of activity for our lobbyist in Sacramento Roxann Miller and with the efforts of environmental services department and with review by your office, Mayor Reed, and city attorney's office, our lobbyist moved forward and the bill passed and was sent to the governor which he signed and this was very similar to legislation the city had supported last year and it also did not include the issues that were somewhat of concern to the committee I recall last year. This was straight restore and keep the money where it should be type of legislation. And it has been signed by the governor.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay so we just need to accept the report basically.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Right.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you for the success.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you or lobbyist Roxann Miller and environmental services department moving quickly as always.

>> Mayor Reed: Sometimes things happen in the legislature for the good, sometimes they move very quickly. This is a good thick to streamline our process to respond. Any other questions?

>> Move to accept it.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to accept. All in favor opposed none opposed, that's approved. Before you leave do you want to talk about AB 71?

>> Betsy Shotwell: You're reading my mind mayor.

>> Mayor Reed: SB 71.

>> Betsy Shotwell: SB 71 authored by Alex Padillo and Elaine Alquist. One of our own senators. This was a carryover from legislation the city had introduced last year as a piece of the mayor's clean tech legislative priorities and congratulations mayor on this passage, again moving very quickly on a city

priority that our lobbyist Roxann Miller testified with senator padilla on Monday. The bill was passed by the legislature and will be presented to the governor this afternoon in San José for signature. And just by way of record, and I want to just read this so I'm very, very clear, it is to create a sales tax exemption for the purchase of green tech manufacturing equipment in California. Again this was one of the clean tech legislative priorities last year and this year and that the mayor led the city with and the council approved and it's very exciting. We were one of three states that did not have this. So you can imagine, the ramifications of the state having this. It will be a ten year window, it will -- the Legislative Analyst will be required to report back. So we'll be kept in constant information as far as how the bill, the impacts of the measure are taking place.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you. This came out of our clean tech legislative agenda from 2009, last year. I think it was last year.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: I went to Sacramento with Brian Sager who is the founder of nanosolar testified at the committee hearing at senator Alquist's request and I really pleased this got picked up again this year and moved through to get signed. Because it's clear that when you tax investment, you get less of it. And nanosolar was one of the companies that wanted to expand in the state, still wants to expand in the state and this is a huge impediment to can charge sales tax when they want to invest in equipment to build their factories. So the signing ceremony will be at nanosolar this afternoon. But there are many, many, many clean tech companies are looking to this. I first found out about this with the Tesla package, because the only way the governor was able to keep Tesla in California instead of moving to New Mexico was the use of this special financing authority and the ability to avoid having to pay sales taxes on investment and equipment. So we recognized quickly how important it would be to our other clean tech companies and I really want to thank the governor and the legislature for moving rather rapidly. It seems.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: Sometimes miracles do happen. Senator Alquist did very well on this.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yes, senator Alquist has been very helpful from the get go and senator Alex padilla was helpful. And lobbyist Roxann Miller did a yeoman's job on this for the last year and be four months.

>> Mayor Reed: Certainly worth the trip to Sacramento.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else on the state legislative update?

>> Betsy Shotwell: That's it.

>> Mayor Reed: Mr. Wall wants to speak around the AB 8X 7 bill, Mr. Wall.

>> David Wall: You've already voted on it, right?

>> Mayor Reed: No.

>> David Wall: Oh, okay. I don't think the -- I can understand why this is a short window of activity by the legislature. Because no one's really looking out of it especially if you tout a Green Vision. Specifically in the language, on the bottom of page 1, quote, it does not include provisions to expand the state always bottle bill to include additional containers or to increase the deposits on any containers. This goes right to a Green Vision argument that this shouldn't be in here at all. You should be going after all these containers because they end up all over the place. I can understand why they amended it to go after the water pollution funding from the feds. But it should be a joint -- should be a separate issue. In addition, somebody who just got religion on the issue of new language, and I quote, new language forbidding transfer of money from the fund for other purposes period end quotes, should have always been there. This is not something that state legislators should be proud of themselves. It should be -- it's like a person went out to drown themselves in the river and then decided that they were over their heads and waded on back out and we are supposed to thank them for saving themselves. You should really look at this before you vote on it, because the bottle bill business should not be locked onto a water pollution control funding just to give people who manufacture these containers a break. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: We're not actually voting on the bill. We're just accepting the report. The bill has already been signed and passed by the governor, signed by the governor. We didn't have any federal legislative report today. Meeting schedules, recommendation from the City Clerk to council the city council meeting of June 29th and approve a summer Rules and Open Government committee meeting schedule. Motion is to approve. All in favor, opposed none opposed, that's approved. Public record, anything from the public record the committee would like to pull for discussion?

>> Lee Price: Mr. Mayor would you mind if I go back real quickly to meeting schedules? I just wanted to remind us, the Rules Committee and any of the members of the public and staff listening, that next week

your regular Rules meeting has been cancelled for Wednesday but you will be meeting at 1:00 on Tuesday, before our regular council meeting for purposes of agenda review only. We won't have other items we typically do have under your Rules Committee agenda and then the staff meeting that generally happens before you meet that meeting has also been cancelled. So we'll just meet at 1:00 for purposes of agenda review, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Because the 31st is Cesar Chavez's birthday holiday.

>> Lee Price: That's correct, the meeting will be here, yes. Although it will be the former formation so we'll actually be on the other side of the room but it will be here in the committee room.

>> Mayor Reed: One final note, the Rules and Open Government committee meeting will meet July 28th.

>> Lee Price: That's correct, after your regular rules committee meeting we can consider all items including the agenda review. .

>> Mayor Reed: To the public record, items the committee would like to pull for discussion, Pete.

>> Councilmember Constant: Item B I know at the last Rules Committee you may have discussed the requests from the small business commission but I wasn't here. So I wanted to ask, is an economic impact study in the work plan? Is that going to be done?

>> Mayor Reed: Yes, the staff reported last time that's part of the analysis they need to do for the environmental clearance.

>> Councilmember Constant: Okay.

>> Mayor Reed: And the committee decided this wasn't time to put this back on the council agenda until the work had been done and we can evaluate the work that was being done.

>> Councilmember Constant: Okay, thanks.

>> Mayor Reed: Although we did have some testimony on it. Item C. Councilmember Pyle might have a comment on that one, that has to do with the trees and PG&E at the T. J. Martin and Jeffrey Fontana parks.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, mayor. I have with me a letter from Mary Ellen Whitner, who is director of governmental relations for the southern region for PG&E. And these probably should go to Lee, but please do take a copy for yourself. This represents a very softer approach on the part of PG&E. We are in negotiations with them, and my office will be meeting with parks and recreation, PG&E, the community group, and of course ourselves very, very soon. I believe it's April 6th -- excuse me, 5th, the day after Easter. So hopefully, we will come to a final resolution. There has been ongoing negotiations regarding this, and it is quite precedent-setting, I think. So it's also been very educational.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. So I think very short message from that, I see that the tree removal work originally scheduled to start on Monday did not start on Monday. Which is a good thing.

>> Councilmember Pyle: That's right, we did get an extension of the date which made everybody relax a little bit more.

>> Mayor Reed: Item E, that is a letter from the ACLU, expressing some concerns about the process we're using for the selection of the independent police auditor, and the community panel. I'd like to have the staff send the council-approved process to Schyler Porras, so she knows that the process we're following was approved in a public session by the council after discussion, and we're doing what we said we would do. I forget when we did that, a few weeks ago. Anything else from the public record?

>> Councilmember Chirco: Move to note and file.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to note and file.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second. All in favor, opposed none opposed, that's approved. Appointments to boards commissions and committees. City Clerk's recommended we start the process to fill an unscheduled vacancy for fire department employee member of the board of administration of the police and fire department retirement plan.

>> Lee Price: Dennis Hawkins assistant City Clerk is here if you have questions. Would you like a report-out or just respond to questions? Thank you.

>> Motion to approve.

>> Section.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve. This is for somebody who resigned before the end of their term.

>> Lee Price: That's correct.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve. All in favor, opposed none opposed, that's approved.

>> Lee Price: Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Reed: Item H-1 about calendars, we dropped. H-2, staff report in response to an item we had before, regarding assessing liquidated damages to Babel plumbing and construction. There was communication from the person who is going to have to bear the liquidated damages about the timing of how they found out about it and how it got all processed, so we asked the staff to sort it out and bring it back to us. That's why it's here.

>> Mr. Mayor, David Sykes, assistant director of Public Works, I'm joined by Nina Grayson from public works. We issued a staff report dated March 18th that included an attachment that went over the sequence of events which I know was quite confusing at the last meeting. So you have that. I wanted to highlight the fact that the wage that was paid that was in violation, did not meet either requirement, either the wages that were in effect initially when the contract was let, nor subsequently, that the wages that changed, so irregardless of the change in rate during the project, the rate that was being paid did not meet either requirement. We have also submitted a supplemental memo that was dated March 23rd, and kind of highlighting a few issues that I'd like to go over with you quickly and then we'll be available to answer questions. The first is as indicated, Babel construction has all along acknowledged the violation. And in a letter that we don't have a copy of receiving, but that they have subsequently provided to us, acknowledged the fact that there was going to be liquidated damages. So we've been able to substantiate that they were aware of the violation, and they were aware of the process of liquidated damages all along. Secondly, yes, there was a delay in issuance of our follow-up letter. Our process had been really a two step process. First step had been to notice a violation. And then the follow-up letter would come that would say here's your liquidated damages and there definitely was a delay in issuing that second letter. The reason for that delay had to do with our staffing issues and taking on new workload, no excuses but there was a delay. As far as we can tell that's the only time we've ever had a delay in issuing that follow-up letter. What we are proposing, and we'll be putting into place, is changing our process, in essence, combining that two-step process into one step. So the initial violation letter will include the fact that there's a violation, what the liquidated damage amount will be and the process for a remedy or protest. So that initial letter will address all those issues, and in essence, alleviate the problem of ever not following up with the second letter, if you will. So I think we'll leave it at that and be available to answer any questions you have.

>> Mayor Reed: So if I understand the sequence, back in November of '08, they were aware that liquidated damages would be assessed.

>> That is correct. We have a copy of the letter --

>> Mayor Reed: November 18th they acknowledged violation and that there will be an assessment.

>> Right. And I think at that time what they were looking for was relief from the liquidated damages that they had made an honest mistake, and that in essence, we're hopeful that that honest mistake could translate to relief from liquidated damage. .

>> Mayor Reed: And they finally got the number. It's all about getting the number. They didn't get the number until February of 2010.

>> That is correct.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, are there questions from the committee? Vice Mayor?

>> Councilmember Chirco: No. The time sequence was helpful, the acknowledgment of their awareness. That's what was unclear in the previous materials. So thank you for the sequence. And the correction has been put in place so that not just the general contractor but also the subcontractor will be aware of -- because there could also be a gap between the general contractor and the subcontractor on communications. Looks like that's been corrected?

>> Thanks for bringing that up, not that we believe that was an issue here but that initial letter will be sent to really all relevant parties just to make sure there's no gaps in the future.

>> Councilmember Constant: Thanks, the information is helpful. I just wanted to make kind of an editorial comment, we've had some discussions about the budget and some things that are preventing places like our airport and others to succeed in these budget-challenging times. And prevailing wage has already been one of those sacred cows that nobody wants to talk about. And the conversation is always about how we have to make sure that people receive a wage large enough to earn a living and to raise on a family. I just wanted to point out what the rates are. Because a lot of people, we're always hearing about the \$14 an hour wage or the \$12 an hour wage but \$71.34 an hour for an electrician, it's no wonder that our public projects cost twice as much as they do in the private sector.

>> Mayor Reed: I think it's a plumber.

>> Councilmember Constant: It's a plumber. And -- they all connect together, at the water heater at least. So myou know, it's really not about maintaining a wage that is just enough to subsist on in Silicon Valley. These are very high rates, and I think that as we're in these tough budget times we should be looking at things like this, and asking ourselves of this is the road we want to keep going down, or should we do what some more progressive cities like the city of Palo Alto have done in order to bring our cost down. And as you can see, I don't think you would be paying poverty wages if we went to the market rate that regular plumbers are being paid on regular jobs.

>> Mayor Reed: Go ahead.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I was just going to move that we accept this but I just had a plumber out and I'm not sure that that is especially high. Because seems like my bill was even higher than that.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And it was a private plumber.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Yes, and it was a private plumber.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to accept the report.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Mr. Mayor, I would like just to ask one question. Because you're not going into the two-letter notification anymore, will there be anything on the letter that you are sending to state that, this is the last letter that we will be sending in reference to this? Just so that -- I mean, they've been in the habit of getting two, and it does give more stall time. I think it's great that you're doing this because it makes the whole thing much more efficient, but will there be anything on there to basically cover going from two to one?

>> Yeah I think we can put some clarifying language in this that will indicate that there's a change in process and this is what they should expect in the future.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Very good.

>> Mayor Reed: Can we do a two-ten net 30 to get them to pay quicker? I didn't get a second on that motion, second, Ong there was a second. Motion to accept the report. All in favor? Opposed none opposed. We have one item to add to a committee work plan that's the neighborhood services and education committee for April 8th, analysis of revenue generation through increased enforcement off-leash violations. Pete.

>> Councilmember Constant: I just wonder if this is really something, given the resources that we don't have, and the financial situation we find ourself in if we really should be spending time on this and committing resources to writing citations for off-leash violations. I mean we could just as easily say we want to analyze whether we should increase enforcement for no smoking, if we want to increase enforcement for whatever. I would much rather we put our resources into increasing our resources in having police officers enforce moving violations and restore some of the traffic teams that we've been eliminating and do things that will actually have a greater impact. I just don't think it is an area we should really be focusing on given our situation.

>> Mayor Reed: Judy.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I can't disagree with Councilmember Constant. I know, if you look at in the neighborhood services, we've heard a report from animal control on the response to dangerous animals which is very quick. So I just don't know that we've got the resources right now to do that. While it could generate some revenue I don't know that we've got the personnel. And animal control is pretty thin right now as it is. But they have a -- like a 100% response to dangerous animals so I think that's the important issue.

>> Councilmember Constant: Quite frankly, the revenue you get for a citation like this is really not even enough to cover the cost of writing the citation.

>> Mayor Reed: Staff, has the work been done on this report?

>> Unfortunately, I don't see staff here to answer the question. So we can bring this back maybe the week after next. I'll have staff here to answer any questions. Next week we're only doing agendas but the week after next we can agendize it.

>> Mayor Reed: If they haven't done the work on the report, that's one thing. If it's already been done, you know, maybe it's different. But given the level of potential revenues we're talking about, it's probably not even going to cover the cost of preparing the report. And so the workload assessment on that is something we ought to think about. So why don't we just bring this back then in two weeks?

>> All right.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, bring it back in two weeks, that completes the agenda. Anything -- one request to speak during open forum, David Wall.

>> David Wall: Thank you. It is a pleasure to see Councilmember Pyle back into fighting trim. We missed you, along with your contemporaries, I don't speak for them. But thank you for getting well quick. Said a prayer at church, apparently it worked. Vice Mayor, I hope you're feeling as well. You look cheerful, but one never knows.

>> Mayor Reed: I'm feeling good too, Dave.

>> David Wall: I was getting ready to share the love. But I got interrupted, Mayor, but thank you anyway. You know last night, for example, you got good ideas about the budget. Councilmember Pyle had an outstanding idea, I don't know if anybody really heard her about creating another variation of deferred comp. Now, if this is cumulative with tax reduction in taxes, this is definitely going to save the city and provide for more retirement for city employees. Your contribution, Mr. Mayor, is ongoing and should be thanked. But this document that I put forth to you last week is against your budget message. Now, if a management position is overstaffed and temporary, you don't need to allocate anywhere from 120 to \$160,000 to fill this position, even if it's a restricted use fund and all the other ancillary costs of interviewing for a closed house position instead of going outside. Because citizens deserve the very best. Then I would like to thank San José police officer John West, number 3097, for his efforts in protecting the safety of children in my neighborhood. A letter will be forthcoming. I went down to Moss Landing, 65 miles one way, and spent a little over that for dinner for two to see a great family wholesome bluegrass band. Could have been here in San José, therefore I wouldn't have violated the mayor's Green Vision by driving that far, because that's 130 miles round trip, and all that money could have stayed here. Other than that, how about a generic thank you for all of you as I close. And may God bless you. By the way, last week of lent, Matthew 26, just read the whole chapter. I forget which precept is applicable. But you can't be wrong by reading the whole thing. All right.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes the open forum. We do have staff here to talk about the item we just discussed regarding the off leash violations. We maybe can handle that today. Let's go back to that agenda item.

>> Sure, John Cicirelli, deputy director, animal control and services. I apologize, you guys got through this agenda really fast. I had to run over from another office.

>> Mayor Reed: No problem.

>> This was brought up in the NSE committee and it was asked that we analyze the impacts of taking existing officer resources and having them focus at least some of those resources on enforcement in the parks for off-leash dog violations that would then generate revenue that could offset at least some of the expense of having officers. So the report is -- it isn't a recommendation, it isn't a proposal, it's really more of an analysis.

>> Mayor Reed: Have you already done the work?

>> The report itself, yes, it is pretty well complete.

>> Mayor Reed: It was my concern, about the work load necessary to do the report wouldn't necessarily justify the expense and money. If we've already done the work, maybe that's a moot point. Pete had a question though.

>> Councilmember Constant: Isn't that the reason additions to the work plans come to the Rules Committee, so that we could make the determination of whether it's worth putting staff time into it?

>> Mayor Reed: Well, this is the place to do the workload analysis, where staff can protect themselves from workload increases.

>> Councilmember Constant: Just pointing out this didn't seem to go that way. It seemed the work went out and then came to us to see if it should be put on the work plan. Seemed like it got out of sequence. I just don't think it's worth pursuing.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else from the committee? So since the work's been done might as well put it on the committee report so the report can get back to the committee.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I would move approval to put this on the NS&E committee work plan.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Reed: That's a motion to add it to the work plan for April 8th. All in favor, opposed, one opposed, that is approved. We're done with the open forum. That concludes our meeting, we're adjourned.