

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: I'd like to call the meeting to order. This is Rules and Open Government Committee meeting for December 12th, 2012. Any changes to our agenda order? Let's start then with the December 18th council agenda. Last council meeting of the year. Anything on page 1? I understand we need to start closed session at 9:00 to allow some additional time in case --

>> City Attorney Doyle: That's correct.

>> Mayor Reed: 9:00.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Last meeting of the year.

>> Mayor Reed: It will be the last one, right, unless we have to call a special one. Last one for this year. Anything else on page 1? Anything on page 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5? Page 6 or 7? I think on item 2.19, we need some kind of a waiver. It's the note I've got. Open purchase with essential staffing for consultant services.

>> That is correct. We need a sunshine waiver. Memo should be released later today.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay.

>> That is for item 2.18.

>> Mayor Reed: 2.18. Anything else on page 6 or 7? Page 8 or 9? Item 4.1 is sale of city property on Emery street or part of, sale of part, we need a sunshine waiver on that as well is that correct?

>> That is correct. The memo is out, the legal documents still need to be posted but they will be by week's end.

>> Mayor Reed: All right. Anything else on page 8 or 9? How about page 10 or 11? Item 4.6 is if agreement with Hopkins real estate group for potential development of singleton landfill. Requested for time certain on that.

>> Ed Shikada: Yes, this would be renumbered previously listed as 2.11. Staff would request that that be heard and heard after consent.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Any else on page 10 or 11? Page 12 or 13? Page 15, 14 or 15? 15 is the joint financing authority item. We want to hear that at the end of the meeting, is that okay? All right.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Motion to approve the agenda with sunshine waiver for three items.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion to approve -- I have some additions. Request to approve a revision of the City's conflict of interest code. Need a waiver of revolving door restrictions with regard to Lee Price our former City Clerk coming back to help out and a transfer of some city property that's been vacated previously on Via Del Oro, to Mission West Properties, 3400 square feet not a big one but needs to be done. Any other requests for additions? I think we have five ceremonial items already. Four. Got plenty of those. Nothing else to add.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Amend to motion to include the additions.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, motion includes the additions. Mr. Wall did you want to speak on this?

>> Sir? With reference to the revolving door policy, whereas the former City Clerk served the city very well during her time period, I believe that the revolving door policy should not be used because we have a very trained and honorable assistant City Clerk and I think she should be given a chance to step in those shoes. Any other department would certainly act in such a fashion and so I'm kind of wondering why the revolving door policy was initiated when we have somebody of the caliber of our assistant City Clerk. Second, on 4.1, sale of a portion of city owned property on Emery street. I worry about your immortal souls charging God for his property, taken that, you know putting your hand right into Bellarmine's collection plate, especially as we enter the third week of advent. I think somebody says it's triple the crimes or punish many rather. So I'd suggest that you just give them the land or possible, another solution would be give them a thousand-year lease for a dollar a year on that

property. That might be a way to solve the problem without you looking real bad in front of God maybe in about 30 years or so. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Martha O'Connell. You need to turn it on. I think you're the first speaker so there's a switch on the handle.

>> I don't think I'm going to be at the council meeting on the 18th so I speak in favor of the waiver of the revolving door policy in order to bring back Lee Price. We've had this excruciating albatross around our neck for years for the boards and commissions and since Lee wrote M benefitE 16 which started all this I think it's critical that we have the continuity and the background so we can get over the finish line of this horrible consolidation process. I'm for consolidation but the process has been agony. So thank you for putting this waiver on the agenda and I hope it passes.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes the public testimony. I forgot to mention, with regard to the request to add the waiver of revolving door restrictions, a couple of things. One, the council has appointed Tony to be the acting City Clerk and there's a memorandum regarding the waiver of the revolving door so that Lee can come back and that memo is out.

>> Dennis Hawkins: Mr. Mayor, if I could, if the maker of the motion would include a sunshine waiver for the added items today, the waiver of the revolving door and the conflict of interest code, we'd appreciate that.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Amend the motion to include the sunshine waiver on the additions.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is on the additions and the sunshine waiver on the motion, all in favor, all opposed, none opposed, that's approved. We have no meeting on December 25th, I hope you'll all be with your families, that's where I will be. No upcoming study sessions to talk about, no legislative update is that correct Betsy?

>> Betsy Shotwell: I'll incorporate (inaudible).

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Rules committee schedule next week there won't be any agendas to look at and we have --

>> City Attorney Doyle: There is the 8th but the rules in lieu --

>> Mayor Reed: Will we have the 8th to consider next week?

>> Yes, we will.

>> Mayor Reed: And so the question is do we have a meeting next week or do we have a meeting on January 2nd? Do we need both or can we get by with one or the other?

>> We have the work plan for rules coming back next week and it has there January 2nd as a rules date. So we will be meeting for rules on January 2nd.

>> Mayor Reed: Unless we decide not to meet.

>> Unless you decide not to meet.

>> Mayor Reed: That's your call.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: Well, if we have the agenda out for the 8th, we wouldn't have the 15th, but on the 2nd, we would have both the 8th and the 15th.

>> That is correct.

>> Mayor Reed: To consider. And if there were any issues around the 8th we could still deal with them on the 2nd. So it's really the committee's preference whether we have this week or the 2nd. I know that Vice Mayor will still be out of town on the 2nd. I'll be here, I'll be back in town. How about you council --

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I'm always here.

>> Mayor Reed: We can get two, I don't know about Councilmember Constant or Councilmember Herrera's schedule, that would be the issue whether we could actually get a quorum.

>> City Attorney Doyle: You can refer things on to -- at least deal with the agenda which is two.

>> Mayor Reed: So what I think we ought to do is double check make sure we can get a quorum so we can take action. If there's only two of us it will be more difficult. If we're going to have a quorum of three, we can cancel next week's rules committee. I don't have a personal preference one way or the other because it doesn't affect my family travel plans. Vice Mayor Nguyen do you have a preference?

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: I guess I don't have a preference since I won't be in town on the 2nd, I don't mind having the meeting next week, just look at January 8th council agenda, and then of course on the 9th we can look at the 15th council agenda. So we still have a little bit of leeway.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember?

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I really have nothing to add here.

>> Mayor Reed: Let's meet next week then and cancel the one on the 2nd.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Okay.

>> Mayor Reed: I think there will be a lot less interest in meeting on the 2nd than there will be meeting on the 19th for a lot of reasons. So we have a motion to cancel that on the 2nd I guess.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to cancel the Rules Committee on the 2nd. On the motion, all in favor, opposed, that's what we'll do. Public record. Some requests to speak on the public record. Mr. Wall.

>> Sir, item A is a letter that I have written to the very reverend father general, Adolfo Nikolas society of Jesus. This is the governor-general of all the Jesuits in Rome. I want this letter to serve as notice that I'm trying and I'll quote, "I'm vigorously trying to save the immortal souls of the mayor and city council from at least a stint in purgatory if not a ticket to the fiery depths of hell through their ministerial act of robbing God by charging Bellarmine college preparatory \$325,000 for land God already owns." I hope this letter serves as potential notice via Canon law, that is an issue I will have to research. If I were you I would take this letter very seriously. It will get to Rome I'm told by the post office, by tomorrow. It cost me \$38 by mailing it that way. By the way Mr. Mayor I'm only told that punishments during advent may be tripled or more I don't really know but the fiery depths of hell that cushion you sit on isn't going to help you much and there's no bottom water there, either. I thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes the public testimony on the public record. Motion?

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Motion to note and file.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion to note and file the public record, All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Item G-2 we have several items to agendize. I have a request to agendize for the December 18th meeting, the adoption of resolution approving compensation for an interim City Clerk.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Motion to approve.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve.

>> Dennis Hawkins: Mr. Mayor, I have been advised we should use the term acting City Clerk, rather than interim, so the agenda would have that corrected language.

>> Mayor Reed: All right, we have a motion to approve adding that to the agenda. All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. A request to add to the December 18th meeting from Councilmember Campos on league of cities.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Motion to approve.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve. On that all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved and then we need to get on the council agenda, the item that we're going to talk about later on the legislative priorities and advocacy list. Would also be on the 18th. I guess I could have taken these as a group. I've got a request to agendize approval of council appointments for liaisons and committees for December 18th.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Is this G-5?

>> Mayor Reed: Yes, that's G-5 and then a request to add an item, selection of vice mayor on January 15th. Meeting agendas.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Motion to approve G-5.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: We have a motion to approve the rest of the items that go on the agenda which is G-4 and G-5 I guess.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I had a question on G-4.

>> Mayor Reed: All right.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I see our director of transportation in the audience I didn't see it maybe it was written in a way I couldn't tell but do you see one of our guiding principles from the state, director of transportation, the ability for cities to have more discretion in managing i.e. speed on the street or traffic calming entice devices or things like that? I just want to understand if that -- is that cued with the director of transportation?

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yes can if we've opened this item, is the item open?

>> Mayor Reed: We'll take discussion on all these items.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Betsy Shotwell, Director of Intergovernmental Relations. Mayor, members of the committee, Hans Larsen director of transportation is here to respond to that inquiry. We did after your comments reviewing the legislative guidings principles on page 2 of my memo indicated an item here, 6, with regards to promoting transportation safety and security for alt modes including traffic calming within neighborhoods safe routes to

school for children, safe local authority to set safe traffic controlling practices in the streets. That had been in the document.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I don't have the document before me, that's why I was asking since our director of transportation is here. And do you believe that is right wording? Let me give you the quick example. The state has given us discretion to lower speed limits in front of schools and that seems to be somewhat more of a loosening of the state rules on cities, overall I mean do you feel it's a wise idea, then, to allow discretion for the city to lower the speed limit, for example, in a neighborhood business district where state law doesn't permit it but we all want this walkable, bikeable shopping district, yet you know you don't have that unless you have cars going at a reasonable speed?

>> Hans Larsen: Yes, I think so as Betsy indicated we have language that covers that area, from a general perspective. I think clearly, the policy direction of the city is to promote more walking and biking and calmer streets. And there is the issue of consistency around the state in terms of traffic regulations. But I think we and other cities are kind of on the leading edge of trying to promote more multi-modalism and calmer streets and so that is something you know we're kind of continuing to work with CalTrans and other kind of regulatory agencies in terms of providing flexibilities for communities that want to be leaders in that area. So I think that we have the guiding principle in there. It really sort of comes down to developing coalitions of support with other progressive communities to lay out some specific legislation that moves us in that direction. So I think I guess kind of summarize, I think we're in there. I don't have a specific proposal or anything that we're actively pursuing but it's you know, it's on our radar screen.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Okay, the reason I ask is I think the language was general, so general I didn't recognize it, devices and processes, do processes include speed limit, in your viewpoint?

>> Hans Larsen: Yes.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: And that's what most people in the legislative circle believe so, versus it being spelled out more directly?

>> Hans Larsen: I think in terms of policy direction it's covered to include that I think we're going to have to look at other opportunities or specific proposals that we could work on. I think one of the things we have tested out the 15-mile-an-hour speed limit around three schools, we'll be coming back to the transportation and environment committee with the results of that and I think that would provide us some guidance in terms of that's the direction we want to continue to pursue or pursue expansion as you mentioned to neighborhoods business districts or what have you. So I think it's on our work plan in the next six months to look at that issue and then formulate a particular direction we want to take.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Okay, and I just wanted to throw out that both State Senator Jim Beall and Assembly member Paul Fong in public forums have discussed allowing very clear words: We want to allow cities to have more discussion and controlling traffic and determining speed both on speed limit and senator Beall talked about traffic master plans where cities could sort of have, outside of just a single speed limit, have much more say on a grid of streets. So barring that that's probably one of the larger items, I can't tell you how many times on council people come to us on open forum and want to talk about that item. I just want to make sure we're going in the direction that allows us the flexibility. And then if we have a different council eight years from now and they don't care that's fine. But I want to make sure while I'm here that this is a priority.

>> Hans Larsen: Understood. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Let me bifurcate the motion because I got confused. We will just deal with G-4, and there's a motion to do two things: Accept the guiding principles and priorities and to put it on the agenda for the 18th. Anything further on that?

>> Betsy Shotwell: If I could, Mayor, our state lobbyist was en route, and I don't know what the weather and the traffic's been like, but she was just going to give a brief update of where things were with regard to the forecast. If

I could, I just wanted to add, that at the federal level of course things are where they are. And we'll just continue to provide the council with updates as they come in from our firm of Patton Boggs. I just pulled off the printer, it was from the hill a minute ago, that the GOP is saying serious differences remain, talks may extend past Christmas, and that they would work to Christmas eve and come back day after Christmas. So we still have a long way to go with regards to that. And I also wanted to just draw your attention to the attachments in the back on attachment 6 where we have the state and the federal calendar -- state and the federal calendar. And Roxann's here just to go over a little bit of that and we'll go into more detail when we present next Tuesday at council. So that the council has a feeling and a vision of where we are in going into next year legislatively and the role the council plays in direct our advocacy in Sacramento and in Washington.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, Roxann just in time, talk about the advocacy levels at the legislative level.

>> Roxann Miller: Mr. Mayor, members of the committee, I know you have in your packet a summary but obviously things would be a bit different, substantially different in Sacramento had the voters not seen to approve as we know proposition 30. To some extent there will be a bump in help in balancing the state budget as well because the voters did approve 39 and did defeat some other things. So with that obviously the trigger is not pulled. However, it's important for us to keep in mind that the calculation was substantially done as it relates to the General Fund. The state's General Fund has shrunk down to current year, \$90 billion. When I say specifically the General Fund, obviously, we have a substantial special funds within the state budget, as well. So when we start to look at the health of the state of California, it's important to pull back that curtain if you will and look at what those commitments are as well as debt service which I could certainly be approaching 10% of the General Fund budget, if we do not get things in line. With regard to the new year, then, it's \$1.9 billion. That's through June of 14. But it is also important, because so much of our discussion and review of the City's well-being relates, as well, to going over the cliff and what that could mean to the City of San José. As well as the state of California. To emphasize that point I wanted to just call to your attention that if, indeed, clearly the California start to grow the economy again, could suffer a real serious blow. That being that fiscal cliff. Because automatic spending cuts for state of California would represent a loss in terms of goods and service in the economy. It's estimated of \$227 billion. Excuse me. \$22.7 billion. Better number. In addition, our vulnerability obviously is our workforce and the

progress we're making in creating jobs. And the estimate is, 225,000 jobs statewide could be affected. Although we are not robust as we were with defense contracts in the current state of our economy, clearly, that would really have a tremendous impact in Southern California. And another important fact, I think, to point out is that of course, in California, the -- this would call an end to unemployment benefits. And that would directly affect an estimated 400,000 Californians. So whatever they can do there obviously we want to encourage appropriate action that's meaningful as well as timely. I also wanted to just point out to you, the two-thirds supermajority, and that is a supermajority well beyond or certainly at this point the necessary two-thirds in both houses, we are looking at in the senate 25 Democrats, well, in the senate we are looking at 25 Democrats and it will be now, at 28, however keep in mind that two of those 28 are already going to be going to Congress. But we will still, however, have a democratic majority, two-thirds vote, in the senate. And we will have on the Republican side with the special election coming up, the first week of January, we will have a total of, it will end up being with all the movement, 11 Republicans. And in the assembly it's 55 Democrats and 25 Republicans. So clearly, the ability to attain the two-thirds vote is there and could be attained. But that also assumes that we don't have the factions within those caucuses that we do, moderates, are within that democratic definition. So keeping that in mind, we have a number of high priority issues, certainly, for the city that we will be addressing in the coming months. But I first want to close on the budget. The 1.9 billion, assumptions have been made that have not panned out, one of the big ones of course was the Facebook and what was expected to be the billion-plus contribution. Now it's amounting to well below the \$1 billion. The --

>> Mayor Reed: This is before you get to the 1.9, or is it included in the 1.9 shortfall?

>> Roxann Miller: The 1.9 grows to the extent, right, that it's not there.

>> Mayor Reed: We start with 1.9 and we add the bad news on top of it.

>> Roxann Miller: Correct, correct, right. So the governor and his staff are behind closed doors putting together their new proposed budget which the governor will present by January 10th to meet the constitutional deadline. And I think it's also, when we talk about the priority issues that Betsy and staff have put together to bring

before you today for priorities for the coming year at the state level, continuing to be the priority is the dissolution of redevelopment agencies. Our continued efforts to work with the Department of Finance, controller's office. There are a custom lawsuits pending, one of which challenges provisions under the trailer bill to the dissolution bill. And that in particular has created havoc at the local level was the language that called for a call-back. Where if they drew a conclusion that was not favorable to the City of San José they were going to have the opportunity to pull back property tax or sales tax. So that lawsuit is in process. And I believe there was an extra call this week for some additional briefs. In addition, those issues which will be on our agenda, our list, from what you have indicated previously and with this document, the flood bond and flood control. If governor has said there are several things he's interested in. One of them is to proceed to repair and improve the state -- the water system delivery in California. The governor's also said he's interested in the high speed rail project being completed and he's interested in some tax revenue reforms as well as education reform. So keeping that in mind, very quickly, additionally issues that we will be involved in, the reform of CEQA. Many feel it is long overdue for some serious reform. There will be perhaps to some degree a difference of priority given on that issue, and paying attention to it, between the senate and the assembly. But that's -- certainly is going to be a priority. In addition to that, enterprise zones, this is our one tool left. Partially because it took a two-thirds vote to eliminate the program because you would be taking away a tax benefit to the businesses that received the tax benefits. That now, with the two-thirds vote, it is a serious -- much more serious in jeopardy. However, it will behoove all of us to continue to work with our colleagues around the state. There are 42 zones in the state. And we'll continue to make a very strong case identifying for the decision makers in Sacramento what it means in terms of jobs and economic growth. In addition to that, we're already seeing bills being introduced in -- under the umbrella of reform of 13. And reform of 13 could take many directions but assemblyman Tom Ammiano has introduced one of the first which would propose the split role for amendments to the property tax. In addition to that, realignment. You may recall obviously with realignment, the reassignment to county system probation, and housed in county jails. It was originally there was an understanding however, it was not -- it did not hold, was that the VLF, any VLF that was going to be distributed to help with the realignment program would also provide some money to assist us at the city level as we have re-entry back into our community. That will be a very important issue I understand from the governor's staff that they are sensitive to the repercussions in cities around the state including San José. So we will be working on that issue as well.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Sounds like the usual bucket of work in Sacramento. Always a lot of things that need to be attended to, and often don't get to. So it's good to have not as bad a fiscal condition as the past. But I just read yesterday that the November's estimate for revenue was \$800 million higher than the actual revenues. So unless things pick up that \$1.9 billion will grow just because of revenues. I had a couple of questions about revenues. The prop 30 you mentioned we are supposed to get some additional money for police as opposed to the county under the realignment. Wasn't a lot of money but at least there's that.

>> Roxann Miller: You may recall they did shift as part of the realignment they shifted some VLF out of cities to help them also make a -- fulfill their obligation to counties as well.

>> Mayor Reed: Right.

>> Roxann Miller: But absolutely. Constitutional guaranteed as you're saying. Which was essential. Absolute imperative.

>> Mayor Reed: And the other proposition with money is proposition 39 and some of that money was dedicated for a specific use. I just want to make sure our staff is looking at all our specific uses that would apply for grants under that funding stream.

>> Roxann Miller: Right, right, in the first year there are 50% available for school and school upgrades as far as consumption and we still have availability of clean energy programs as well.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. Questions or comments? Vice Mayor.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Thank you. Just a couple of questions. Thank you very much Roxann and Betsy for the presentation. In terms of the revenues generating from prop 30 when did we expect to see some of that trickle down to the city level, an estimation?

>> Roxann Miller: I think we will have to be working very closely with the county and the Governor's Office because it is going to take -- what will become key is after the governor, when the governor introduces his budget proposal, January 10th, I'm talking with his staff, though, before then to try to get a handle on what's the opening proposal that he is going to put on the table. Absolutely.

>> Betsy Shotwell: And I had read that we wouldn't even see that on paper until after April.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Okay. And then in terms of the elimination of the redevelopment agencies, so you know when this all started it was projected that the state was going to reap north of \$1 billion, and obviously that's not going to happen. Do we have any sense or do they have any sense of how much they're actually getting out of all the dissolution at this point?

>> Roxann Miller: The governor they did assume they were getting about \$1 billion. And what they have gotten to date is a couple hundred million dollars. So there are several pretty large gaps in what their assumptions were.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: And I probably assume that number will continue to go down further as we're moving along here.

>> Roxann Miller: Right. I think the other thing that's important for us, aggressively looking to create jobs and economic development. We are going to see again, several efforts at new tools to try to -- the post-RDA era. Last year, the end of the session, give you a quick example, the infrastructure district program, financing program had to date not been used but for a handful of circumstances in certain parts of the state. That bill, the governor vetoed. What that bill would have done a first step but a big step would have eliminated the requirement for a vote before establishing the infrastructure districts, as well as eliminating the vote required for the -- for going ahead and proceeding to issue debt to support that activity. Lois Wolk the senator from Yolo county and Solano has reintroduced that bill already. So that's out there. There is an indication, and I've gotten from folks in the Governor's Office there was another bill looking to offer us a tool if you will which was the pro tem Darryl

Steinberg's bill that would have allowed a JPA with the City's increment and then if the county wanted to participate, increments of existing property tax to be used. It's misunderstanding that the governor is not interested in pursuing that bill at this point.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Thank you.

>> Roxann Miller: So we have several options that will be active and out there.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else? We have a motion to accept the recommendations and put it on the council agenda for the 18th. We don't need a sunshine waiver on this because this memo's been out for a long time. We've been through committees, right? On that motion? All in favor? Opposed, none opposed, that's approved.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: I want to go back to G-2 and 3, our motion on the 18th included the sunshine waiver for the additions and I think we need to make sure these two are included in that.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Happy to amend that prior motion to include the sunshine waivers for G-2 and -- just G-2?

>> Mayor Reed: G-2 and 3 I think.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Does that need sunshine?

>> Mayor Reed: I'm just looking at if it's going on next week's agenda I don't know how long the memo has been out, whether it's a ten-day rule or not.

>> City Attorney Doyle: This is G-2?

>> Mayor Reed: G-3.

>> City Attorney Doyle: I think that came to the rules committee on Thursday so it's been out sufficient time.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay so just on G-2 then. Need sunshine waiver on that, all in favor, opposed, none okay so sunshine waiver on that. Not sure it needs one but we'll be careful. Now to G-5, recommendations to agendaize for the 18th, approval of council appointments, and agendaize for the 15th the election of the Vice Mayor.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Motion to approve.

>> Vice Mayor Nguyen: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve those. On the motion all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Open forum I think is our last item. Martha O'Connell.

>> Every once in a while I come down and give you an update La La land called disbudgeting boards and commissions. This is a quarter report. One commission that hasn't posted any minutes for this entire year, I don't believe they have any minutes on the Website so I'll check that out. The audio recording is so bad it's inaudible. Would I like to know where the tapes are stored, we are supposed to provide support of the all these boards and commissions to be put in the office of the City Clerk, where we have continuity and people who know what they're doing. Now, this same commission that hasn't posted any minutes and has tape recordings that are inaudible is not providing the links for any of the documents that they're voting on. I don't think they did it deliberately. I think they just didn't realize that they're supposed to do that. So I look forward to consolidation and I hope the support services go into the City Clerk's office and I'm serious, this isn't a joke. As a citizen of San José I'm volunteering. I will work, I will work for nothing and put me in an office somewhere for 20 hours a week and I'll help you guys do this. The unions might protest but I'm making that offer.

>> Mayor Reed: David Wall.

>> Sir, we have the unique situation that is happening behind Columbus park. There is a shanty town that is growing. The shanty town is comprised of some unique building materials, tumble weeds used as igloos. One issue, though, I've been -- it's tough sledding for me to go out there and interview people, especially on the river, but there's been a murder of late down there that raises the question. The question is, the person that was murdered, I knew the person. I photographed his encampments and I showed him what his destruction to the river was. But he was allegedly burned to death by a girlfriend but his body fell into the river. Now, does that mean that the murder occurred in San José, because there's admiralty law issues here. Because Guadalupe river is a navigable river. And it's interesting. I want to find out. Because the people who were telling me was murder he two weeks ago but I'm not sure. Some of these people are on drugs and other people said two months ago. And so I want to find out exactly when this person was murdered. And now it's almost impossible for me the get down to where his encampment was because I just -- my legs, my disability I just can't get down there. But if I were you Mr. Mayor, I would really start thinking long-term about bringing in the military to deal with these encampments, these shanty towns. Because there's really no way the city can give out homeless vouchers to the number of people that are there. And besides some of these people are very dangerous people. I mean the police should be at least run warrant checks on everybody that's out there just to find out who they are. But this business about the body in the river, does it go to the number of homicides in San José, because it was really goes under admiralty law because it was in a river. Anyway that's just something I thought I'd tell you.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes the open forum, concludes our meeting, we're adjourned.