



**BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL AGENDA & RULES COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING**

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2021

3:00 P.M.

Committee Members:

Mayor Jesse Arreguin, Councilmembers Sophie Hahn and Susan Wengraf

Alternate: Councilmember Lori Droste

PUBLIC ADVISORY: THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED EXCLUSIVELY THROUGH VIDEOCONFERENCE AND TELECONFERENCE

Pursuant to Section 3 of Executive Order N-29-20, issued by Governor Newsom on March 17, 2020, this meeting of the City Council Agenda & Rules Committee will be conducted exclusively through teleconference and Zoom videoconference. Please be advised that pursuant to the Executive Order, and to ensure the health and safety of the public by limiting human contact that could spread the COVID-19 virus, there will not be a physical meeting location available.

To access the meeting remotely using the internet: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Use URL <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82354172388>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon on the screen.

To join by phone: Dial **1-669-900-9128 or 1-877-853-5257 (Toll Free)** and Enter Meeting ID: **823 5417 2388**. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

Written communications submitted by mail or e-mail to the Agenda & Rules Committee by 5:00 p.m. the Friday before the Committee meeting will be distributed to the members of the Committee in advance of the meeting and retained as part of the official record. City offices are currently closed and cannot accept written communications in person.

AGENDA

Roll Call

Public Comment - Limited to items on this agenda only

Referred Items for Review

1. **Commission Reorganization for Post-COVID19 Budget Recovery**
From: Councilmember Droste (Author), Councilmember Robinson (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Kesarwani (Co-Sponsor)

Referred: June 15, 2020

Due: March 1, 2021

Recommendation: 1. Reorganize existing commissions with the goal of achieving 20 total commissions; 2. Reorganize existing commissions within various departments to ensure that no single department is responsible for more than five commissions; 3. Reorganize commissions within the Public Works Department to ensure Public Works oversees no more than three commissions; 4. Refer to the City Manager and every policy committee to agendize at the next meeting available to discuss commissions that are in their purview and make recommendations to the full Council on how to reorganize and address the various policy areas. Commission members should be notified and chairs should be invited to participate. Policy committee members are encouraged to consider the renaming of some commissions in order to ensure that all policy areas are addressed.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Lori Droste, Councilmember, District 8, (510) 981-7180

Items for Future Agendas

- Discussion of items to be added to future agendas

Adjournment – Next Meeting Monday, February 8, 2021

~~~~~

Written communications addressed to the Agenda Committee and submitted to the City Clerk Department by 5:00 p.m. the Friday before the Committee meeting, will be distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting.

This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953 and applicable Executive Orders as issued by the Governor that are currently in effect. Members of the City Council who are not members of the standing committee may attend a standing committee meeting even if it results in a quorum being present, provided that the non-members only act as observers and do not participate in the meeting. If only one member of the Council who is not a member of the committee is present for the meeting, the member may participate in the meeting because less than a quorum of the full Council is present. Any member of the public may attend this meeting. Questions regarding this matter may be addressed to Mark Numainville, City Clerk, (510) 981-6900.



**COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:**

To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at (510) 981-6418 (V) or (510) 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date.

\* \* \*

I hereby certify that the agenda for this special meeting of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City's website, on January 28, 2021.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark Numainville".

Mark Numainville, City Clerk

## Communications

Communications submitted to City Council Policy Committees are on file in the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA, and are available upon request by contacting the City Clerk Department at (510) 981-6908 or [policycommittee@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:policycommittee@cityofberkeley.info).





Lori Droste  
Councilmember, District 8

## **ACTION CALENDAR**

June 30, 2020

**To:** Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

**From:** Councilmember Lori Droste (Author) and Councilmembers Rigel Robinson (Co-Sponsor) and Rashi Kesarwani (Co-Sponsor)

**Subject:** Commission Reorganization for Post-COVID19 Budget Recovery

### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1) Reorganize existing commissions with the goal of achieving 20 total commissions.
- 2) Reorganize existing commissions within various departments to ensure that no single department is responsible for more than five commissions.
- 3) Reorganize commissions within the Public Works Department to ensure Public Works oversees no more than three commissions.
- 4) Refer to the City Manager and every policy committee to agendaize at the next meeting available to discuss commissions that are in their purview and make recommendations to the full Council on how to reorganize and address the various policy areas. Commission members should be notified and chairs should be invited to participate. Policy committee members are encouraged to consider the renaming of some commissions in order to ensure that all policy areas are addressed.

## **PROBLEM/SUMMARY STATEMENT**

Demand for city workers staffing commissions is larger than the City's ability to supply it at an acceptable financial and public health cost. Thirty-seven commissions require valuable city staff time and funding that could be better spent providing essential services. The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the City of Berkeley in a myriad of ways, resulting in enormous once-in-a-lifetime socioeconomic and public health impacts. While the City Manager and department heads are addressing how to best prepare and protect our residents, particularly our most vulnerable, they are also required to oversee an inordinate amount of commissions for a medium-sized city at a significant cost.

The City of Berkeley faces many challenges, including the COVID-19 pandemic and its resultant budget and staffing impacts. Prior to the onset of COVID-19, the City Council and staff spent significant Council time on items originating with the City's advisory commissions. As the Shelter in Place is gradually lifted, critical city staff will resume staffing these 37 commissions. As a result, too much valuable staff time will continue to be spent on supporting an excessive amount of commissions in Berkeley rather than addressing the basic needs of the City.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies, and Laws**

The City of Berkeley has approximately thirty-seven commissions overseen by city administration, most of which have at least nine members and who are appointed by individual councilmembers. These commissions were intended to be a forum for public participation beyond what is feasible at the City Council, so that issues that come before the City Council can be adequately vetted.

Some commissions are required by charter or mandated by voter approval or state/federal mandate. Those commissions are the following:

1. Board of Library Trustees (charter)
2. Business Improvement Districts (state mandate)
3. Civic Arts Commission (charter)
4. Community Environmental Advisory Commission (state/federal mandate--CUPA)
5. Fair Campaign Practices Commission/Open Government (ballot measure)
6. Homeless Services Panel of Experts (ballot measure)
7. Housing Advisory Commission (state/federal mandate)
8. Human Welfare and Community Action (state/federal mandate)
9. Measure O Bond Oversight Committee (ballot measure)
10. Mental Health Commission (state/federal mandate)
11. Personnel (charter)

12. Police Review Commission (ballot measure)
13. Sugar-Sweetened Beverages (ballot measure)

Berkeley must have its own mental health commission because of its independent Mental Health Division. In order to receive services, the City needs to have to have an advisory board. Additionally, Berkeley's Community Environmental Advisory Commission is a required commission in order to oversee Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) under California's Environmental Protection Agency. Additionally, some commissions serve other purposes beyond policy advisories. The Children, Youth and Recreation Commission, Housing Advisory Commission, and the Human Welfare and Community Action Commission advise Council on community agency funding. However, some of the aforementioned quasi-judicial and state/federal mandated commissions do not need to stand independently and can be combined to meet mandated goals.

In comparison to neighboring jurisdictions of similar size, Berkeley has significantly more commissions. The median number of commissions for these cities is 12 and the average is 15.

| Comparable Bay Area City | Population (est.) | Number of Commissions | Links                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Berkeley                 | 121,000           | 37                    | <a href="https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_Commissions/External%20Roster.pdf">https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3 - Commissions/External%20Roster.pdf</a> |
| Antioch                  | 112,000           | 6                     | <a href="https://www.antiochca.gov/government/boards-commissions/">https://www.antiochca.gov/government/boards-commissions/</a>                                                                               |
| Concord                  | 130,000           | 14                    | <a href="https://www.cityofconcord.org/264/Applications-for-Boards-Committees-Comm">https://www.cityofconcord.org/264/Applications-for-Boards-Committees-Comm</a>                                             |
| Daly City                | 107,000           | 7                     | <a href="http://www.dalycity.org/City_Hall/Departments/city_clerk/Commissions_Information/boards.htm">http://www.dalycity.org/City_Hall/Departments/city_clerk/Commissions_Information/boards.htm</a>         |
| Fairfield                | 117,000           | 7                     | <a href="https://www.fairfield.ca.gov/gov/comms/default.asp">https://www.fairfield.ca.gov/gov/comms/default.asp</a>                                                                                           |
| Fremont                  | 238,000           | 15                    | <a href="https://www.fremont.gov/76/Boards-Commissions-Committees">https://www.fremont.gov/76/Boards-Commissions-Committees</a>                                                                               |
| Hayward                  | 160,000           | 12                    | <a href="https://www.hayward-ca.gov/your-government/boards-commissions">https://www.hayward-ca.gov/your-government/boards-commissions</a>                                                                     |
| Richmond                 | 110,000           | 29                    | <a href="https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/256/Boards-and-Commissions">https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/256/Boards-and-Commissions</a>                                                                               |
| San Mateo                | 105,000           | 7                     | <a href="https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/60/Commissions-Boards">https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/60/Commissions-Boards</a>                                                                                       |

|           |         |    |                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----------|---------|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sunnyvale | 153,000 | 10 | <a href="https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=22804">https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=22804</a> |
| Vallejo   | 122,000 | 17 | <a href="http://www.ci.vallejo.ca.us/cms/one.aspx?pageId=22192">http://www.ci.vallejo.ca.us/cms/one.aspx?pageId=22192</a>                                 |

### Consultation and Outreach

To understand the impact on various departments and staffing capacity, the following table shows which departments are responsible for overseeing various commissions.

| Commission Name                                                | Overseeing Department<br>(Total Commissions in<br>Department) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Animal Care Commission                                         | City Manager (7)                                              |
| Civic Arts Commission                                          | City Manager (7)                                              |
| Commission on the Status of Women                              | City Manager (7)                                              |
| Elmwood BID Advisory Board                                     | City Manager (7)                                              |
| Loan Administration Board                                      | City Manager (7)                                              |
| Peace and Justice Commission                                   | City Manager (7)                                              |
| Solano Ave BID Advisory Board                                  | City Manager (7)                                              |
|                                                                |                                                               |
| Cannabis Commission                                            | Planning (8)                                                  |
| Community Environmental Advisory Commission                    | Planning (8)                                                  |
| Design Review Committee                                        | Planning (8)                                                  |
| Energy Commission                                              | Planning (8)                                                  |
| Joint Subcommittee on the Implementation of State Housing Laws | Planning (8)                                                  |
| Landmarks Preservation Commission                              | Planning (8)                                                  |
| Planning Commission                                            | Planning (8)                                                  |
| Zoning Adjustments Board                                       | Planning (8)                                                  |
|                                                                |                                                               |
| Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission                     | Parks (3)                                                     |
| Parks and Waterfront Commission                                | Parks (3)                                                     |
| Youth Commission                                               | Parks (3)                                                     |
|                                                                |                                                               |
| Commission on Aging                                            | Health, Housing, and<br>Community Services<br>(HHCS) (10)     |
| Commission on Labor                                            | HHCS (10)                                                     |
| Community Health Commission                                    | HHCS (10)                                                     |



|                                                               |                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Homeless Commission                                           | HHCS (10)           |
| Homeless Services Panel of Experts                            | HHCS(10)            |
| Housing Advisory Commission                                   | HHCS (10)           |
| Human Welfare & Community Action Commission                   | HHCS (10)           |
| Measure O Bond Oversight Committee                            | HHCS (10)           |
| Mental Health Commission                                      | HHCS (10)           |
| Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts             | HHCS (10)           |
|                                                               |                     |
| Disaster and Fire Safety Commission                           | Fire (1)            |
|                                                               |                     |
| Commission on Disability                                      | Public Works (5)    |
| Public Works Commission                                       | Public Works (5)    |
| Traffic Circle Task Force                                     | Public Works (5)    |
| Transportation Commission                                     | Public Works (5)    |
| Zero Waste Commission                                         | Public Works (5)    |
|                                                               |                     |
| Fair Campaign Practices Commission/Open Government Commission | City Attorney (1)   |
|                                                               |                     |
| Personnel Board                                               | Human Resources (1) |
|                                                               |                     |
| Police Review Commission                                      | Police (1)          |
|                                                               |                     |
| Board of Library Trustees                                     | Library (1)         |

Gray=charter

Red=state/federal mandate

Yellow=quasi-judicial

Blue=ballot initiative

Orange=state/federal mandate and quasi-judicial

Green=quasi-judicial and ballot initiative

The departments that staff more than five commissions are Health, Housing, and Community Services (10 commissions), Planning (8 commissions), and the City Manager's department (7 commissions). At the same time, some smaller departments (e.g. the City Attorney's office) may be impacted just as meaningfully if they have fewer staff and larger individual commission workloads.

With the recent addition of policy committees, proposed legislation is now vetted by councilmembers in these forums. Each policy committee is focused on a particular

content area aligned with the City of Berkeley's strategic plan and is staffed and an advisory policy body to certain city departments. Members of the public are able to provide input at these committees as well. The policy committees currently have the following department alignment:

### **Department and Policy Committee alignment**

1. **Agenda and Rules**—all departments
2. **Budget and Finance**—City Manager, Clerk, Budget, and Finance
3. **Land Use and Economic Development**—Clerk, Planning, HHCS, City Attorney, and City Manager (OED)
4. **Public Safety**—Clerk, City Manager, Police, and Fire
5. **Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment and Sustainability** (Clerk, City Manager, Planning, Public Works, and Parks)
6. **Health, Equity, Life Enrichment, and Community** (Clerk, City Manager, HHCS)

### **CRITERIA CONSIDERED**

#### **Effectiveness**

*How does this proposal maximize public interest?* For this analysis, the effectiveness criterion includes analysis of the *benefits* to the entire community equitably with specific emphasis on public health, racial justice and safety.

#### **Fiscal Impacts/Staffing Costs**

*What are the costs?* The fiscal impact of the proposed recommendation and various alternatives considered includes direct costs of commissions.

#### **Administrative Burden/Productivity Loss**

*What are the operational requirements or productivity gains or losses from this proposal?*

The administrative burden criterion guides the analysis in considering operational considerations and productivity gains and losses. While operational considerations and tradeoffs are difficult to quantify in dollar amounts, productivity losses were considered in its absence.

#### **Environmental Sustainability**

The environmental sustainability criterion guides legislation in order to avoid depletion or degradation of the natural resources and allow for long-term environmental quality.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

### **Alternative #1–The Current Situation**

The current situation is the status quo. The City of Berkeley would retain all commissions and no changes would be made.

### **Alternative #2–Collaborative Approach with Quantity Parameters**

This approach would specify a specific number (20) of commissions the City of Berkeley should manage and set parameters around individual department responsibilities. Furthermore, it requires a collaborative approach and outreach to address specific policy areas by referring it to the Council policy committees for further analysis and specific recommendations.

### **Alternative #3–Committee Alignment, Mandated and Quasi-Judicial Commissions**

This alternative would consist of five commissions aligned directly with the policy committees in addition to quasi-judicial bodies and ones required by charter, ballot measure or law.

- *Budget and Finance Commission*
- *Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment and Sustainability Commission (state/federal mandate--CUPA)*
- *Health, Equity, and Life Enrichment*
- *Land Use and Economic Development*
- *Public Safety*
- Board of Library Trustees (charter)
- Civic Arts Commission (charter)
- Community Environmental Advisory Commission (state/federal mandate--CUPA)
- Fair Campaign Practices Commission/Open Government (ballot measure)
- Homeless Services Panel of Experts (ballot measure)
- Housing Advisory Commission (state/federal mandate)
- Human Welfare and Community Action (state/federal mandate)
- Landmarks Commission (quasi-judicial)
- Measure O Bond Oversight Committee (ballot measure)
- Mental Health Commission (state/federal mandate)
- Planning (quasi-judicial)
- Personnel (charter)
- Police Review Commission (ballot measure)
- Sugar-Sweetened Beverages (ballot measure)
- Zoning Adjustments Board (quasi-judicial)

#### **Alternative #4: Extreme Consolidation**

This alternative represents a prescriptive approach with maximum consolidation in content area and mandated commissions, absent charter amendments.

- Board of Library Trustees (charter)
- Business Improvement District (state/federal mandate)
- Civic Arts Commission (charter)
- Community Environmental Advisory Commission/Energy/Zero Waste (state/federal--CUPA)
- Fair Campaign Practices Commission/Open Government (ballot measure)
- Homeless Services Panel of Experts (ballot measure)
- Human Welfare and Community Action (state/federal mandate)
- Measure O Bond Oversight Committee (ballot measure)/Housing Advisory Commission (state/federal mandate)
- Mental Health Commission (state/federal mandate)
- Personnel (charter)
- Planning Commission (quasi-judicial and appeals)
- Board of Appeals (land use appeals)
- Police Review Commission (ballot measure)
- Health and Sugar-Sweetened Beverages (ballot measure)

#### **PROJECTED OUTCOMES (CRITERIA X ALTERNATIVES)**

|                                       | <b>Current Situation</b> | <b>Collaborative Approach</b> | <b>Policy Committee Alignment</b> | <b>Extreme Consolidation</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Benefit/ Effectiveness</b>         | medium                   | high                          | medium                            | low                          |
| <b>Cost</b>                           | high                     | medium                        | low                               | low                          |
| <b>Administrative Burden</b>          | high                     | low                           | low                               | medium                       |
| <b>Relative Environmental Benefit</b> | low                      | medium                        | medium                            | high                         |

#### **Current Situation and Its Effects (Alternative #1)**

##### *Effectiveness of the Current Situation*

Commissions serve a vital role in the City of Berkeley's rich process of resident engagement. An analysis of agendas over the past several years shows that the

commissions have created policy that have benefited the community in meaningful and important ways. In 2019, approximately two-thirds of commission items submitted to Council passed. From 2016-2019, an average of 39 items were submitted by commissions to Council for consideration. Every year roughly 15-18 (~40-45%) commissions do not submit any items for Council policy consideration in any given year. The reason for this varies. Some commissions don't submit policy recommendations (BIDs) and some commissions recommendations may not rise to Council level at all or come to Council as a staff recommendation (e.g. ZAB and DRC). Additionally, a few commissions struggle to reach monthly quorum as there are currently 64 vacancies on the various commissions, excluding alternative commissioners.

It is also important to consider equitable outcomes and the beneficiaries as well. For example, the City's Health, Housing and Community Development department serves an important role in addressing COVID-19, racial disparities, inequitable health outcomes, affordable housing, and other important community programs. Additionally, Health, Housing, and Community Development also staffs ten commissions, more than many cities of Berkeley's size. Council needs to wrestle with these tradeoffs to ensure that we seek the maximum benefit for *all* of the Berkeley community, particularly our most vulnerable.

### *Staffing Costs*

Based upon preliminary calculations of staff titles and salary classifications, the average staff secretary makes roughly \$60-\$65/hour. Based upon recent interviews with secretaries and department heads, individual commission secretaries work anywhere from 8-80 hours a month staffing and preparing for commission meetings. To illustrate this example, a few examples are listed below.

| Commission                        | Step 5 Rate of Pay | Reported Hours a Month | Total <b>Direct</b> Cost of Commission <b>per Month</b> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Animal Care                       | \$70.90            | 8                      | \$567.20                                                |
| Landmarks Preservation Commission | \$57.96            | 80                     | \$4,636.80                                              |
| Design Review Commission          | \$52.76            | 60                     | \$3,165.60                                              |
| Peace and Justice                 | \$60.82            | 32                     | \$1946.24                                               |

It is extremely challenging to estimate a specific cost of commissions in the aggregate because of the varying workload but a safe estimate of salary costs dedicated to commissions would be in the six-figure range.

Many commissions--particularly quasi-judicial and land use commissions-- require more than one staff member to be present and prepare reports for commissions. For example, Zoning Adjustment Board meetings often last five hours or more and multiple staff members spend hours preparing for hearings. The Planning Department indicates that *in addition* to direct hours, additional commission-related staff time adds an extra 33% staff time. Using the previous examples, this means that the Landmarks Preservation Commission would cost the city over \$6,000 in productivity while the Design Review Commission would cost the City over \$4,000 a month.

#### *Productivity Losses and Administrative Burden*

Current productivity losses are stark because of the sheer amount of hours of staffing time dedicated to commissions. As an example, in 2019 one of the City of Berkeley's main homeless outreach workers staffed a commission within the City Manager's department. She spent approximately 32 hours a month working directly on commission work. While this is not a commentary on a particular commission, this work directly impacted her ability to conduct homeless outreach. The Joint Subcommittee on the Interpretation of State Housing Laws is another example. Planners dedicate 50 hours a month to that commission. Meanwhile, this commission has limited ability in affecting state law and the City Attorney's office is responsible for interpreting state law. While this commission does important work on other issues, there is little nexus in interpreting state housing laws and could be disbanded and consolidated with an existing commission. If this commission were disbanded, the current planner could dedicate significant hours to Council's top priorities in Planning. This year's top Council priority is the displacement of Berkeley's residents of color and African Americans (Davila).

#### *Environmental Sustainability*

The current commission structure doesn't have a large impact on the environment but, in relative terms, is the most burdensome because of the potential vehicle miles travelled by hundreds of commissioners (VMT) and printing costs associated with a large number of commissions.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

### **Effectiveness**

#### *Alternative #2–Collaborative approach*

While the outcome is unknown, a collaborative approach with a specified target quantity of commissions and departmental responsibility would likely yield significant benefit to the community. Due to the projected budget cuts, city staff will need to have more bandwidth to deliver baseline services and priority projects. Civic engagement will still be retained due to a myriad of ways to provide public input but more importantly, current commissioners and civic partners are invited to provide feedback to the policy committees for consideration. Additionally, this approach is a less prescriptive approach which allows Council to acknowledge that the current number of commissions is unsustainable and impacts baseline services. Instead of recommending specific commission cuts at this moment, this approach simply allows Council to state an appropriate number of commissions (20) and acknowledge the severe staffing impacts of the current configuration. Furthermore, twenty commissions is a reasonable starting point, especially when considering that most area cities that are approximately Berkeley's size have seven commissions.

#### *Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment*

This approach would yield some benefit in that commissions would reflect current policy committees and would directly advise those bodies. This is beneficial because commissions directly aligned with policy committees would be an independent civic replica of the appointed policy committee bodies. It further retains mandated commissions. However, this prescriptive approach doesn't allow for flexibility in retaining historically important commissions and it does not address the benefit of potentially consolidating two commissions that address the same policy content area. For instance, it may be possible to combine the sugar-sweetened beverage oversight panel with the Health, Life, and Equity commission or the CEAC with the Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment and Sustainability.

#### *Alternative 4–Extreme Consolidation–*

This approach is the most drastic alternative and the overall effectiveness is likely low, mainly due to potential community backlash due to Berkeley's long history of civic engagement. Furthermore, the Planning Commission would likely become overburdened and less effective because land use appeals would have to be routed through the Planning Commission.

## **Costs/Fiscal Impact**

### *Alternative 2--Collaborative Approach*

The fiscal impact of the Collaborative Approach is unknown at this time because this recommendation does not prescribe specific commission consolidations or cuts. However, if commissions are reorganized such that Berkeley will have 20 instead of 38, there will be significant direct cost savings. One can reasonably assume that the direct financial cost could reduce to almost half the current amount.

### *Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment*

The fiscal impact of Policy Committee Alignment would yield significant savings due to commission consolidation. One can reasonably assume that the direct financial cost could reduce to more than half the current amount.

### *Alternative 4--Extreme Consolidation*

Extreme Consolidation would yield the most savings due to commission consolidation. One can reasonably assume that the direct financial cost would reduce to 25%-30% of the current amount spent on commission work.

## **Productivity**

### *Alternative 2--Collaborative Approach*

The most glaring impact on the current commission structure is administrative impacts and productivity. Whether City Council consolidates commissions or not, attributable salary costs will still exist. The primary benefit of pursuing the Collaborative Approach would center on productivity. The City of Berkeley is likely to garner significant productivity gains by specifying a target number of commissions overall and within departments. Using the Peace and Justice and Joint Subcommittee on the Interpretation of State Housing Laws examples above, more staff will be able to focus on core services and priority programs. Thousands of hours may be regained by dedicated staff to tackle the tough issues our community faces, especially in light of COVID-19 and concerns around racial equity.

### *Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment*

This alternative likely will yield the same productivity benefits as the collaborative approach, if not more. The City of Berkeley would likely garner significant productivity gains by specifying less than twenty commissions. Thousands of hours may be regained by dedicated staff to tackle the tough issues our community faces, especially in light of COVID-19 and concerns around racial equity.



*Alternative 4–Extreme Consolidation*

This alternative would likely provide the most productivity gains and lessen administrative burdens overall. However, there could be unintended consequences of productivity within the planning department absent additional policy changes. For example, the quasi-judicial Zoning Adjustments Board and Planning Commission agendas are packed year round. It is unclear whether eliminating one of these commissions would lessen the administrative burden and increase productivity in the Planning Department or whether those responsibilities would merely shift commissions. At the same time, the Planning Department could benefit from reducing commissions to increase productivity within the planning department.

**Environmental Sustainability**

*Alternative 2–Collaborative approach*

This alternative doesn't have a large impact on the environment other than potential vehicle miles travelled by hundreds of commissioners (VMT) and printing costs. However, these environmental impacts could be cut in half with commission reorganization.

*Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment*

This alternative doesn't have a large impact on the environment other than potential vehicle miles travelled by hundreds of commissioners (VMT) and printing costs. However, these environmental impacts could be cut in half with commission reorganization.

*Alternative 4–Extreme Consolidation*

This alternative would have negligible impacts on the environment other than potential vehicle miles travelled by hundreds of commissioners (VMT) and printing costs.

**RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The Collaborative Approach is the best path forward in order to pursue Berkeley's commitment to

- Create affordable housing and housing support services for our most vulnerable community members
- Be a global leader in addressing climate change, advancing environmental justice, and protecting the environment
- Champion and demonstrate social and racial equity
- Provide an efficient and financially-healthy City government
- Provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities
- Foster a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy
- Create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared City

- Be a customer-focused organization that provides excellent, timely, easily-accessible service and information to the community
- Attract and retain a talented and diverse City government workforce

The status quo—37 commissions— is too costly and unproductive. At the same time, civic engagement and commission work absolutely deserve an important role in Berkeley. Consequently, this legislation retains commissions but centers on overall community benefit, staff productivity, and associated costs. This is imperative to address, especially in light of COVID-19 and community demands for reinvestment in important social services.