



BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL AGENDA & RULES COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2024

2:30 P.M.

2180 Milvia Street, 6th Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704 – Redwood Room

1404 Le Roy Ave, Berkeley, CA 94708 – Teleconference Location

Committee Members:

Mayor Jesse Arreguin, Councilmembers Sophie Hahn and Susan Wengraf

Alternate: Councilmember Terry Taplin

This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid model with both in-person attendance and virtual participation. All Committee meetings are recorded.

To access the meeting remotely use this URL - <https://cityofberkeley-info.zoomgov.com/j/1612981697>. To request to speak, use the “raise hand” function in Zoom. To join by phone: Dial **1-669-254-5252** or **1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free)** and enter **Meeting ID: 161 298 1697**. To provide public comment, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair. To submit a written communication for the public record, email policycommittee@berkeleyca.gov.

This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953. Any member of the public may attend this meeting, however, if you are feeling sick, please do not attend the meeting in person.

Pursuant to the City Council Rules of Procedure and State Law, the presiding officer may remove, or cause the removal of, an individual for disrupting the meeting. Prior to removing an individual, the presiding officer shall warn the individual that their behavior is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. The presiding officer may then remove the individual if they do not promptly cease their disruptive behavior. “Disrupting” means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body, or engaging in behavior that constitutes use of force or a true threat of force.

California Government Code Section 84308 (Levine Act) Parties to a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use are required to disclose if they made contributions over \$250 within the prior 12 months to any City employee or officer. Parties and participants with a financial interest are prohibited from making more than \$250 in contributions to a decisionmaker for the 12 months after the final decision is rendered on the proceeding. The above contribution disclosures and restrictions do not apply when the proceeding is competitively bid, or involves a personnel or labor contract. For more information, see Government Code Section 84308.

AGENDA

Roll Call

Public Comment

Review of Agendas

1. **Approval of Minutes: August 26, 2024**
2. **Review and Approve Draft Agenda:**
 - a. 9/24/24 – Regular City Council Meeting
3. **Selection of Item for the Berkeley Considers Online Engagement Portal**
4. **Adjournments In Memory**

Scheduling

5. **Council Worksessions Schedule**
6. **Council Referrals to Agenda Committee for Scheduling**
7. **Land Use Calendar**

Referred Items for Review

8. **Discussion and Possible Action on City Council Rules of Decorum, Procedural Rules, and Public Comment Processes**
9. **City Council Legislative Systems Redesign, Including Strengthening the Committee System to Provide More In-Depth Review and Vetting of Major Items**

Unscheduled Items

10. **Modifications or Improvements to City Council Meeting Procedures (referred by Council at the March 14, 2023 meeting)**
11. **Strengthening and Supporting City Commissions: Guidance on the Development of Legislative Proposals**
12. **Discussion and Recommendations on the Continued Use of the Berkeley Considers Online Engagement Portal**
13. **Consideration of Changes to Supplemental Material Timelines (referred by Council at the May 7, 2024 meeting)**

Items for Future Agendas

- Requests by Committee Members to add items to the next agenda

Adjournment – Next Meeting Monday, September 16, 2024

Additional items may be added to the draft agenda per Council Rules of Procedure.

Rules of Procedure as adopted by Council resolution, Article III, C3c - Agenda - Submission of Time Critical Items

Time Critical Items. A Time Critical item is defined as a matter that is considered urgent by the sponsor and that has a deadline for action that is prior to the next meeting of the Council and for which a report prepared by the City Manager, Auditor, Mayor or council member is received by the City Clerk after established deadlines and is not included on the Agenda Committee's published agenda.

If the Agenda Committee finds the matter to meet the definition of Time Critical, the Agenda Committee may place the matter on the Agenda on either the Consent or Action Calendar.

The City Clerk shall not accept any item past the adjournment of the Agenda Committee meeting for which the agenda that the item is requested to appear on has been approved.

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 in advance of the meeting and retained as part of the official record.

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 public participation may be addressed to the City Clerk Department (510) 981-6900.



COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. 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. Attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various scents, whether natural or manufactured, in products and materials. Please help the City respect these needs.

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 Thursday, September 5, 2024.



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@berkeleyca.gov.

BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL AGENDA & RULES COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 2024

2:30 P.M.

2180 Milvia Street, 6th Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704 – Redwood Room

1404 Le Roy Ave, Berkeley, CA 94708 – Teleconference Location

Committee Members:

Mayor Jesse Arreguin, Councilmembers Sophie Hahn and Susan Wengraf

Alternate: Councilmember Terry Taplin

This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid model with both in-person attendance and virtual participation. All Committee meetings are recorded.

To access the meeting remotely use this URL - <https://cityofberkeley-info.zoomgov.com/j/1607301824>. To request to speak, use the “raise hand” function in Zoom. To join by phone: Dial **1-669-254-5252 or 1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free)** and enter **Meeting ID: 160 730 1824**. To provide public comment, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair. To submit a written communication for the public record, email policycommittee@berkeleyca.gov.

This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953. Any member of the public may attend this meeting, however, if you are feeling sick, please do not attend the meeting in person.

Pursuant to the City Council Rules of Procedure and State Law, the presiding officer may remove, or cause the removal of, an individual for disrupting the meeting. Prior to removing an individual, the presiding officer shall warn the individual that their behavior is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. The presiding officer may then remove the individual if they do not promptly cease their disruptive behavior. “Disrupting” means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body, or engaging in behavior that constitutes use of force or a true threat of force.

California Government Code Section 84308 (Levine Act) Parties to a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use are required to disclose if they made contributions over \$250 within the prior 12 months to any City employee or officer. Parties and participants with a financial interest are prohibited from making more than \$250 in contributions to a decisionmaker for the 12 months after the final decision is rendered on the proceeding. The above contribution disclosures and restrictions do not apply when the proceeding is competitively bid, or involves a personnel or labor contract. For more information, see Government Code Section 84308.

Roll Call: 2:37 p.m. All present.

Public Comment – 35 speakers

Review of Agendas

1. Approval of Minutes: July 15, 2024

Action: M/S/C (Wengraf/Arreguin) to approve the minutes of 7/15/24.

Vote: All Ayes.

2. Review and Approve Draft Agenda:

a. 9/10/24 – Regular City Council Meeting

Action: M/S/C (Arreguin/Wengraf) to place Item 38 Wildfire Hardening on the Consent Calendar for the 9/10/24 meeting.

Vote: Ayes – Wengraf, Arreguin; Noes – None; Abstain - Hahn.

Action: M/S/C (Arreguin/Wengraf) to place Item 37 Encampment Policy on the Action Calendar for the 9/10/24 meeting.

Vote: Ayes – Wengraf, Arreguin; Noes – None; Abstain - Hahn.

Action: M/S/C (Arreguin/Hahn) to approve the agenda of 9/10/24, except Item 23 and Item 25, including the changes noted below.

- Item Added: AC Transit Draft Plan (Wengraf) – Mayor Arreguin and Councilmember Hahn added as co-sponsors; added to 9/10/24 Consent Calendar
- Item 16 Roundstone (City Manager) – revised title and recommendation
- Item 31 Ambulance Fees (City Manager) – revised recommendation
- Item 32 Voting Delegates (City Manager) – moved to Consent Calendar
- Item 33 Rules of Procedure (City Manager) – moved to Consent Calendar; policy committee recommendation added
- Item 34 Building Codes (City Manager) – removed from the agenda by the City Manager
- Item 35a/35b – Panoramic Hill (Commission/City Manager) – moved to Consent Calendar
- Item 36 COPA/TOPA (Harrison) – scheduled for a special meeting in September
- Item 37 Encampment Policy (Kesarwani) – revised item submitted; scheduled for 9/10/24 Action Calendar
- Item 38 Wildfire Hardening (Wengraf) – revised item submitted; Councilmember Hahn added as a co-sponsor; scheduled for 9/10/24 Consent Calendar

Order of Action Items

Item 31 Ambulance Fees

Item 37 Encampment Policy

Vote: All Ayes.

Action: M/S/C (Arreguin/Hahn) to add Item 23 and Item 25 from the draft agenda regarding Mills Act contracts to the 9/10/24 agenda on the Consent Calendar.

Vote: Ayes – Hahn, Arreguin; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Wengraf (recused – resides within 500 feet).

3. **Selection of Item for the Berkeley Considers Online Engagement Portal**
– None Selected

4. **Adjournments In Memory** – None

Scheduling

5. **Council Worksessions Schedule** – TOPA scheduled for a special meeting
6. **Council Referrals to Agenda Committee for Scheduling** – received and filed
7. **Land Use Calendar** – received and filed

Referred Items for Review

8. **Discussion and Possible Action on City Council Rules of Decorum, Procedural Rules, and Public Comment Processes**

Action: 0 speakers. No action or discussion.

9. **City Council Legislative Systems Redesign, Including Strengthening the Committee System to Provide More In-Depth Review and Vetting of Major Items**

Action: 1 speaker. M/S/C (Hahn/Arreguin) to send the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure, as discussed and further amended on 8/26/24, to the City Council with a positive recommendation.

Vote: Ayes – Hahn, Arreguin; Noes – None; Abstain – Wengraf.

Unscheduled Items

10. **Modifications or Improvements to City Council Meeting Procedures (referred by Council at the March 14, 2023 meeting)**
11. **Strengthening and Supporting City Commissions: Guidance on the Development of Legislative Proposals**
12. **Discussion and Recommendations on the Continued Use of the Berkeley Considers Online Engagement Portal**
13. **Consideration of Changes to Supplemental Material Timelines (referred by Council at the May 7, 2024 meeting)**

Items for Future Agendas

- None

Adjournment

Action: M/S/C (Arreguin/Hahn) to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: All Ayes.

Adjourned at 5:02 p.m.


I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct record of the Agenda & Rules Committee meeting held on August 26, 2024.



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@berkeleyca.gov.



DRAFT AGENDA
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, September 24, 2024
6:00 PM

SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD ROOM - 1231 ADDISON STREET, BERKELEY, CA 94702

TELECONFERENCE LOCATION - 1404 LE ROY AVE, BERKELEY, CA 94708

JESSE ARREGUIN, MAYOR

Councilmembers:

DISTRICT 1 – RASHI KESARWANI
 DISTRICT 2 – TERRY TAPLIN
 DISTRICT 3 – BEN BARTLETT
 DISTRICT 4 – IGOR TREGUB

DISTRICT 5 – SOPHIE HAHN
 DISTRICT 6 – SUSAN WENGRAF
 DISTRICT 7 – CECILIA LUNAPARRA
 DISTRICT 8 – MARK HUMBERT

This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid model with both in-person attendance and virtual participation. Live captioned broadcasts of Council meetings are available on B-TV (Channel 33) and via internet video stream at http://berkeley.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?publish_id=1244. All Council meetings are recorded.

*To access the meeting remotely use this URL: <<INSERT ZOOM for GOV URL HERE>>. To request to speak, use the “raise hand” function in Zoom. To join by phone: Dial **1-669-254-5252 or 1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free)** and enter **Meeting ID: <<INSERT MEETING ID HERE>>**. To provide public comment, Press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair. To submit a written communication for the public record, email council@berkeleyca.gov.*

This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953. Any member of the public may attend this meeting, however, if you are feeling sick, please do not attend the meeting in person. The City Council may take action related to any subject listed on the Agenda.

Pursuant to the City Council Rules of Procedure and State Law, the presiding officer may remove, or cause the removal of, an individual for disrupting the meeting. Prior to removing an individual, the presiding officer shall warn the individual that their behavior is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. The presiding officer may then remove the individual if they do not promptly cease their disruptive behavior. “Disrupting” means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body, or engaging in behavior that constitutes use of force or a true threat of force.

Government Code Section 84308 (Levine Act) - Parties to a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use are required to disclose if they made contributions over \$250 within the prior 12 months to any City employee or officer. Parties and participants with a financial interest are prohibited from making more than \$250 in contributions to a decisionmaker for the 12 months after the final decision is rendered on the proceeding. The above contribution disclosures and restrictions do not apply when the proceeding is competitively bid, or involves a personnel or labor contract. For more information, see Government Code Section 84308.

Preliminary Matters

Roll Call:

Land Acknowledgement Statement: *The City of Berkeley recognizes that the community we live in was built on the territory of xučyun (Huchiun (Hooch-yoon)), the ancestral and unceded land of the Chochenyo (Cho-chen-yo)-speaking Ohlone (Oh-low-nee) people, the ancestors and descendants of the sovereign Verona Band of Alameda County. This land was and continues to be of great importance to all of the Ohlone Tribes and descendants of the Verona Band. As we begin our meeting tonight, we acknowledge and honor the original inhabitants of Berkeley, the documented 5,000-year history of a vibrant community at the West Berkeley Shellmound, and the Ohlone people who continue to reside in the East Bay. We recognize that Berkeley’s residents have and continue to benefit from the use and occupation of this unceded stolen land since the City of Berkeley’s incorporation in 1878. As stewards of the laws regulating the City of Berkeley, it is not only vital that we recognize the history of this land, but also recognize that the Ohlone people are present members of Berkeley and other East Bay communities today. The City of Berkeley will continue to build relationships with the Lisjan Tribe and to create meaningful actions that uphold the intention of this land acknowledgement.*

Ceremonial Matters: *In addition to those items listed on the agenda, the Mayor may add additional ceremonial matters.*

City Manager Comments: *The City Manager may make announcements or provide information to the City Council in the form of an oral report. The Council will not take action on such items but may request the City Manager place a report on a future agenda for discussion.*

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Matters: *Persons will be selected to address matters not on the Council agenda. If five or fewer persons wish to speak, each person selected will be allotted two minutes each. If more than five persons wish to speak, up to ten persons will be selected to address matters not on the Council agenda and each person selected will be allotted one minute each. Persons attending the meeting in-person and wishing to address the Council on matters not on the Council agenda during the initial ten-minute period for such comment, must submit a speaker card to the City Clerk in person at the meeting location and prior to commencement of that meeting. The remainder of the speakers wishing to address the Council on non-agenda items will be heard at the end of the agenda.*

Public Comment by Employee Unions (first regular meeting of the month): *This period of public comment is reserved for officially designated representatives of City of Berkeley employee unions, with five minutes allocated per union if representatives of three or fewer unions wish to speak and up to three minutes per union if representatives of four or more unions wish to speak.*

Consent Calendar

The Council will first determine whether to move items on the agenda for “Action” or “Information” to the “Consent Calendar”, or move “Consent Calendar” items to “Action.” Three members of the City Council must agree to pull an item from the Consent Calendar or Information Calendar for it to move to Action. Items that remain on the “Consent Calendar” are voted on in one motion as a group. “Information” items are not discussed or acted upon at the Council meeting unless they are moved to “Action” or “Consent”.

No additional items can be moved onto the Consent Calendar once public comment has commenced. At any time during, or immediately after, public comment on Information and Consent items, any Councilmember may move any Information or Consent item to “Action.” Following this, the Council will vote on the items remaining on the Consent Calendar in one motion.

For items moved to the Action Calendar from the Consent Calendar or Information Calendar, persons who spoke on the item during the Consent Calendar public comment period may speak again at the time the matter is taken up during the Action Calendar.

Public Comment on Consent Calendar and Information Items Only: *The Council will take public comment on any items that are either on the amended Consent Calendar or the Information Calendar. Speakers will be entitled to two minutes each to speak in opposition to or support of Consent Calendar and Information Items. A speaker may only speak once during the period for public comment on Consent Calendar and Information items.*

Additional information regarding public comment by City of Berkeley employees and interns: Employees and interns of the City of Berkeley, although not required, are encouraged to identify themselves as such, the department in which they work and state whether they are speaking as an individual or in their official capacity when addressing the Council in open session or workshops.

Recess Items

- 1. Contract: B-Bros Construction Inc. for Temporary Stabilization of Stair Tower Windows at 2180 Milvia Street**
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution approving the City Manager's emergency authorization of a contract with B-Bros Construction Inc. to make necessary repairs to the windows in the secondary egress stairwells in 2180 Milvia Street in an amount not to exceed \$400,000.
Financial Implications: See report.
Contact: Terrance Davis, Public Works, (510) 981-6300

Consent Calendar

- 2. Establish 2025 City Council Meeting Schedule**
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution establishing the City Council regular meeting schedule for 2025, with starting times of 6:00 p.m.
Financial Implications: None.
Contact: Mark Numainville, City Clerk, (510) 981-6900
- 3. Formal Bid Solicitations and Request for Proposals Scheduled for Possible Issuance After Council Approval on September 24, 2024**
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Approve the request for proposals or invitation for bids (attached to staff report) that will be, or are planned to be, issued upon final approval by the requesting department or division. All contracts over the City Manager's threshold will be returned to Council for final approval.
Financial Implications: See report.
Contact: Henry Oyekanmi, Finance, (510) 981-7300

Consent Calendar

- 4. Grant Application: Reconnecting Communities Pilot (RCP) Discretionary Grant Program for the Santa Fe Railroad Trackbed to Park Conversion Project**
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager or their designee to: submit a grant application in the amount of up to \$5 million to the U.S. Department of Transportation for the Reconnecting Communities Pilot (RCP) Discretionary Grant Program (second round) for the Santa Fe Railroad Trackbed to Park Conversion Project; accept any grants; execute any resulting grant agreements and any amendments; and that Council authorize the implementation of the project and appropriation of funding for related expenses, subject to securing the grant.
Financial Implications: See report.
Contact: Scott Ferris, Parks, Recreation and Waterfront, (510) 981-6700
- 5. Civic Arts Commission Fund Request - Mitigation Fee Nexus Study, Public Art on Private Development Requirement**
From: Civic Arts Commission
Recommendation: The Civic Arts Commission recommends that the City Council allocate \$125,000 in the FY24/25 Budget to fund a nexus study on the existing Public Art on Private Development Requirement (Berkeley Municipal Code 23.316), which was established in 2017. The Civic Arts Commission would like to make changes to the requirement to ensure ongoing support for the arts and culture sector in Berkeley. In order to make any changes to the Public Art on Private Development Requirement, first a nexus study is required by the State of California's Mitigation Fee Act.
Financial Implications: See report.
Contact: Jennifer Lovvorn, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-7530

Council Consent Items

- 6. Budget Referral: Independent Consultant to Conduct Analysis of Referring Restaurant Inspections to Alameda County**
From: Councilmember Kesarwani (Author)
Recommendation: Refer to the November budget process \$100,000 for the City Manager to engage an independent consultant to conduct an analysis that considers feasibility, costs, and benefits of referring food facility inspections to Alameda County, and submit a report with recommendations for Council consideration and potential action as soon as practicable.
The report should consider the following key areas:
- Environmental Health Division staffing, recruitment and retention;
- Costs and staffing resources to develop a new restaurant inspection database that complies with state rules; and
- Costs and staffing resources to develop a restaurant "grading" system, such as those used in Los Angeles County, New York City, or other jurisdictions.
Financial Implications: See report.
Contact: Rashi Kesarwani, Councilmember, District 1, (510) 981-7110

Action Calendar

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action. For items moved to the Action Calendar from the Consent Calendar or Information Calendar, persons who spoke on the item during the Consent Calendar public comment period may speak again during one of the Action Calendar public comment periods on the item. Public comment will occur for each Action item (excluding public hearings, appeals, and/or quasi-judicial matters) in one of two comment periods, either 1) before the Action Calendar is discussed; or 2) when the item is taken up by the Council.

A member of the public may only speak at one of the two public comment periods for any single Action item.

The Presiding Officer will request that persons wishing to speak line up at the podium, or use the "raise hand" function in Zoom, to determine the number of persons interested in speaking at that time. Up to ten (10) speakers may speak for two minutes. If there are more than ten persons interested in speaking, the Presiding Officer may limit the public comment for all speakers to one minute per speaker. Speakers are permitted to yield their time to one other speaker, however no one speaker shall have more than four minutes. The Presiding Officer may, with the consent of persons representing both sides of an issue, allocate a block of time to each side to present their issue.

Action items may be reordered at the discretion of the Chair with the consent of Council.

Action Calendar – Scheduled Public Comment Period

During this public comment period, the Presiding Officer will open and close a comment period for each Action item on this agenda (excluding any public hearings, appeals, and/or quasi-judicial matters). The public may speak on each item. Those who speak on an item during this comment period may not speak a second time when the item is taken up by Council.

Action Calendar – Policy Committee Track Items

7. **Contract No. 32000196 Amendment: Szabo & Associates for Communications Consulting Services**
From: Mayor Arreguin (Author)
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to amend Contract No. 32000196 with Szabo & Associates for communications consulting services for the Mayor's Office, increasing the contract amount by \$11,632.30 for a new total not to exceed \$347,632.30.
Financial Implications: See report.
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Mayor, (510) 981-7100

Action Calendar – Policy Committee Track Items

8. **Resolution Clarifying the Intent of Measure Y (2024) – Increasing the Parks, Trees and Landscaping Maintenance Tax**
From: Councilmember Humbert (Author), Councilmember Taplin (Author), Councilmember Wengraf (Author)
Recommendation: In order to ensure that voters are fully informed and to inform future discussions of potential expenditures, it is recommended that the Berkeley City Council adopt the following language to clarify (but not change) the intent of Measure Y: The intent of Measure Y is to generate additional funds by increasing the Parks Tax for park and landscape maintenance in the Waterfront including Cesar Chavez (Berkeley’s largest park), improvements to Berkeley’s urban forest and street tree plantings, and essential park and landscaping related capital projects.
Financial Implications: See report.
Contact: Mark Humbert, Councilmember, District 8, (510) 981-7180

Information Reports

9. **LPO NOD: 2000 Kala Bagai Way, LMSAP2024-0002**
From: City Manager
Contact: Jordan Klein, Planning and Development, (510) 981-7400
10. **LPO NOD: 2227 Parker Street, #LMIN2024-0001**
From: City Manager
Contact: Jordan Klein, Planning and Development, (510) 981-7400
11. **LPO NOD: 8 Greenwood Common, #LMSAP2024-0001**
From: City Manager
Contact: Jordan Klein, Planning and Development, (510) 981-7400

Public Comment – Items Not Listed on the Agenda

Adjournment

NOTICE CONCERNING YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS: *If you object to a decision by the City Council to approve or deny a use permit or variance for a project the following requirements and restrictions apply: 1) No lawsuit challenging a City decision to deny (Code Civ. Proc. §1094.6(b)) or approve (Gov. Code 65009(c)(5)) a use permit or variance may be filed more than 90 days after the date the Notice of Decision of the action of the City Council is mailed. Any lawsuit not filed within that 90-day period will be barred. 2) In any lawsuit that may be filed against a City Council decision to approve or deny a use permit or variance, the issues and evidence will be limited to those raised by you or someone else, orally or in writing, at a public hearing or prior to the close of the last public hearing on the project.*

Archived indexed video streams are available at:

<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/city-council/city-council-agendas>.

Channel 33 rebroadcasts the following Wednesday at 9:00 a.m. and Sunday at 9:00 a.m.

Communications to the City Council are public record and will become part of the City’s electronic records, which are accessible through the City’s website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to the City Council, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or

any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service to the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the City Clerk Department for further information.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the City Council regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the public counter at the City Clerk Department located on the first floor of City Hall located at 2180 Milvia Street as well as posted on the City's website at <https://berkeleyca.gov/>.

Agendas and agenda reports may be accessed via the Internet at:
<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/city-council/city-council-agendas>
and may be read at reference desks at the following locations:

City Clerk Department - 2180 Milvia Street, First Floor
Tel: 510-981-6900, TDD: 510-981-6903, Fax: 510-981-6901
Email: clerk@berkeleyca.gov

Libraries: Main – 2090 Kittredge Street,
Claremont Branch – 2940 Benvenue, West Branch – 1125 University,
North Branch – 1170 The Alameda, Tarea Hall Pittman South Branch – 1901 Russell

COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location.


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.

Attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various scents, whether natural or manufactured, in products and materials. Please help the City respect these needs.



Captioning services are provided at the meeting, on B-TV, and on the Internet. In addition, assisted listening devices for the hearing impaired are available from the City Clerk prior to the meeting, and are to be returned before the end of the meeting.

Questions regarding public participation may be addressed to the City Clerk Department (510) 981-6900 or by email at clerk@berkeleyca.gov.



Civic Arts Commission

CONSENT CALENDAR

September 24, 2024

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Civic Arts Commission

Submitted by: Dana Blecher, Chairperson, Civic Arts Commission

Subject: Civic Arts Commission Fund Request - Mitigation Fee Nexus Study, Public Art on Private Development Requirement

RECOMMENDATION

The Civic Arts Commission recommends that the City Council allocate \$125,000 in the FY24/25 Budget to fund a nexus study on the existing Public Art on Private Development Requirement (Berkeley Municipal Code 23.316), which was established in 2017. The Civic Arts Commission would like to make changes to the requirement to ensure ongoing support for the arts and culture sector in Berkeley. In order to make any changes to the Public Art on Private Development Requirement, first a nexus study is required by the State of California's Mitigation Fee Act.

SUMMARY

Established by ordinance in 2017, the City's [Public Art on Private Development Requirement](#), codified in the Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) section 23.316, requires that construction developers of private property in Berkeley do one of the following:

- A. Include on-site publicly accessible art valued at 1.75 percent of the construction cost. If the value of on-site publicly accessible art as installed is less than 1.75 percent of the construction cost, an amount equal to 80 percent of the difference in value shall be paid to the City of Berkeley as an in-lieu fee.
- B. Pay an in-lieu fee to the City of 0.80 percent of the construction cost.

This requirement applies to:

- New multifamily residential projects of five or more dwelling units
- New commercial structures
- New industrial structures
- All construction of building additions exceeding 10,000 square feet

The following project types are exempt from the requirement:

- Development projects where at least 60 percent of the units are affordable housing
- Buildings with religious assembly uses or nonprofit arts/cultural uses
- Transitional housing

A complete list of projects participating in this program current through July 2024, entitled "Private Percent Project Payment Tracking" is included in this report as Attachment 1.

In the eight years since the Public Art on Private Development Requirement was established, City Zoning regulations and State laws have changed which have impacted the public art requirement and are preventing it from fully fulfilling its original intent. The Civic Arts Commission wishes to address these issues by making amendments to Berkeley Municipal Code 23.316.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

The fiscal impact of this recommendation is the allocation of \$125,000 in General Funds in Fiscal Year 2024/2025 to fund a mitigation fee Nexus Study for the Public Art on Private Development Requirement. The cost of the Nexus Study cannot be funded from the fees collected through the Public Art on Private Development Requirement, because those funds are limited by policy to expenditures related to public art and the staffing to administer the projects.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Since the establishment of the Public Art on Private Development Requirement in 2017, the Civic Arts Commission has noted the following issues that it would like to address by making amendments to Berkeley Municipal Code 23.316.

1. Currently projects that were not expressly exempt from this requirement are seeking an exemption by claiming that their project's type of structure is not expressly included in the "applicability" section (for example "Group Living Accommodations"). To address this, changes could be made to 23.316.020 Applicability, specifically by editing section "B. Uses." in this chapter to "Structures" so that it would apply to all types of structures, not just "residential, commercial, and industrial."
2. In 2023, the City made administrative changes to Zoning BMC Section 23.328 (Inclusionary Housing) which changed thresholds used for the affordable housing in-lieu fee from a "per unit" threshold to square feet. This created a discrepancy with the thresholds used in the Public Art Requirement section where the threshold of "five or more dwelling units" is used. To address this, the Public Art Requirement thresholds could be changed to bring consistency between the methodology used in the two requirements.
3. The Commission is interested in exploring the inclusion of another option beyond "on-site art" or "paying an in-lieu fee" such as allowing developers to designate a percentage of construction costs to build out publicly accessible non-profit arts venue space at the ground floor that would be designated as such in perpetuity.
4. Currently, pursuant to the State Density Bonus law, developers are able to request concessions to waive the public art requirement for projects that have a certain increased percent of inclusionary affordable housing.

The Commission is interested in exploring zoning amendments that would result in fewer developers leveraging concessions to waive the Public Art Requirement, and instead:

- a. Alternatively, explore whether inclusionary affordable units can be set aside for artists/arts workers when developers seek concessions on the public art requirement.
- b. Change the Public Art Requirement to be solely a Mitigation Impact Fee so that it is not on the list of costs that may be waived as a “concession” as is currently allowed under the State Density Bonus laws.

BACKGROUND

The City of Berkeley is well known for its diversity in art, music and culture. Arts and culture are also an important economic engine, bringing visitors from throughout the region and world to Berkeley to take part in our community’s numerous cultural activities and admire our public art program. The City of Berkeley established the Public Art in Private Development policy by Ordinance in 2017, which requires qualifying private development projects to either incorporate a public art element or pay an in-lieu fee to the Cultural Trust Fund to support the ongoing activities outlined above. The Public Art on Private Development Program plays an essential role in maintaining and advancing Berkeley’s cultural arts landscape.

Public Art Program Impact

Since the establishment of Public Art in Private Development policy and the adoption of the Ordinance in 2017, 49 development projects have completed their Public Art on Private Development requirement as follows:

- 8 have created on-site public art (Total value = \$1,347,013)
- 35 have paid the in-lieu fee (Total collected = \$4,729,284)
- 6 had “State Density Bonus” concessions granted to waive the public art requirement (Art requirement amount waived = \$89,793,613 for three of the six projects - three did not provide values.)

There are currently 53 eligible projects in the development pipeline:

- 10 stated intentions to create on-site public art (Estimated total value = \$2,429,949)
- 41 stated intentions to pay the in-lieu fee (Estimated total = \$5,995,920)
- 1 stated intention to seek a “State Density Bonus” concession to waive the public art requirement (Value unknown.)

Details for all the development projects being tracked as subject to this requirement may be found in Attachment 1, the total received as of July 2024, since program inception is approximately \$4.73M.

Use of In-Lieu Funds

By policy, 70% of the monies received from art in-lieu fees contributed primarily from commercial developers on large-scale projects goes towards acquiring and installing public art in the City of Berkeley. The recent sculpture by Mildred Howard installed near

BART's Ashby Station is an example of such an acquisition. The City of Berkeley has many unfunded Public Art needs that are dependent upon this fund source. For example, there are some projects which have been identified on the Civic Arts Commission Work Plan, which have not yet been fully funded through this fund source, such as Turtle Island Monument.

20% of the art in-lieu fees goes to administration which in turn support a portion of staff salaries for two FTEs in the Civic Arts team. These staff manage public art selection processes, contracts with artists, fabrication of artwork, installation of art and maintenance of the City's art collection. These functions are essential to maintaining the high quality of cultural arts in the City of Berkeley.

The remaining 10% of the art in-lieu fee contributes to the care and maintenance of existing public art in the City's public art collection, an essential factor in responsible art ownership. The recent cleaning and restoration of the *Mak Roote* murals at the University Avenue underpass at the Berkeley Amtrak station is an excellent case in point where several City departments teamed up to restore commissioned murals from the natural occurring weather damage but also to clean and beautify the surrounding area to greatly improve the setting for the artworks. This budget allows for the proper care and maintenance of dozens of public artworks in the City of Berkeley public art collection.

In 2019, the Civic Arts Program completed a comprehensive assessment of the City's Public Art Collection, which included a complete inventory and condition evaluation of all the artworks in the City's collection. The assessment found that 65% of the City's outdoor artworks require conservation attention. The estimated cost to conserve all the artworks in need of treatment is between \$782,135 to \$995,530. To preserve the collection, the artwork should also be regularly maintained at a cost of approximately \$50,000 annually. Additionally, artwork is sometimes vandalized, and those repair costs can vary depending upon the damage.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

There are no identifiable environmental effects, climate impacts, or sustainability opportunities associated with the subject of this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Public Art on Private Development Program is critical in the acquisition, installation, care and maintenance of many of the cultural artifacts and artworks that are integral to the City of Berkeley's unique identity. These attributes are world-renown, enjoyed by the public and can attract residents/tenants to reside in Berkeley. As the state law related to housing and private development evolves, so must the public art program and its fee structure.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

None.

CIVIC ARTS COMMISSION APPROVAL

The Civic Arts Commission took the following action at their regular meeting on July 24, 2024:

M/S/C (Covarrubias/Blecher) to request Council Referral for amendments to the Public Art on Private Development Ordinance and Budget Referral Request for Fee Nexus Study.

Vote: Ayes — Anno, Bachrach, Blecher, Covarrubias, Crandall, Ibarra, Pineda, Woo;
Nays — None; Abstain — None; Absent — Bullwinkel.

CITY MANAGER

The City Manager takes no position on the content and recommendations of the Commission's Report.

CONTACT PERSON

Jennifer Lovvorn, Secretary, Civic Arts Commission, (510) 981-7533

Attachment:

1: Public Art on Private Development, Private Percent Project Payment Tracking, 2024.

PUBLIC ART ON PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT		Date: 7/24/2024															
Fiscal Year	Project Address	Project Street	Type	On-Site Art Value	On-Site Art Admin 5% Fee	In-Lieu Fee Payment Amount	Date Paid	Fee Waived: State Density Bonus Concession Amount	On-Site Art	In-Lieu Fee	Fee Waived	Cumulative Totals: Number of On-site Art Projects	Cumulative Totals: Value of On-site Art Projects	Cumulative Totals: Number In-Lieu Fees	Cumulative Totals: Total In-Lieu Fees	Cumulative Totals: Number Fee Waived	Cumulative Totals: Total Amount Fees Waived
FY19																	
	1717	University	On-Site Art - Final Art Plan Approved							1							
	1950	Addison	On-Site Art - Final Art Plan Approved	\$252,682.00						1							
	2120	Berkeley	On-Site Art - Final Art Plan Approved	\$60,000.00						1							
	2124	BANCROFT	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$60,186.58	8/4/2017				1						
	2029	BLAKE	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$126,400.00	8/7/2017				1						
				\$312,682.00	\$0.00	\$186,586.58				3	2	3	\$312,682.00	2	\$0.00		
FY20																	
	2503	HASTE	On-Site Art Plan approved & Admin Fee Paid	\$328,460.28	\$16,423.01		3/1/2019			1							
	2510	CHANNING	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$106,664.00	4/17/2019				1						
	2621	TENTH	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$84,000.00	5/17/2019				1						
	739	CHANNING	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$20,388.00	5/23/2019				1						
	2580	Bancroft	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$235,569.89	6/27/2019 for FY20				1						
				\$328,460.28	\$16,423.01	\$446,621.89				1	4	4	\$641,142.28	6	\$463,044.90		
FY21																	
	2628	SHATTUCK	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$88,879.00	9/3/2019				1						
	999	ANTHONY	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$25,200.00	12/18/2019				1						
	2100	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$144,000.00	2/21/2020				1						
	2072	Addison	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$74,936.00	2/24/2020				1						
	2452	Durant	On-Site Art - Final Art Plan Approved	\$42,185.00						1							
	2556	TELEGRAPH	On-Site Art Plan approved & Admin Fee Paid	\$103,722.50	\$5,186.13		5/20/2020			1							
	2028	BANCROFT	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$48,000.00	8/27/2020				1						
				\$145,907.50	\$5,186.13	\$381,015.00				2	5	6	\$787,049.78	11	\$849,246.03		
FY22																	
	2229	FOURTH/2222 5th Street	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$17,360.21	5/26/2021				1						
				\$0.00	\$0.00	\$17,360.21				0	1	6	\$787,049.78	12	\$866,606.24		
FY23																	
			Community Benefit Agreement			\$60,000.00	6/30/2023										
	3000	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$72,329.13	9/22/2021				1						
	2176	Kittredge (Same Project)	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$236,792.00	11/3/2021				1						
	2176	Kittredge (Same Project)	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$49,748.00	12/23/2021				1						
	2025	Kala Bagai Way	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$31,002.00	11/19/2021				1						
	600	Addison	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$1,414,578.00	12/21/2021				1						
	2352	Shattuck (Combo Art and Fee)	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$230,166.07	1/25/2022				1						
	2352	Shattuck (Combo Art and Fee)	On-Site Art Plan approved & Admin Fee Paid	\$425,250.00	\$21,262.50		1/25/2022			1							
	2902	ADELINE	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$80,000.00	4/11/2022				1						
	2000	Dwight	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$115,625.00	4/13/2022				1						
	2701	SHATTUCK	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$37,352.90	6/21/2022				1						
	2099	MLK	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$103,304.58	6/23/2022				1						
				\$425,250.00	\$21,262.50	\$2,430,897.68				1	9	7	\$1,212,299.78	21	\$3,318,766.42		
FY24																	
			Community Benefit Agreement			\$62,424.00	9/30/2023										
	1951	SHATTUCK	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$480,000.00	7/19/2022				1						
	2000	University	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$41,388.52	7/20/2022				1						
	1331	ASHBY	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$7,040.00	7/21/2022				1						
	787	BANCROFT	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$164,905.22	9/20/2022				1						
	2213	Fourth	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$96,000.00	9/20/2022				1						
	2650	TELEGRAPH	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$46,278.00	9/22/2022				1						
				\$0.00	\$0.00	\$898,035.74		\$0.00	0	6	0	7	\$1,212,299.78	27	\$4,216,802.16	0	\$0.00
FY25																	
			Community Benefit Agreement			\$63,672.00	not yet paid										
	2067	University	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$36,711.74	7/13/2023				1						
	2434	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$9,600.00	9/28/2023				1						
	1773	Oxford	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$30,548.77	10/2/2023				1						
	2590	BANCROFT	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$110,964.00	10/24/2023				1						
	2317	Channing	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$23,274.81	11/7/2023				1						
	2403	SAN PABLO	On-Site Art Plan approved & Admin Fee Paid	\$134,714.00	\$6,735.70		5/1/2024			1							
	2555	College	In-Lieu Fee Paid			\$13,115.15	5/9/2024				1						
	2480	Bancroft	Fee Waived: State Density Bonus Concession				5/1/2023	\$61,443			1						
	1950	Shattuck	Fee Waived: State Density Bonus Concession				3/12/2024	\$89,627,324			1						
	2109	Milvia	Fee Waived: State Density Bonus Concession				3/12/2024	\$116,290			1						
	2037	Durant	Fee Waived: State Density Bonus Concession				5/21/2024				1						
	2680	BANCROFT	Fee Waived: State Density Bonus Concession				6/25/2024				1						
	2036	BANCROFT	Fee Waived: State Density Bonus Concession				6/25/2024				1						
				\$134,714.00	\$6,735.70	\$224,214.47		\$89,805,056.69	1	6	6	8	\$1,347,013.78	33	\$4,447,752.33	6	\$89,805,056.69
FY26																	

Bayer Annual Payment FY26		Community Benefit Agreement				not yet paid											
2127	Dwight (2127-2159)	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$125,476.26	7/1/2024											
3030	TELEGRAPH	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$156,056.16	7/1/2024											
			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$281,532.42		\$0.00	0	2	0	8	\$1,347,013.78	35	\$4,729,284.75	6	\$89,805,056.69	
In Progress																	
742	Grayson	In-Lieu Fee			\$314,637.06												
805	Jones	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$9,712.50	\$485.63													
1110	University	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$175,000.00														
1155 (-1173)	Hearst	In-Lieu Fee															
1200 (-1214)	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee			\$66,166.54	Not yet paid/This FY or next											
1201	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee			\$65,789.48												
1207	TENTH	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$56,039.00														
1367	University	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$7,651.19												
1598	University	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$106,658.34												
1650	Alcatraz					not compliant											
1650	SHATTUCK				\$32,000.00												
1652	University	In-Lieu Fee			\$29,939.27												
1740	SAN PABLO					not compliant											
1752	Shattuck	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$73,218.48												
1773	Oxford	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$30,548.77												
1790	University	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$39,286.00												
1822	San Pablo					not compliant											
1835	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee			\$94,198.00	Not yet paid											
1900	FOURTH	In-Lieu Fee			\$560,000.00	Not yet paid											
1914	Fifth	In-Lieu Fee			\$224,385.86												
2001	ASHBY					no applic- not complaint											
2015	Blake	In-Lieu Fee			\$246,317.00	Not yet paid											
2018	Blake	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$32,000.00	Not yet paid											
2023	SHATTUCK aka 2025 Kala Bagal Way	In-Lieu Fee			\$30,822.00	Not yet paid											
2037	Kala Bagal Way	Concession?															
2065	KITTREDGE																
2115	KITTREDGE	In-Lieu Fee			\$237,979.00	Not yet paid											
2127	Dwight (2127-2159)	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$125,476.26	Not yet paid											
2128	Oxford (2132-2154 Center)	Concession? Value in DRC packet \$1.1M			\$917,163.00	Not yet paid											
2136	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee			\$104,878.65	Not yet paid											
2190	SHATTUCK	In-Lieu Fee			\$680,000.00												
2198	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee			\$46,400.00	Not yet paid											
2210	Harold	In-Lieu Fee			\$122,500.00	Not yet paid											
2221	Fourth/2216 5th St	In-Lieu Fee			\$87,200.00												
2229	FOURTH/2222 5th Street																
2300	Ellsworth	In-Lieu Fee			\$263,324.00												
2317	Channing	In-Lieu Fee			\$23,274.81	Not yet paid											
2325	MCGEE Ave	In-Lieu Fee			\$8,000.00	Not yet paid											
2420	Shattuck	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$314,864.00	\$15,743.20													
2427	SAN PABLO (2427-2433)	In-Lieu Fee			\$72,106.00	Not yet paid											
2434	SAN PABLO				\$9,600.00	Not yet paid											
2435	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee			\$24,671.14	Not yet paid											
2440	SHATTUCK				\$120,000.00	received declaration 11/18/21											
2441	Le Conte	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$31,994.00	received declaration 2/21/24											
2449	Dwight	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$70,880.00	received declaration 11/9/22											
2462	BANCROFT	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$75,228.00												
2527	SAN PABLO	In-Lieu Fee			\$59,200.00	Not yet paid											
2538	Durant	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$132,000.00	Not yet paid											
2538	Durant	In-Lieu Fee			\$132,000.00												
2550	Shattuck	TBD															
2587	Telegraph	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$139,044.00	Not yet paid											
2601	San Pablo	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$496,920.00	\$24,846.00													
2712	TELEGRAPH	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$58,118.00	Not yet paid											
2720	SAN PABLO	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$ 191,501.00	\$ 9,575.05													
2733	San Pablo	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$ 383,583.00	\$ 19,179.15													
2795	SAN PABLO																
2800	TELEGRAPH	In-Lieu Fee			\$24,573.85	not yet paid											
2847	Shattuck	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$247,415.72	\$12,370.79													
2920	Shattuck	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$449,914.00	\$22,495.70													
2942	College	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			8636.05												
3000	SHATTUCK					No Declaration Yet											
3030	TELEGRAPH	In-Lieu Fee (20% for Admin)			\$156,056.16												
3031	Adeline	On-Site Art (5% Admin Fee)	\$105,000.00	\$ 5,250.00													
3031	TELEGRAPH	In-Lieu Fee			\$312,000.00												
TOTAL			\$2,429,949.22	\$109,945.51	\$5,995,920.91		\$0.00	10	40	2	18	\$3,776,963.00	76	\$10,835,151.17	8	\$89,805,056.69	



Rashi Kesarwani
Councilmember, District 1

CONSENT CALENDAR
September 24, 2024

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
FROM: Councilmember Rashi Kesarwani (Author)
SUBJECT: Budget Referral: Independent Consultant to Conduct Analysis of Referring Restaurant Inspections to Alameda County

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to the November budget process \$100,000 for the City Manager to engage an independent consultant to conduct an analysis that considers feasibility, costs, and benefits of referring food facility inspections to Alameda County, and submit a report with recommendations for Council consideration and potential action as soon as practicable.

The report should consider the following key areas:

- Environmental Health Division staffing, recruitment and retention;
- Costs and staffing resources to develop a new restaurant inspection database that complies with state rules; and
- Costs and staffing resources to develop a restaurant “grading” system, such as those used in Los Angeles County, New York City, or other jurisdictions.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Nearly 45 Percent of Berkeley Food Facilities Were Not Inspected in 2023. The Berkeley City Auditor released an audit in July 2024, “Berkeley Restaurant Inspections: Chronically Understaffed Program Did Not Meet Targets,” finding that the City’s Environmental Health Division of the Health, Housing and Community Services Department did not meet its targets for food facility inspections in 2023, increasing health risk.¹ Nearly 45 percent of Berkeley’s permitted food facilities, including 193 restaurants, were not inspected even once. This is in stark contrast to Alameda County, where only 3 percent of food facilities went uninspected during the same period. Chronic understaffing and inadequate data management have exacerbated the City’s challenges in meeting its inspection targets and ensuring public health.

¹ City Auditor, “Berkeley Restaurant Inspections: Chronically Understaffed Program Did Not Meet Targets,” https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Berkeley_Restaurant_Inspections_-_Chronically_Understaffed_Program_Did_Not_Meet_Targets.pdf

City Staff Say Annual Inspection Targets Are “Not Achievable” for High Risk Food Facilities. Berkeley is one of four cities in California that conducts its own restaurant inspections, which are typically handled by county health offices, according to Berkeleyside.² According to reporting from Berkeleyside, City spokesperson Maitée Rossoukhi wrote in an e-mail that staff have visited 302 of the 544 “high risk facilities” in Berkeley, a category that includes restaurants, nursing homes, catering operations and several other types of food-centric businesses. The city estimates the rest of the inspections will be done by the end of October. Significantly, Berkeleyside wrote, even if the division’s staff clear the backlog of facilities that were not inspected last year, they would still be well short of the department’s stated target of visiting restaurants every four months, as show in Figure 2 below from the audit report. The City Auditor’s report found that almost none of Berkeley’s food facilities are inspected that often, and division employees consider the goal “not achievable.”

Figure 2. Inspection Targets By Risk Level, 2023

Risk Level	Description and Examples	Total Facilities	Annual Inspection Targets
Very High	Foods that fall within the high risk designation and serve a vulnerable population. Example: nursing care facilities.	7	3
High	Foods with complex preparation, including pre-preparation, cooling, and reheating. Examples: catering operations, food trucks, and restaurants.	526	3
Medium	Foods that require light preparation. Examples: cafes, schools, and fraternities/sororities.	204	2
Low	Pre-packaged foods. Examples: small grocery stores, convenience stores, and farmer’s market stands.	143	1
No Risk Level	Various types of facilities listed above.	53	1 or more

Source: Environmental Health Division and analysis of Division database

BACKGROUND

Understaffing, Poor Data Management, and Resulting Lack of Public Transparency Plague Berkeley’s Current Inspection System. The audit found that Berkeley’s Environmental Health Division is severely understaffed, with only three food inspectors responsible for nearly 600 routine inspections each—far exceeding the recommended workload by the federal Food and Drug Administration. This staffing shortage has resulted in a backlog of inspections, particularly among high-risk facilities such as restaurants and nursing care homes. Additionally, the audit exposed gaps in public transparency, with limited access to food safety information, and issues with data management, leading to some facilities being overlooked entirely. According to reporting from Berkeleyside, City staff estimate that it could take “a year or longer” for Berkeley to develop a new database that complies with state rules, a process that would require additional funding from the City.

² Savidge, Nico, “Berkeley may rethink restaurant inspections after audit reveals serious failures, health chief says,” <https://www.berkeleyside.org/2024/08/05/berkeley-restaurant-inspections-environmental-health-audit>, Aug. 5, 2024

RATIONALE

Alameda County appears to have an effective food inspection program with a much lower percentage of uninspected facilities compared to Berkeley. The county's larger pool of resources and established systems for data management and reporting suggest that the City should further explore the possibility of referring food facility inspections to the county.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Engaging an independent consultant will incur costs of \$100,000. The consultant's analysis and recommendations will guide the City Council in making an informed decision that could ultimately lead to cost savings.

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember Rashi Kesarwani
(510) 981-9110



Office of the Mayor

CONSENT CALENDAR
September 24, 2024

To: Members of the City Council

From: Mayor Jesse Arreguín

Subject: Contract No. 32000196 Amendment: Szabo & Associates for Communications Consulting Services

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to amend Contract No. 32000196 with Szabo & Associates for communications consulting services for the Mayor's Office, increasing the contract amount by \$11,632.30 for a new total not to exceed \$347,632.30.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This amendment will add \$11,632.30 to extend the Mayor's Office's existing contract for communications consulting services. Funds for this contract amendment are available from the Mayor's Office budget.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Under Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 7.18.010A, "expenditures...which exceed the amount of \$50,000 shall require Council approval", as adopted under Ordinance No. 7,566 and mandated under Article XI, Section 67.5 of the City Charter.

Contract No. 32000196 was entered into on March 16, 2020, originally at \$35,000. Since then, amendments have been made to extend the term of the contract. A new extension was approved by Council in July 2021, which was required as the increase in the cumulative amount of the contract went beyond the \$50,000 threshold, thus requiring Council approval.

In 2021 during the first contract extension, as a courtesy, bargaining unit members of SEIU CSU/PTRLA were advised by City of Berkeley Human Resources Department of this contract extension and offered the opportunity to meet. The services provided under this contract are not of the kind, nature or type of work presently performed by the bargaining unit members.

BACKGROUND

Under Article VI, Section 21 of the City Charter, the Mayor is the ceremonial head of the City. As such, the Mayor serves as a spokesperson for the City, and should provide consistent information to residents and businesses on the operations and policies of the

City. Providing open and transparent lines of communication is a cornerstone of democracy and good governance. Relaying critical information, such as communications during the ongoing local state of emergency in response to COVID-19, PG&E Power Safety Shutoff events, other critical events, and City policies and programs, are important to the health, safety and operation of the City.

Services provided by Szabo & Associates include development of press releases and media advisories on issues of importance to the Berkeley community, maintaining social media accounts, press coordination, graphic design, and other support services relating to the communications from the Mayor's Office.

Council had previously approved an amendment to this contract under Resolution No. 71,426-N.S. at the June 25, 2024 meeting. While there are no changes to the term and cost of the contract, since the passage of the latest Resolution, it has been discovered that the totality of the contract since its inception in 2020 had unfortunately been miscalculated, resulting in a gap of \$11,632.30. Approval of this resolution will have no impact on the General Fund, as the Mayor's Office already has funds available for this purpose. This contract is set to expire on November 30, 2024 to coincide with the end of the Mayor's term in office.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no environmental impacts associated with the recommendations in this report.

CONTACT PERSON

Mayor Jesse Arreguín 510-981-7100

Attachments:

1: Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

CONTRACT: SZABO & ASSOCIATES FOR COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTING
SERVICES FOR THE MAYOR'S OFFICE

WHEREAS, as the ceremonial head of the city under the City Charter, the Mayor must serve as a city spokesperson and provide consistent information to residents and businesses on the operations and policies of the City; and

WHEREAS, Szabo & Associates is a communications consulting firm whose services include development of press releases and media advisories on issues of importance to the Berkeley community, maintaining social media accounts, press coordination, and other support services relating to the communications; and

WHEREAS, providing open and transparent lines of communication is a cornerstone of democracy and good governance. Relaying critical information, such as communications during the ongoing local state of emergency in response to COVID-19, PG&E Power Safety Shutoff events, other critical events, and City policies and programs, are important to the health, safety and operation of the City; and

WHEREAS, under Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 7.18.010A, "expenditures...which exceed the amount of \$50,000 shall require Council approval", as adopted under Ordinance No. 7,566 and mandated under Article XI, Section 67.5 of the City Charter; and

WHEREAS, Contract No. 32000196 was entered into on March 16, 2020, originally at \$35,000, with additional amendments having been made, and requires Council approval by passing the \$50,000 threshold; and

WHEREAS, in July 2021, Council approved Resolution No. 69,985-N.S. to increase the contract by \$78,000 and extending the contract to June 30, 2022; and

WHEREAS, in July 2022, Council approved Resolution No. 70,451-N.S. to increase the contract by \$78,000 and extending the contract to June 30, 2023; and

WHEREAS, in June 2023, Council approved Resolution No. 70,928-N.S. to increase the contract by \$78,000 and extending the contract to June 30, 2024; and

WHEREAS, in June 2024, Council approved Resolution No. 71,426-N.S. to increase the contract by \$32,500 and extending the contract to November 30, 2024; and

WHEREAS, since the passage of the latest Resolution, it has been discovered that the totality of the contract since its inception in 2020 had unfortunately been miscalculated, resulting in a gap of \$11,632.30; and

WHEREAS, funding for this amendment is available in the Mayor's Office budget.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the City Manager is authorized to execute an amendment to Contract No. 32000196 with Szabo & Associates for communications consulting services for the Mayor's Office, increasing the contract by \$11,632.30.



Berkeley City Councilmembers
Mark Humbert, District 8
Terry Taplin, District 3
Susan Wengraf, District 6
 2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor
 Berkeley, CA 94704
 mhumbert@berkeleyca.gov

CONSENT CALENDAR
September 24, 2024

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Councilmember Humbert (Author), Councilmember Taplin (Author),
Councilmember Wengraf (Author)
Subject: Resolution Clarifying the Intent of Measure Y (2024) – Increasing the
Parks, Trees and Landscaping Maintenance Tax

RECOMMENDATION

In order to ensure that voters are fully informed and to inform future discussions of potential expenditures, it is recommended that the Berkeley City Council adopt the following language to clarify (but not change) the intent of Measure Y:

The intent of Measure Y is to generate additional funds by increasing the Parks Tax for park and landscape maintenance in the Waterfront including Cesar Chavez (Berkeley’s largest park), improvements to Berkeley’s urban forest and street tree plantings, and essential park and landscaping related capital projects.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None. Staff time to record resolution.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

At a special meeting on July 30, 2024, the Berkeley City Council unanimously approved¹ Item 6c to²:

1. Adopt a Resolution placing the attached measure to increase the parks, trees and landscaping maintenance tax on the ballot at the November 5, 2024 General Municipal Election.
2. Designate, by motion, specific members of the Council to file ballot measure arguments on this measure as provided for in Elections Code Section 9282.

¹<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/city-council-meetings/2024-07-30%20Special%20Annotated%20Agenda%20-%20Council.pdf>

²<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2024-07-30%20Special%20Item%2006c%20Ballot%20Measure%20%E2%80%93%20Increasing%20the%20Park%20Trees%20and%20Landscaping.pdf>

BACKGROUND

In an item from the December 12, 2023 Council Meeting³, the Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Commission recommended that the City Council include in upcoming community survey for possible 2024 ballot measures, a measure to increase the Parks Tax by 4ct/ft² or ~20%, and appropriate funding for the survey.

This recommendation was based on action at the regular Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Commission meeting on November 8, 2023. At that meeting, the Commission approved a motion to communicate a recommendation to Council to include an increase in the Parks Tax by 4cts/SF or ~20% in polling for possible November 2024 ballot measures. The estimated \$3.5M annually, would be divided between: major maintenance/capital projects, Urban Forest restoration, and consolidation of three Waterfront Parks into City Park system.

The vote at the meeting was:

M/S/C (Avellar/Kawczynska/U). Ayes: Abshez; Avellar; Cox; Diehm; Kawczynska; Lee; Ranuzzi; Wozniak; Noes: None; Absent: Hurtado; Leave of Absence: None.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

None. The resolution makes no change to the originally intended uses of potential funds; it merely formalizes and makes explicit the intent verbally discussed at previous Council meetings.

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember Mark Humbert Council District 8 510-981-7180

³<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2023-12-12%20Item%202023%20Council%20Referral%20%E2%80%93%20Request%20for%20City.pdf>

Upcoming Worksessions and Special Meetings

start time is 6:00 p.m. unless otherwise noted

Scheduled Dates	
Sept 16 (Mon.)	1. Ashby BART Development & Berkeley – El Cerrito Corridor Access Plan
Sept 30 (Mon.)	1. COPA/TOPA Ordinance
Oct 22	1. Draft Waterfront Specific Plan
Oct 29 (3:30pm)	1. Re-Imagining Public Safety Update (tentative)

Unscheduled Workshops and Special Meetings

1. Feasibility Study Follow Up Session (Fall 2024)

Unscheduled Presentations (City Manager)

1. Economic Dashboards Update (January 2025)

	City Council Referrals to the Agenda & Rules Committee and Unfinished Business for Scheduling
	None

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT			
WORKING CALENDAR FOR SCHEDULING LAND USE MATTERS BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL			
Address	Board/ Commission	Appeal Period Ends	Public Hearing
NOD – Notices of Decision			
Public Hearings Scheduled			
3000 Shattuck Avenue (construct 10-story mixed-use building)	ZAB		TBD
Remanded to ZAB or LPC			
Notes			

9/4/2024

Local City Rules of Order to prevent disruptions at their Council Meetings

Berkeley Council *Rules of Order and Procedure* and are similarly strong, or stronger, than several surrounding municipalities in defining rules of decorum, disruption, and enforcement of decorum. Berkeley also refers to those guidelines in the front of its agenda.

The Cities studied: El Cerrito, Walnut Creek, Santa Monica, Santa Cruz, Concord, and San Francisco, though not necessarily stronger in their guidelines, do have a few practices worth Berkeley could consider borrowing. Highlights of those guidelines are in the following paragraph. Specifics follow on the next page.

Highlights

El Cerrito does not allow Councilmembers or the public to make personal, slanderous, or profane remarks to any member of the Council, staff or the general public. They also suspended public comment via Zoom in Sept 2023. Walnut Creek does not allow speakers to cede their unused time to other speakers. Santa Monica lists on the first page of their agenda, the Standards of Behavior that Promote Civility at All Public Meetings. They also prohibit applause, vocally or clapping, except for ceremonial items, or when invited by presiding officer. They include blocking the audience or camera view of the proceedings as disruptions. Santa Cruz includes in their Rules of Procedure, guidelines for Councilmember interactions with each other. Concord does not allow public comment via Zoom unless a Councilmember is attending remotely. San Francisco does not permit audible support or opposition to statements by elected or those testifying and does not permit bringing in or displaying signs.

Specifics

Rules & Protocols from other Cities re: What they do at their Council Meetings

BERKELEY

On Agenda

Pursuant to the City Council Rules of Procedure and State Law, the presiding officer may remove, or cause the removal of, an individual for disrupting the meeting. Prior to removing an individual, the presiding officer shall warn the individual that their behavior is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. The presiding officer may then remove the individual if they do not promptly cease their disruptive behavior. "Disrupting" means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body, or engaging in behavior that constitutes use of force or a true threat of force.

Council Rules of Procedure

V. Procedural Matters

B. Decorum

No person shall disrupt the orderly conduct of the Council meeting. Prohibited disruptive behavior includes but is not limited to shouting, making disruptive noises, such as boos or hisses, creating or participating in a physical disturbance, speaking out of turn or in violation of applicable rules, preventing or attempting to prevent others who have the floor from speaking, preventing others from observing the meeting, entering into or remaining in an area of the meeting room that is not open to the public, or approaching the Council Dais without consent. Any written communications addressed to the Council shall be delivered to the City Clerk for distribution to the Council.

C. Enforcement of Decorum

When the public demonstrates a lack of order and decorum, the presiding officer shall call for order and inform the person(s) that the conduct is violating the Rules

of Order and Procedure and provide a warning to the person(s) to cease the disruptive behavior. Should the person(s) fail to cease and desist the disruptive conduct, the presiding officer may call a five (5) minute recess to allow the disruptions to cease. If the meeting cannot be continued due to continued disruptive conduct, the presiding officer may have any law enforcement officer on duty remove or place any person who violates the order and decorum of the meeting under arrest and cause that person to be prosecuted under the provisions of applicable law.

EL CERRITO

Agenda

Conduct: This meeting shall be conducted pursuant to the El Cerrito City Council Rules of Order and Procedure, including adjourning by 11:00 PM unless extended to a specific time determined by a majority of the Council

Council Rules of Order and Procedure

XI. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Y. Decorum

... No person shall disrupt the orderly conduct of the City Council meeting. Prohibited disruptive behavior includes but is not limited to shouting, making disruptive noises, such as boos or hisses, creating or participating in a physical disturbance, speaking out of turn or in violation of applicable rules, preventing or attempting to prevent others who have the floor from speaking, preventing others from observing the meeting, approaching the City Council dais or speaker podium without consent, or refusing to obey the orders of the Mayor or Council. Any message to or contact with any member of the City Council while the City Council is in session shall be through the City Clerk. Neither Councilmembers nor any persons addressing the City Council shall make personal, slanderous, or profane remarks to any member of the Council, staff or the general public. Noise emanating from the audience within the City Council Chamber or lobby area

which disrupts meetings shall not be permitted. All cellular phones and other consumer devices shall be muted while in the Chamber. Refusal shall be grounds for removal.

Z. Enforcement of Decorum

The Mayor may call a recess if a speaker or group of speakers become unruly and/or interferes with the orderly conduct of the meeting. Any law enforcement officers on duty or whose services are commanded by the Mayor shall be Sergeant-at-Arms of the City Council meetings. They shall carry out all orders and instructions given by the Mayor for the purpose of maintaining order and decorum at the City Council meetings. Upon instructions of the Mayor or a majority of the City Council, it shall be the duty of the Sergeant-of-Arms, or any officer present, to escort outside or place under arrest any person who violates the order and decorum of the meeting, and cause them as necessary, to be prosecuted under the provisions of applicable law.

Instructions for Submitting Public Comments – For Hybrid City Council Meetings

El Cerrito has suspended public comment via Zoom (per 9/28/2023 revision)

WALNUT CREEK

Agenda

Nothing about Rules and Procedures or Decorum on their agenda.

Council Handbook

9.5. Public Comment

1. Opportunity to Speak

... Speakers may not assign unused time to other speakers.

9.7. Additional Protocol and Decorum

5. Warnings. The Mayor shall ask that any person violating the rules of decorum be orderly and silent. The warning shall be in substantially the form described below. If, after receiving a clear warning from the Mayor, the person persists in disturbing the meeting, the Mayor may order a brief recess of the City Council to

2/29/2024

regain order. If the person persists in disturbing the meeting, despite having been previously warned, the Mayor may order him or her to leave the City Council meeting. If the person does not depart the City Council Chamber of his or her own volition, the Mayor may order any law enforcement officer who is on duty at the meeting as Sergeant-at-Arms of the City Council to escort that person from the City Council Chamber.

The Mayor shall deliver the requisite warning in substantially the following form:

You are hereby advised that your conduct is in violation of the Rules of Order and Decorum of the City Council and California Penal Code Section 403, and you are directed to be orderly and silent. Penal Code Section 403 states that any person who, without authority of law, willfully disturbs or breaks up a lawfully convened meeting of the City Council is guilty of a misdemeanor. Continued disruption of this City Council meeting will result in your removal from the meeting by the Sergeant-at-Arms and you will not be permitted to return to City Council Chamber for the duration of the meeting. In addition, any continued disruption of this meeting is grounds for your being arrested and charged with a misdemeanor. Do you understand this admonition?

6. Misdemeanor. Any person who willfully disturbs or breaks up a City Council meeting may be arrested and charged with a misdemeanor, pursuant to California Penal Code Section 403.

MOUNTAIN VIEW

Agenda

Nothing about Rules and Procedures or Decorum on their agendas.

Council Code of Conduct

6.8 Decorum

6.8.1 While the City Council is in session, all persons shall conduct themselves with reasonable decorum.

6.8.2 The presiding officer may remove or cause the removal of any individual(s) for disrupting a meeting in accordance with California Government Code Section CLK/6/Council Code of Conduct 428-03-14-23CoC -34- 54957.95, as may be amended from time to time. The presiding officer shall call a recess until such time as the individual(s) have been removed and the meeting can resume without disruption.

6.8.3 In accordance with California Government Code Section 54957.9, as may be amended from time to time, the Council may order a meeting room cleared and continue in session in the event a meeting is willfully interrupted by a group or groups of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting impossible and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals who are disrupting the meeting.

6.8.4 The Police Chief or authorized representative shall be sergeant at arms of the Council meeting. The sergeant at arms shall carry out all orders and all instructions of the presiding officer for the purpose of maintaining order and decorum at Council meetings.

SANTA MONICA

Agenda

The following is listed on the first page of the downloaded agenda, but not the on-line agenda:

STANDARDS OF BEHAVIOR THAT PROMOTE CIVILITY AT ALL PUBLIC MEETINGS:

- Treat everyone courteously;
- Listen to others respectfully;
- Exercise self-control;
- Give open-minded consideration to all viewpoints;
- Focus on the issues and avoid personalizing debate;
- Embrace respectful disagreement and dissent as democratic rights, inherent components of an inclusive public process, and tools for forging sound decisions
- Hate has no place in Santa Monica. The City opposes abusive or threatening hate speech, intolerance, or dehumanization, and supports basic civil respect and human decency.

[Amended Rules of Order and Procedure for the Conduct of City Council Meetings, Resolution No. 11547 \(09/26/2023\)](#)

RULE 16. RULES OF CONDUCT AND SAFETY.

2/29/2024

1st paragraph: Applause, vocally or clapping, is prohibited, except for ceremonial items, or as may be invited by the Presiding Officer.

2nd paragraph: Any person who disrupts the meeting shall be called to order by the Presiding Officer. Disruption shall include but not be limited to, blocking the audience or camera view of the proceedings.

SANTA CRUZ

Agenda

Nothing about Rules and Procedures or Decorum on their agendas.

Councilmembers' Handbook

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCT OF CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS

COUNCIL INTERACTIONS

In interactions with each other, Councilmembers will abide by the following principles:

- Be Respectful: Treat each other with respect, even when/especially when there is disagreement.
- Engage in Open and Honest Communication: Be direct, straightforward, and transparent with each other.
- Be Honest and Truthful: Act with integrity and authenticity; be ethical.
- Address Difficult Issues: Confront challenging topics directly; avoid talking around them or not talking about them at all.
- Find Areas of Common Ground: Seek areas of agreement; identify shared interests, values, and positions.
- Be Open to Different Perspectives: Keep an open mind; be willing to change your views with new information, data, etc.
- Give the Benefit of the Doubt: Freely give credit for good intentions; avoid ascribing bad intentions.
- Role Model Good Leadership: Be professional; adhere to standards of civility; demonstrate effective leadership for the community.

- Be Considerate of Each Other's Time: Manage expectations about responsiveness and availability, recognize the time limitations and constraints of your colleagues.

DECORUM IN COUNCIL MEETINGS

3. While the Council is in session, all persons shall preserve order and decorum. Any person who causes a disruption at the Council meeting shall be removed from the meeting and barred from further attendance at said meeting by the presiding officer unless permission for continued attendance is granted by a majority vote of the Council. Disruption is defined as behavior that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting. An individual may cause a disruption by failing to comply with reasonable meeting rules, using force or threatening to use force, or causing other disruptions.

CONCORD

Agenda

Please note the following change to the City's public comment procedures: Unless a Councilmember is participating in the meeting remotely pursuant to AB 2449, remote public comment will not be accepted. Public comment may be provided in-person or via email, as set forth below.

Rules and Procedures

Didn't find one.

SAN FRANCISCO

Agenda

Board procedures do not permit: 1) vocal or audible support or opposition to statements by Supervisors or by other persons testifying; 2) ringing and use of cell phones or electronic devices; 3) bringing in or displaying signs in the meeting room; and 4) standing in the meeting room.

Rules of Order

1. Public Participation

1.3.1. Actions Prohibited during Board of Supervisors' Meetings. 1. Applause or vocal expression of support or opposition 2. Standing in meetings 3. Eating or drinking in the public gallery 4. Use of electronic devices, unless they are in silent mode 5. Handheld signs in the Legislative Chamber or in the committee room (although small signs may be worn on clothing)

1.7. Disorderly Conduct. The presiding officer shall order removed from the meeting room any person who commits the following acts in respect to a meeting of the Board or of a standing or special committee:


1.7.1. Disorderly, contemptuous or insolent behavior toward the Board or committee or any member thereof, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting;

1.7.2. A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting;

1.7.3. Disobedience of any lawful order of the presiding officer, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Board or committee;

1.7.4. Usage and ringing of cell phones and pagers, not in silent mode in Board and committee meetings;

1.7.5. Any other interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting.



Office of the Mayor

Jesse Arreguín
Mayor

February 21, 2019

To: City Council Land Use, Housing and Economic Development Committee
From: Mayor Jesse Arreguin
Subject: Purposes, Procedures and Requirements for Policy Committees

As this is the first meeting of the new Land Use Policy Committee, I wanted to remind Committee members about the purposes of our committee system, the procedures adopted by the Council on December 11, 2018, and requirements for reviewing and recommending legislation to the City Council.

In thinking about a rational review process, I also wish to propose some new procedures which I hope we will adopt by unanimous consent to guide our future deliberations.

Purposes of Policy Committees:

As described in Resolution No. 68,726-N.S. which established our new Policy Committee system the purposes are to:

Ensure “*an efficient and standardized structure for public policy development and consideration*”; and

“*Provide the community and the City Council with adequate opportunity for detailed policy discussions outside of a meeting of the full City Council*”

As stated in the Governing Policies and Procedures for City Council Policy Committees adopted on December 11, 2018, items with moderate to significant administrative, operational, budgetary, resource or programmatic impacts should be referred to a Policy Committee.

Committees will review items for completeness in accordance with Section III.B.2 of the City Council Rules of Procedure and Order and alignment with Strategic Plan goals.

Committees are also designed to allow a fuller review and discussion of City Council items, to allow Councilmembers to engage with authors and ask questions, to afford citizens and commissions an opportunity to comment on proposals before they come to Council and allow for recommended changes based on discussion with the Committee and the authors.

In addition, to assist in Committee and full Council review, staff will undertake a high-level, preliminary analysis of potential costs, timelines, and staffing demands associated with the item.

Procedures Adopted by Council for Committee review:

Items must appear on a Committee agenda within 60 days of referral by either the Agenda Committee or Council.

Within 120 days of the referral date, the Committee must vote to either (1) accept the author's request that the item remain in committee until a date certain (2) send the item to the Agenda Committee to be placed on a Council agenda with a Committee recommendation.

The Committee shall review items for completeness in accordance with Section III.B.2 and use the "Guidelines for Developing and Writing Council Agenda Items" in their analysis of items for completeness.

In addition, the Committee will engage with the author to understand the purposes, costs, and impacts and feasibility of implementation and may propose amendments to the author for consideration.

After preliminary discussion, the Committee will request that staff provide the "high-level, preliminary analysis of potential costs, timelines and staffing demands associated with the item".

After substantive policy discussion and review for completeness, the Committee will make one of the four recommendations to the City Council:

- "Positive Recommendation": Recommending Council pass the item as proposed originally by the author;
- "Qualified Positive Recommendation": Recommending Council pass the item with some changes;
- "Qualified Negative Recommendation": Recommending that Council reject the item unless certain changes are made;
- "Negative Recommendation": Recommending that the item not be approved.

If a Committee does not take final action by the 120-day deadline the item is automatically returned to the Agenda Committee and appears on the next Council agenda.

Issue Focus of Land Use Committee:

- Land Use
- Preservation
- Development standards
- Housing and Affordable Housing
- Disability/Universal Access
- Business and economic growth
- Business retention, attraction and development
- Civic arts and culture

Proposed New Procedures for Committee Review:

Public Comment: Public comment at the beginning of the Committee meeting should be for non-agenda items within the purview of the policy committee.

The Committee will allow public comment when each agenda item is taken up.

Order of Committee Discussion of Items:

1. When an item is called, the Chair will permit the author of the referred item 5 minutes to introduce the item.
2. Then the Committee will ask initial questions of the author on the proposal.
3. After initial questions, the Committee will then take public comment on the item. The Committee will follow the established time limits in the Council Rules of Procedure, 2 minutes, and if 10 or more speakers 1 minute, with time yielded for a maximum of 4 minutes per speaker.
4. After public comment, the Committee will return to discussion and possible action. Items will likely take two or more meetings to complete Committee discussion and review.

The Committee will request the financial, legal, administrative high-level analysis from staff to be presented at the next Committee meeting.

The Committee after review for completeness and discussion of policy merits, can make a Positive Recommendation to Council, or a Qualified Recommendation.

Focus of Committee Process:

The Policy Committee process should not just be limited to review of referred items. If time permits, the Committee should allow for hearings on policy matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, allowing open forums to solicit input from community members or experts on relevant policy issues, and initiate policy proposals for Council consideration.

Along these lines, I am specifically proposing that the Land Use, Housing and Economic Development Committee have an open forum of 30 minutes (or more if Committee wishes to extend time) to invite representatives of Business Associations and other small business owners to speak and engage with the Committee on issues impacting businesses.

Agenda Committee 1/16/2024

Item 10 - City Council Legislative Systems Redesign

Discussion Items - Part 1

Background:

The Agenda Committee presented materials and solicited input from the City Council during fall of 2023 regarding possible Legislative Systems Redesign options. The goal of Systems Redesign is to improve processes for developing, introducing, vetting, passing, funding, and implementation of Major Council Items and initiatives. Based on City Council input, the Agenda Committee has been tasked with proposing a new set of improvements to:

1. Consider possible refinements to the definition of Major Items
2. Make the Council Item Guidelines mandatory for Major Items (formerly referred to as "Policy Track Items")
3. Establish transparent deadlines for budget processes and clarity about what kind of "asks" can be submitted/considered at each budget cycle
4. Strengthen the Committee System to provide more in-depth review and vetting of Major Items
5. Clarify levels of input from Staff and City Attorney at all stages, from development to implementation
6. Clarify processes and timelines for implementation of items once passed and funded
7. Establish protocols for one-time vetting/disposition of currently backlogged items
8. Consider yearly prioritization processes in light of the intended outcome of fewer, more fully considered Major Items in the queue

To facilitate focused discussion, this memo only addresses proposals related to items 1, 2, and 3, above. Additional considerations will be discussed at subsequent meetings.

1. Consider possible refinements to the definition of Major Items

"Major Items" are items meeting the current definition of *Policy Committee Track Items*:

"Moderate to significant administrative, operational, budgetary, resource, or programmatic impacts."

Some Councilmembers expressed that the definition might be further clarified. After discussing a variety of options, and considering times when the definition might have

proved problematic, it was decided that no changes should be proposed; the definition appears to provide good guidance to members of the Agenda & Rules Committee and has not been a source of controversy to date.

Consideration was given to potentially require all Ordinance changes to be labeled Major Items, but on further discussion, it was concluded that only Ordinance changes/new Ordinances with “moderate to significant administrative, operations, budgetary, resources, or programmatic impacts” would be worthy of being considered as Major Items - thus reinforcing the appropriateness of the existing definition.

One possible improvement could be to add examples of items that may be considered Major Items, rather than to amend the rule:

“Examples may include, but are not limited to Items that:

- *Clarify or extend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in moderate to significantly impactful ways*
- *Change/Amend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in moderate to major ways*
- *Create a new and meaningful exception to existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws*
- *Reverse/change existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in moderate to significant ways*
- *May require moderate to significant increases in funding or additional FTE for start-up and/or ongoing operations”*

Recommendation: Keep existing definition, add examples, and revisit should controversies occur.

2. Make the Council Item Guidelines mandatory for Major Items (formerly referred to as “Policy Track Items”)

In discussing this seemingly straightforward concept, a number of considerations arose that are addressed in the following proposed path forward.

The Council Rules of Procedure and Order already include an outline of what is “required” for Council items, in Section XXX of the Rules. The Guidelines – suggested but not required and included in an Appendix to the Rules – were built from the Rules, providing more elaboration and specificity.

As suggested but not required, the Guidelines have not been “in conflict” with the Rules. However, adopting the Guidelines as requirements changes this equation; *the existing Rules and the Guidelines cannot both be simultaneously required*. The proposed path forward addresses the potential conflict that arises when the Guidelines are adopted as mandatory for Major Items.

In addition, if the Guidelines are mandatory only for Major Items, we must consider what will be mandatory for “all other” items – hereinafter referred to as “Standard Items.” The proposed path forward thus addresses both Major Item and Standard Item requirements.

Another consideration is how the Agenda Committee will evaluate whether an item - Major or Standard - is in compliance with mandatory requirements, and what the Agenda Committee must or may do if it finds an item falls short of the requirements. The following proposal addresses these issues as well.

Finally, the Guidelines were reviewed to identify any possible edits that might be suggested prior to adoption of the Guidelines as mandatory.

Proposal:

1. Make Edits to Guidelines:
 - a. Remove “preamble” language
 - b. Make light changes to the Guidelines and expand illustrative examples
 - c. *See Edited Version of the Guidelines*

2. Remove/eliminate existing Rules about how to present/write Items and adopt a two-tiered set of Rules for **Standard Items** and **Major Items**, based on the Guidelines.
 - a. For **Major Items**, make the full Guidelines MANDATORY
 - b. For **Standard Items**, make elements **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14 and 15** of the Guidelines MANDATORY, with other elements RECOMMENDED.
 - c. **Drafting Consideration** - Keep the Guidelines as an Appendix – incorporated by reference into the Rules – rather than “pasting” the full Guidelines directly into the Rules.

- d. **Clerk Templates** - the Clerk's Office will create updated, more user-friendly and easily accessible templates for Major and Standard Items, as well as for Supplemental, Late, and other Submissions.
 - e. For "**Speciality Items**" such as D13 Account grants, letters and resolutions in support of State or Federal Legislation, and other "special" Item types, the Clerk's Office will provide updated RECOMMENDED templates.
3. **For MANDATORY elements of both Major and Standard Items**, suggest adopting the following (or similar) standard for review by the Agenda Committee:

If a Major or Standard Item, as submitted by the Primary Author, does not substantially and materially meet reasonably applicable Mandatory Elements of the Guidelines, the Agenda & Rules Committee shall request, and may require, that the Primary Author provide additional analysis and/or consultation to fulfill Guideline requirements.

If the Agenda & Rules Committee requests or requires the Primary Author to provide additional analysis or consultation, the Item may or shall be referred back to the Primary Author and may be resubmitted for a future Agenda.

4. **For RECOMMENDED elements of Standard Items and Speciality Items**, authorize the Agenda Committee to do what it currently has the power to do under Rules Section (C)(1) (with some edits):

Refer the item back to the Primary Author for adherence to ~~required~~ recommended form or for additional analysis as ~~required~~ recommended in Section III.B.2 (Primary Author may decline and request Policy Committee assignment).

5. **For Emergency/Time Sensitive Items**, Items can bypass mandatory Guidelines requirements if the Agenda Committee makes the findings for a Time Critical Track Item (existing definition).

Proposed Standard for allowing Emergency/Time Sensitive Items to go forward without fulfilling the Mandatory Guidelines:

The Agenda Committee may make an exception to Mandatory Guidelines requirements for a Major or Standard Item if the Item meets the definition of a Time Critical Track Item, as provided in Section (3)(g)(1) of the Rules, in which case the Item may go forward as submitted on the Action Calendar for the Agenda under consideration with a notation, added by the Clerk's Office, that additional materials have been requested by the Agenda Committee. The Primary Author shall submit such additional materials as a Supplemental 1 filing.

Time Critical Track Item Definition (existing, Section (3)(g)(1)):

A Time Critical item is defined as a matter that is considered urgent by the sponsor and that has a deadline for action that is prior to the next meeting of the Council.

6. Appeals - provide a mechanism to appeal Agenda Committee decisions to the full Council?

May be advisable to have a bypass mechanism - or not?

3. Establish transparent deadlines for budget processes and clarity about what kind of "asks" can be submitted/considered at each budget cycle

The Council did not support a single, yearly cycle for submitting Council items, but expressed a desire for clear deadlines to be established for submission/consideration of items for various budget processes. In addition, questions have arisen regarding what kinds of requests can/should be submitted for consideration at various junctures in the yearly/biennial budget cycle.

Overall, it was determined that *the Agenda Committee should formally ask the Budget Committee for guidance on these questions*, as they fall more squarely into the Budget Committee's purview.

- By when should Standard and Major Items with budgetary considerations be passed out from Council to be considered in the June budget adoption/update?
- Working back from that date, by when should a Major Item or Standard Item be submitted, to allow time for consideration by the appropriate

Policy Committee and/or the City Council? (This may be a question for Agenda & Rules Committee to determine, once B&F sets the deadline)

- What kinds of budget requests are allowed/appropriate for the June budget?
- Consider establishing deadlines for the City Manager to bring Budget Updates (Fall and Spring) to the City Council.
- With established deadlines for Budget Updates, work back to establish deadlines for Major and Standard items to be submitted for consideration at each Budget Update. (This may be a question for Agenda & Rules Committee to determine, once B&F sets the deadline)
- What kinds of budget requests will be considered at Fall and Spring updates - from both Council and from the City Manager/Staff?
- If only emergency/time sensitive requests will be considered (or, for example, expansions of existing programs but not new programs, etc.), how will excess funds, if any, be rolled over and made available for Council priorities at the next June budget?

APPENDIX B. GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING AND WRITING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

~~These guidelines are derived from the requirements for Agenda items listed in the Berkeley City Council Rules of Procedure and Order, Chapter III, Sections B(1) and (2), reproduced below. In addition, Chapter III Section C(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Order allows the Agenda & Rules Committee to request that the Primary Author of an item provide “additional analysis” if the item as submitted evidences a “significant lack of background or supporting information” or “significant grammatical or readability issues.”~~

~~These guidelines provide a more detailed and comprehensive overview of elements of a complete Council item. These Guidelines are mandatory for all Major Items and strongly recommended for all other council reports Standard Items. While not all elements ~~would be~~ are applicable to every type of A ~~agenda~~ item, the Guidelines ~~are intended to~~ prompt Authors to consider important elements of a complete item and to present ~~presenting~~ items with as much relevant information and analysis as possible.~~

~~Chapter III, Sections (B)(1) and (2) of Council Rules of Procedure and Order:~~

- ~~2. Agenda items shall contain all relevant documentation, including the following as Applicable:~~
- ~~a. A descriptive title that adequately informs the public of the subject matter and general nature of the item or report and action requested;~~
 - ~~b. Whether the matter is to be presented on the Consent Calendar or the Action Calendar or as a Report for Information;~~
 - ~~c. Recommendation of the City Manager, if applicable (these provisions shall not apply to Mayor and Council items.);~~
 - ~~d. Fiscal impacts of the recommendation;~~
 - ~~e. A description of the current situation and its effects;~~
 - ~~f. Background information as needed;~~
 - ~~g. Rationale for recommendation;~~
 - ~~h. Alternative actions considered;~~
 - ~~i. For awards of contracts; the abstract of bids and the Affirmative Action Program of the low bidder in those cases where such is required (these provisions shall not apply to Mayor and Council items.);~~
 - ~~j. Person or persons to contact for further information, with telephone number. If the Primary Author of any report believes additional background information, beyond the basic report, is necessary to Council understanding of the subject, a separate compilation of such background information may be developed and copies will be available for Council and for public review in the City Clerk Department, and the City Clerk shall provide limited distribution of such background information depending upon quantity of pages to be~~

~~duplicate. In such case the agenda item distributed with the packet shall so indicate.~~

Guidelines for City Council Items:

1. Title
2. Consent/Action/Information Calendar
3. Recommendation
4. Summary Statement/Current situation and its effects
5. Background
6. Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
7. Actions/Alternatives Considered
8. Consultation/Outreach Overview and Results
9. Rationale for Recommendation
10. Implementation, Administration and Enforcement
11. Environmental Sustainability
12. Fiscal ~~Impacts~~ [Considerations](#)
13. Outcomes and Evaluation
14. Contact Information
15. Attachments/Supporting Materials

1. Title

A descriptive title that adequately informs the public of the subject matter and general nature of the item or report and action requested.

2. Consent/Action/Information Calendar

Whether the matter is to be presented on the Consent Calendar or the Action Calendar or as a Report for Information.

3. Recommendation

Clear, succinct statement of action(s) to be taken. Recommendations can be further detailed within the item, by specific reference.

Common action options, that can be presented singularly or in combination with others, include:

- Adopt first reading of ordinance
- Adopt a resolution
- Referral to the City Manager (City Manager decides if it is a short term referral or is placed on the RRV ranking list)
- Direction to the City Manager (City Manager is directed to execute the recommendation right away, ~~it is not placed on any referral list~~)
- Referral to a Commission, ~~or to a Standing or Ad Hoc~~ Council [Policy Committee](#), or other Legislative Body

- Referral to the budget process
- Send letter of support
- Accept, Approve, Modify or Reject a recommendation from a Commission or Committee
- Designate members of the Council to perform some action

4. Summary Statement/“Current situation and its effects”

A short resume of the circumstances that give rise to the need for the recommended action(s).

- Briefly state the opportunity/problem/concern that has been identified, and the proposed solution.
- Example (fictional):
Winter rains are lasting longer than expected. Berkeley’s winter shelters are poised to close in three weeks, but forecasts suggest rain for another two months. If they do not remain open until the end of the rainy season, hundreds of people will be left in the rain 24/7. Therefore, this item seeks authorization to keep Berkeley’s winter shelters open until the end of April, and refers to the Budget Process \$40,000 to cover costs of an additional two months of shelter operations.

5. Background

A full discussion of the history, circumstances and concerns to be addressed by the item.

- For the above fictional example, Background would include *information and data about the number and needs of homeless individuals in Berkeley, the number and availability of permanent shelter beds that meet their needs, the number of winter shelter beds that would be lost with closure, the impacts of such closure on this population, the weather forecasts, etc.*

6. Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws

Review, identify and discuss relevant/applicable Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws, and how the proposed actions conform with, compliment, are supported by, differ from or run contrary to them. What gaps were found that need to be filled? What existing policies, programs, plans and laws need to be changed/supplemented/improved/repealed? What is missing altogether that needs to be addressed?

Review of all pertinent/applicable sections of:

- The City Charter
- Berkeley Municipal Code
- Administrative Regulations
- Council Resolutions
- Staff training manuals

Review of all applicable City Plans:

- The General Plan
- Area Plans
- The Climate Action Plan
- Resilience Plan
- Equity Plan
- Capital Improvements Plan
- Zero Waste Plan
- Bike Plan
- Pedestrian Plan
- Other relevant precedents and plans

Review of the City's Strategic Plan

Review of similar legislation previously introduced/passed by Council

Review of County, State and Federal laws/policies/programs/plans, if applicable

7. Actions/Alternatives Considered

- What solutions/measures have **other jurisdictions** adopted that serve as models/cautionary tales?
- What solutions/measures are recommended by **advocates, experts, organizations**?
- What is the range of actions considered, and what are some of their major pros and cons?
- Why were other solutions not as feasible/advisable?

8. Consultation/Outreach Overview and Results

- Review/list external and internal stakeholders that were consulted, as relevant.
 - **External:** constituents, communities, neighborhood organizations, businesses and not for profits, advocates, people with lived experience, faith organizations, industry groups, people/groups that might have concerns about the item, etc.
 - **Internal:** staff who would implement policies, the City Manager and/or deputy CM, Department Heads, City Attorney, City Clerk, etc.
 - **Commissions:** what Commissions were or will be consulted and what were their recommendations/concerns/suggestions?
- What reports, articles, books, websites and other materials were consulted?
- What was learned from these sources?
- What changes or approaches did they advocate for that were accepted or rejected?

9. Rationale for Recommendation

A clear and concise statement as to whether the item proposes actions that:

- Conform to, clarify or extend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws

- Change/Amend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in **minor** ways
- Change/Amend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in **major** ways
- Create an exception to existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
- Reverse/go contrary to or against existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws

Argument/summary of argument in support of recommended actions. The argument likely has already been made via the information and analysis already presented, but should be presented/restated/summarized. ~~Plus~~In addition, further elaboration of terms for recommendations, if any, should be spelled out with clarity.

- Example: Keeping winter shelters open for an extra three months extends the City's existing Winter Shelter program in a minor way. The shelters have been open during inclement weather every year for decades, and have been extended to accommodate extended rainy and cold seasons in previous years. Keeping winter shelters open through April ensures our homeless neighbors will continue to have a place to keep dry and warm and supports the City's strategic plan goal of providing services to those with critical needs in our community. All services associated with the Winter Shelter program, including but not limited to meal and storage services, are specifically included in the direction to extend the program.

10. Implementation, Administration and Enforcement

Discuss how the recommended action(s) would be implemented, administered and enforced. What staffing (internal or via contractors/consultants) and materials/facilities are likely required for implementation? Initial, high-level consultation with the City Manager and/or the City Attorney regarding implementation, administration, and enforcement is strongly recommended, but not required.

11. Environmental Sustainability

Discuss the impacts of the recommended action(s), if any, on the environment and the recommendation's positive and/or negative implications with respect to the City's Climate Action, Resilience, and other sustainability goals.

12. Fiscal Impacts Considerations

Review the recommended action's potential to generate funds or savings for the City in the short and long-term, as well as the potential direct and indirect costs and benefits. Initial, high-level consultation with the City Manager and/or the City Attorney regarding the fiscal impacts of the proposal is strongly recommended, but not required.

13. Outcomes and Evaluation

State the specific outcomes expected, if any.

- ~~(i.e., Example: “it is expected that 100-300 homeless people will be referred to housing every year able to access dry and warm shelter during the 3-month extension of the winter shelter program”)~~

Also state and what reporting or evaluation is recommended. _

- Example: The shelter operator shall keep an accounting of the number and any available demographic information about individuals who use the shelter during the extension period and report to the City Council, through the City Manager, on success or challenges of the program extension).

14. Contact Information

15. Attachments/Supporting Materials

APPENDIX B. GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING AND WRITING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

These Guidelines are mandatory for all Major Items and strongly recommended for Standard Items. While not all elements are applicable to every type of agenda item, the Guidelines prompt Authors to consider important elements of a complete item and to present items with as much relevant information and analysis as possible.

Guidelines for City Council Items:

1. Title
2. Consent/Action/Information Calendar
3. Recommendation
4. Summary Statement/Current situation and its effects
5. Background
6. Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
7. Actions/Alternatives Considered
8. Consultation/Outreach Overview and Results
9. Rationale for Recommendation
10. Implementation, Administration and Enforcement
11. Environmental Sustainability
12. Fiscal Considerations
13. Outcomes and Evaluation
14. Contact Information
15. Attachments/Supporting Materials

1. Title

A descriptive title that adequately informs the public of the subject matter and general nature of the item or report and action requested.

2. Consent/Action/Information Calendar

Whether the matter is to be presented on the Consent Calendar or the Action Calendar or as a Report for Information.

3. Recommendation

Clear, succinct statement of action(s) to be taken. Recommendations can be further detailed within the item, by specific reference.

Common action options, that can be presented singularly or in combination with others, include:

- Adopt first reading of ordinance
- Adopt a resolution

- Referral to the City Manager (City Manager decides if it is a short term referral or is placed on the RRV ranking list)
- Direction to the City Manager (City Manager is directed to execute the recommendation right away; it is not placed on any referral list)
- Referral to a Commission, Council Policy Committee, or other Legislative Body
- Referral to the budget process
- Send letter of support
- Accept, Approve, Modify or Reject a recommendation from a Commission or Committee
- Designate members of the Council to perform some action

4. Summary Statement

A short resume of the circumstances that give rise to the need for the recommended action(s).

- Briefly state the opportunity/problem/concern that has been identified, and the proposed solution.
- Example (fictional):
Winter rains are lasting longer than expected. Berkeley's winter shelters are poised to close in three weeks, but forecasts suggest rain for another two months. If they do not remain open until the end of the rainy season, hundreds of people will be left in the rain 24/7. Therefore, this item seeks authorization to keep Berkeley's winter shelters open until the end of April, and refers to the Budget Process \$40,000 to cover costs of an additional two months of shelter operations.

5. Background

A full discussion of the history, circumstances and concerns to be addressed by the item.

- For the above fictional example, Background would include *information and data about the number and needs of homeless individuals in Berkeley, the number and availability of permanent shelter beds that meet their needs, the number of winter shelter beds that would be lost with closure, the impacts of such closure on this population, the weather forecasts, etc.*

6. Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws

Review, identify and discuss relevant/applicable Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws, and how the proposed actions conform with, compliment, are supported by, differ from or run contrary to them. What gaps were found that need to be filled? What existing policies, programs, plans and laws need to be changed/supplemented/improved/repealed? What is missing altogether that needs to be addressed?

Review of all pertinent/applicable sections of:

- The City Charter
- Berkeley Municipal Code
- Administrative Regulations
- Council Resolutions
- Staff training manuals

Review of all applicable City Plans:

- The General Plan
- Area Plans
- The Climate Action Plan
- Resilience Plan
- Equity Plan
- Capital Improvements Plan
- Zero Waste Plan
- Bike Plan
- Pedestrian Plan
- Other relevant precedents and plans

Review of the City's Strategic Plan

Review of similar legislation previously introduced/passed by Council

Review of County, State and Federal laws/policies/programs/plans, if applicable

7. Actions/Alternatives Considered

- What solutions/measures have **other jurisdictions** adopted that serve as models/cautionary tales?
- What solutions/measures are recommended by **advocates, experts, organizations**?
- What is the range of actions considered, and what are some of their major pros and cons?
- Why were other solutions not as feasible/advisable?

8. Consultation/Outreach Overview and Results

- Review/list external and internal stakeholders that were consulted, as relevant.
 - **External:** constituents, communities, neighborhood organizations, businesses and not for profits, advocates, people with lived experience, faith organizations, industry groups, people/groups that might have concerns about the item, etc.
 - **Internal:** staff who would implement policies, the City Manager and/or deputy CM, Department Heads, City Attorney, City Clerk, etc.
 - **Commissions:** what Commissions were or will be consulted and what were their recommendations/concerns/suggestions?
- What reports, articles, books, websites and other materials were consulted?

- What was learned from these sources?
- What changes or approaches did they advocate for that were accepted or rejected?

9. Rationale for Recommendation

A clear and concise statement as to whether the item proposes actions that:

- Conform to, clarify or extend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
- Change/Amend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in **minor** ways
- Change/Amend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in **major** ways
- Create an exception to existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
- Reverse/go contrary to or against existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws

Argument/summary of argument in support of recommended actions. The argument likely has already been made via the information and analysis already presented, but should be presented/restated/summarized. In addition, further elaboration of terms for recommendations, if any, should be spelled out with clarity.

- *Example: Keeping winter shelters open for an extra three months extends the City's existing Winter Shelter program in a minor way. The shelters have been open during inclement weather every year for decades, and have been extended to accommodate extended rainy and cold seasons in previous years. Keeping winter shelters open through April ensures our homeless neighbors will continue to have a place to keep dry and warm and supports the City's strategic plan goal of providing services to those with critical needs in our community. All services associated with the Winter Shelter program, including but not limited to meal and storage services, are specifically included in the direction to extend the program.*

10. Implementation, Administration and Enforcement

Discuss how the recommended action(s) would be implemented, administered and enforced. What staffing (internal or via contractors/consultants) and materials/facilities are likely required for implementation? Initial, high-level consultation with the City Manager and/or the City Attorney regarding implementation, administration, and enforcement is strongly recommended, but not required.

11. Environmental Sustainability

Discuss the impacts of the recommended action(s), if any, on the environment and the recommendation's positive and/or negative implications with respect to the City's Climate Action, Resilience, and other sustainability goals.

12. Fiscal Considerations

Review the recommended action's potential to generate funds or savings for the City in the short and long-term, as well as the potential direct and indirect costs and benefits. Initial, high-level consultation with the City Manager and/or the City

Attorney regarding the fiscal impacts of the proposal is strongly recommended, but not required.

13. Outcomes and Evaluation

State the specific outcomes expected, if any.


- Example: *“It is expected that 300 homeless people will be able to access dry and warm shelter during the 3-month extension of the winter shelter program.”*

Also state what reporting or evaluation is recommended.

- Example: *“The shelter operator shall keep an accounting of the number and any available demographic information about individuals who use the shelter during the extension period and report to the City Council, through the City Manager, on success or challenges of the program extension).”*

14. Contact Information

15. Attachments/Supporting Materials



Kate Harrison
Councilmember District 4

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet


Meeting Date: **October 10, 2023**

Item Number: **1**

Item Description: **City Council Legislative Systems Redesign**

Submitted by: **Councilmembers Harrison, Robinson, and Taplin**

Refer to the Agenda Committee the elements contained in the “Alternative Legislative Alignment Process” as described in the background section.



Kate Harrison
Councilmember District 4

ACTION CALENDAR
October 10, 2023

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Harrison (Author), Councilmember Robinson (Co-Sponsor), and Councilmember Taplin (Co-Sponsor)

Subject: Alternative Council Legislative Process

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to the Agenda Committee the elements contained in the “Alternative Legislative Alignment Process” as described below in the background section:

1. Incorporate positive elements of the Councilmember Hahn proposal, including mandatory Council memo guidelines, a formal process for City staff to provide conceptual input to authors, re-evaluating backlogged items for potential removal, and policy committees’ using a checklist to guide their analysis;¹
2. Establish objective definitions and provide for comprehensive consideration of significant items;
3. Require referrals and budget requests over a given threshold to be considered first by a policy committee.
4. Preserve and formalize rolling deadlines for significant item submission;
5. Retain policy/budget judgement and prioritization to Council as a whole rather than policy committees, while tasking committees with role of ensuring items are drafted to form and sufficiently inform Council and the public’s consideration.

CURRENT SITUATION, EFFECTS, AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

At the October 2019 Council retreat, the Council and the City Manager discussed approaches to better align the legislative process to the budget and ensure implementation was feasible. In particular, many referrals to the City Manager were not well drafted and were not reviewed by policy committees before being referred. Many budget referrals were also not considered by policy committees despite their potential to have outsized impacts on staff and budgetary resources. Even with the referral ranking system, there remain a sizeable backlog of items that are not necessarily funded or considerate of staff resources. Councilmembers have not identified a sufficient number of lower-ranked items for removal from the list and may remain there for years.

¹ Councilmember Hahn, Draft Proposal, p. 44., <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/legislative-body-meeting-agendas/2023-09-18%20Agenda%20Packet%20-%20Agenda%20Committee.pdf>
2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704 • Tel: (510) 981-7140 • TDD: (510) 981-6903 • Fax: (510) 981-6903 E-Mail: KHarrison@cityofberkeley.info

Alternative Council Legislative Process

These considerations merit Council consideration and possible action. At the same time, proposals dictating how often Council can submit legislation and overly complex rules for policy committees risks veering into limiting councilmembers' legislative authority, fails to respond to emerging circumstances, is unprecedented in comparable cities and risks violating the spirit if not the letter of the City Charter. This item finds that (1) policy committee system created in 2018 is fundamentally sound with certain enhancements, and (2) that the problem that needs to be addressed is ending the practice of allowing significant policy and budget referrals to bypass the policy committee system.

Before Council could consider the issue in depth, the COVID-19 pandemic occurred. During the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Mayor and Council briefly suspended consideration of nearly all non-emergency Council legislation and meetings of committees and commissions. As the pandemic wore on, the reality of governing and the needs of the people, including the pressing need for street improvements, responses to our affordable housing crisis, the murder of George Floyd and socio-economic factors – some related and some not to the pandemic – made introducing no new policy infeasible, and Council began legislating anew.

On June 15, 2021 City Management proffered its "Systems Alignment Proposal" proposal to Council. The proposal recommended restricting the time period for submitting Council items (exempting Departments and the City Manager) to only four months per year, among other details, citing the need for more in depth budgetary and implementation analysis. However, the Council's policy committees, created shortly before this time, were tasked with vetting items for any staffing impacts in light of vacancies and considering budget impacts Current rules provide that the policy committees are to:

- review items for completeness and alignment with Strategic Plan goals;
- ensure Council items include adequate discussion of budget implications, administrative feasibility, basic legal concerns, and staff resource demands to allow for informed consideration by the full Council;
- include a positive, qualified, or negative "Committee recommendation" based on these criteria.²

Many items improved significantly through the committee process.

Questions about the impact of the city management proposal on the City Charter were outlined in an alternative Council item submitted by Councilmember Harrison in June 2021.³ Ultimately the City Manager's proposal was not adopted by Council, and was

² Berkeley City Council Rules of Procedure, <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/City%20Council%20Rules%20of%20Procedure%20-%20July%2011%202023%20-%20FINAL.pdf>.

³ Councilmember Harrison, "Comments and Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal," June 15, 2021, <https://records.cityofberkeley.info/PublicAccess/api/Document/AemaKwyWOMW%C3%89OLzGWGj2m%C3%81pnQxBkfMC7W2S7PsoYWkE%C3%81c3kNbNXoWpsj%C3%891iLPosUUV90e0sL0rH3HFNV2BEtmCo%3D/>.

Alternative Council Legislative Process

instead referred to the Agenda Committee for consideration alongside alternative proposals. The City Manager has indicated that it would be inappropriate for the City Manager under the Charter to be recommending or determining how the Council makes policy decisions. Indeed, the policy and legislative function is firmly lodged under the Council per the Charter as was noted in Councilmember Harrison's 2021 alternative item.

Some of the elements of the City Manager's 2021 proposal have reemerged as part of a new proposal led by Councilmember Hahn through the Agenda Committee. According to the Agenda Committee record, Councilmember Hahn indicated that her proposal represents an understanding between the City Manager and City Clerk's office. The City Manager noted that "there are characteristics of my [the City Manager's] proposal woven into what you [Councilmember Hahn] will be providing [the Council]" but has indicated this is clearly a matter for Council to determine.

The Council's process is not fundamentally flawed, and does not require measures such as a nearly 300-day legislative process for "major items." The Council's Policy Committee and budget process systems are sound, and among other updates the main task before Council is to close outstanding loopholes to the committee process.

This alternative item builds upon the proposal submitted by Councilmember Harrison in 2021, comments directly to the positive and less positive elements of Councilmember Hahn's proposal, and offers an updated alternative proposal that better aligns the legislative process to the budget and staff implementation process without sacrificing Berkeley's democratic process, and directly deals with referrals and budget requests submitted without sufficient budget and implementation analysis.

Certain elements of the legislative processes that have largely bypassed the policy committee process include: (1) referrals to the City Manager, (2) departmental, City Manager, including some major policy items, and (3) departmental, City Manager and Council budget referrals. All of these can have an outsized impact on limited budget resources and staff time and should be incorporated in the policy committee process ahead of the respective budget process. The policy committees are where—before passing out an item—significant budgetary impacts and feasibility, in addition to the proposals merits, ought to be determined.

We can fix the process without stripping the people's representatives of their Charter responsibility to respond to the public's needs and of due process to propose, debate, and consider legislation.

BACKGROUND

Positive Aspects of the Councilmember Hahn Proposal

Alternative Council Legislative Process

- Council items are required to follow the guidelines already promulgated rather than leaving these guidelines as recommended only;⁴
- Formal process for City staff to provide high level conceptual input to authors before they submit proposals;⁵
- Process for addressing or re-prioritizing the “backlog” of unfunded items;⁶
- Major Items passed by Council but not funded are automatically rolled-over to future funding opportunities (this has already been implemented to a certain extent).⁷
- Policy Committees’ analysis is enhanced using a checklist (excluding Hahn proposal to rate items).⁸

Concerns about the Councilmember Hahn Proposal

- Does not clearly articulate the specific legislative problems it is trying to solve, or provide examples of how the current system is “[in]consistent[],” how it “overwhelm[s]” City staff, and how the current system fails to “[s]uccessfully implement state of the art and/or innovative programs and policies.”⁹
- Severely limits the public’s access to the democratic process and extends the legislative process for “Major Items” to nearly 300-days (September to July and beyond). This compares to the current expected 120-day timeline. Items can that quickly become stale or inadequate by the time they are finally implemented.¹⁰ The proposal does not appreciate the September deadline artificially circumscribes Council’s ability to be responsive to public.¹¹ For example, if a Councilmember develops a non-time critical but nonetheless important piece of major legislation in October, the public will have to wait 11 months until September plus another nine months (July of the next year) before the item can be budgeted and implemented.
- Does not align with the fall budget process in which “excess equity” is considered and most council budget referrals are funded.
- Does not subject City Management’s “Major Items” to the same review. Neighboring cities such as Oakland require all non-time critical staff policy items to be routed through Policy Committees so all budgetary decisions (the purview of Council) are made against the same criteria.¹²
- Provides Agenda Committee with too much power to determine pick ‘winners and losers’ as to what constitutes a “Major Item” or time critical. Existing and proposed definition of “Major Item” and “Time Critical” are overly subjective.¹³
- Provides Policy Committees inappropriate authority to prioritize/score items they review. Currently, Policy Committees provide recommendations about individual

⁴ Councilmember Hahn Draft Proposal, p. 44.

⁵ Id., p. 43.

⁶ Id., p. 47.

⁷ Id., p. 44.

⁸ Id., p. 36.

⁹ Id., p. 24.

¹⁰ Id., p. 43.

¹¹ Id. p. 27.

¹² Oakland City Council Rules of Procedure, March 8, 2023, <https://www.oaklandcityattorney.org/wp-content/city-council/89588%20CMS.pdf>. See also Councilmember Hahn Draft Proposal, p. 27.

¹³ Id., p. 44.

Alternative Council Legislative Process

policies, and Council as a whole is rightly tasked with prioritizing and scoring items in terms of approval and budgeting.¹⁴

- Asserts that Policy Committees are a burden on staff and the Council, when in fact they have been shown to benefit the legislative process and reduce discussion at full Council. The Council's policy committees would only be allowed to meet to consider major legislation during less than six months of the year (down from the current nine months).¹⁵
- Requires Council to score items as part of the budget process through opaque and non-public processes, rather than through the current deliberative Council meeting process, Budget Committee, and Mayoral budget process provided for in Charter.¹⁶
- Creates an implementation team that includes the Councilmember author after it is passed by a policy committee. The stated goal is to "establish clarity of intentions, sketch timelines, discuss opportunities, ideas, challenges, etc." These are functions that the policy committees are tasked to do. The role for the Councilmember should be circumscribed as to prevent inappropriate meddling in administrative matters that are assigned to the City Manager under the Charter.¹⁷

Alternative Council Legislation Alignment Proposal

From the perspective of the authors of this item, a workable and sensible democratic process proposal should include the following:

Incorporate Positive Elements of Councilmember Hahn Proposal

- The positive elements listed above under "Positive Aspects of the Councilmember Hahn Proposal."

Establish Objective Definitions and Comprehensive Consideration of Significant Items

- Establish *objective* definitions for items with "significant" or "insignificant" budgetary or staffing implications, e.g., a dollar figure threshold, number of FTE needed, or requirement for consultant work. The current system fails to define "moderate to significant" and leaves subjective discretion to the Agenda Committee. This would ensure fairness amongst all Councilmembers. Alternatively, items could be referred directly to Policy Committees for such determination bypassing the Agenda Committee, unless deemed time critical.

Under this proposal, significant items would be subject to the normal maximum 120-day Policy Committee review timeline and include some of the enhancements offered by Councilmember Hahn. Items with insignificant impacts could be routed directly to Council or be provided a more streamlined maximum 90-day timeline and a less intensive review. In the case that items referred under

¹⁴ Id.

¹⁵ Id., p. 26.

¹⁶ Id.

¹⁷ Id., p. 45

Alternative Council Legislative Process

the 90-day timeline are found by the Policy Committee to have more significant impacts, a committee would be empowered to extend the item to 120 days for enhanced review.

- Ensure that all items submitted as referrals to the City Manager or budget referrals over the threshold are thoroughly vetted by Policy Committees and include estimates of all budget and staffing implications before coming out of the committee process so that they can be properly routed to the budget process.
- Ensure that policy items from City Management and Departments (other than time critical contracts and strictly administrative matters) are routed to policy committees as in Oakland and San Francisco.

Preserve and Formalizing Rolling Deadlines for Significant Item Submission

- Provide rolling submission deadlines ahead of applicable biennial (July), annual adjustment (July), and annual appropriation ordinance budget processes (fall/spring). The Council and City Manager may strive to encourage Councilmembers to submit the bulk of their items to the biennial and AAO #1 processes, but circumstances and community demands may warrant submission and consideration at other budget process periods. The Council, Mayor, and Budget Committee should, as in the past, continue to defer items or not fund items with significant budgetary or staffing implications as appropriate. There does not need to be an artificial deadline imposed on items.

Retain Policy/Budget Judgement and Prioritization to Council as a Body, While Tasking Committees with Ensuring Items Are Drafted to Form and Sufficiently Inform Council and Public Consideration

- Pursuant to the Council's historic rules of procedures, *subjective judgements* of legislation are appropriately the purview of the Council as a whole, not Committees.

This alternative proposal would achieve the important goal of aligning Council items with significant budget and staff impacts with legislation in an objective way that is not detrimental to the Council's obligations under the Charter and the public's right to representative democracy.


CONTACT


Councilmember Kate Harrison
kharrison@cityofberkeley.info | 510-981-7140

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Flowchart of Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal

Alternative Council Legislative Process Proposal





Office of the Mayor

WORKSESSION
October 10, 2023

To: Honorable Members of the City Council
From: Mayor Jesse Arreguín
Subject: City Council Legislative Systems Redesign

BACKGROUND

On February 8, 2021, at the direction of City Council during a retreat, the City Manager presented a Systems Alignment Proposal to the Agenda and Rules Committee. Following discussion, the Systems Alignment proposal was calendared for a future Council meeting.

On April 26, 2021 the Systems Alignment proposal was presented to All Council.

Councilmember Droste submitted a response to the Systems Alignment proposal at the May 18, 2021 meeting followed by Councilmembers Hahn and Harrison at the June 15, 2021 meeting. During the June 15, 2023 Council engaged in discussion and referred the Systems Alignment proposal to the Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

On March 14, 2023, Councilmembers Robinson and Wengraf presented Reforms to Public Comment Procedures at meetings of the City Council for discussion and action.

At the Agenda & Rules Committee Councilmember Hahn, in collaboration with the City Clerk and other staff, presented "Major Item Legislative, Budgeting & Implementation Systems Redesign". Upon deliberation, the Agenda & Rules Committee set a worksession for full council discussion on October 10, 2023.

In order to assist Council in understanding the various recommendations from previous meetings, Mayor Arreguin directed his staff, with assistance from Councilmember Wengraf's staff, to create a matrix of all the proposals and responses from City Councilmembers at the relevant meetings which was reviewed at the September 26, 2023 Agenda and Rules Committee meeting.

CONTACT PERSON

Mayor Jesse Arreguín 510-981-7100

City Council Legislative Systems Redesign

WORKSESSION
October 10, 2023

Attachments:

- 1: PowerPoint Presentation
- 2: Council Rules of Procedure – Appendix B
- 3: Comparison Matrix
- 4: Background Materials

MAJOR ITEM

Submission, Review, Approval, Funding, & Implementation

PROCESS SKETCH FOR DISCUSSION

Presented to Berkeley City Council
by the Agenda & Rules Committee

October ##, 2023

TERMINOLOGY

MAJOR ITEM

Is an Item meeting the current/existing definition of a **Policy Committee Track Item**:

Moderate to significant administrative, operational, budgetary, resource, or programmatic impacts

BIG IDEAS

COUNCIL/MAYOR - Successfully develop and implement State of The Art/ Innovative Programs and Policies to serve Berkeley, and to model best practices

CITY CLERK - Consistency in process for Major Item Development, Budgeting and implementation

CITY ATTORNEY – Ensure legal and drafting compliance

CITY MANAGER - Help the Organization deliver without overwhelm; help staff be successful in their work

YEARLY CYCLE

Built around **JUNE 30** Budget Adoption/Update

July – September

COUNCIL

Finalize Y2 Items

CITY MANAGER

Implement Y1 Items

October – March

**COMMITTEE
SEASON**

April – June

**COUNCIL + BUDGET
SEASON**

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

One Cycle - Benefits

- **Every Year, opportunity to submit** and have Council review/vote on and fund Major Items
- **Four Subject Matter Committees** only meet during a Committee Season (except if emergency or special circumstance)
- Staff can **focus on implementation** during the “off season,” and Councilmembers can finalize the next year’s items
- Significantly **reduce gap between approval and implementation**

MAJOR ITEM DEVELOPMENT & SUBMISSION

All Year → *End of September*

- Must use **Major Item Guidelines** format
(Appendix B to Council Rules of Procedure & Order)
- September 30 **Submission Deadline**
- Major Items **can be submitted prior** to September 30 and reviewed by Agenda & Rules for **compliance with guidelines**
- Timeline allows for Councilmembers to **work all year** on items, with **concentrated opportunity** July-September
- **Staff input** at Pre-submission = high level/conceptual; early vetting of concepts with **City Attorney** to identify legal & drafting inputs

AGENDA COMMITTEE

OCTOBER

Review & Assign Major Items to Committees

- Early October **Special Meeting(s)**
- Review Major Items for **compliance with Guidelines**
- Assign *compliant* Major Items to Policy Committees
- Send *non-compliant* Major Items back to Authors for resubmission by End of October

POLICY COMMITTEES

OCTOBER - MARCH

- Organizing Meeting(s) Mid-October – Plan Committee Session/Schedule Hearings
- Major Items reviewed by Committee and move out on Rolling Basis, November - March
- [Committees may also prioritize/score items they review]
- All Major Items OUT of Policy Committees by March 30

CITY COUNCIL

APRIL

- Vote on all Major Items by **April 30**
- May require special meeting(s) in April
- **City Attorney** sign-off on **drafting and legal conformity** of Ordinances, Resolutions, and Formal Policies
- Approved items sent to **Budget Committee**

PRIORITIZATION OF MAJOR ITEMS* EARLY MAY

- All **Major Items** that have been passed by Council, both NEW and PENDING/previously unfunded, to be prioritized by Councilmembers
- Prioritization due Second Friday in May (process TBD)

** Not the same as All-Item prioritization*

BUDGET COMMITTEE

MAY - JUNE

- Council [and Committee?] Prioritizations provided to Budget Committee as guides, but **not binding**
- Budget Committee makes **Recommendations** to Full Council
- Budget passed; Major Items funded move forward to **Implementation**
- ROLLOVER: Major Items passed by Council but not funded get **automatically rolled-over** to future funding opportunities

IMPLEMENTATION

JULY +

- **Implementation Lead** assigned by **City Manager**
- **Implementation Team** assembled by **Lead + CM**
- Meet with **Author(s)** to clarify intentions, sketch timelines, discuss opportunities, ideas, challenges
- **Implementation Team** prepares
 - **Launch Plan**
 - **Operating Plan**
- Program/Policy is **Launched + Implemented**

OVERRIDE

for Time Critical Items

SPECIAL TOPIC # 1

- Rules of Procedure and Order already provide Override:
An item that would otherwise be assigned to a Policy Committee may bypass Policy Review if the Agenda Committee deems it Time Critical. Agenda & Rules Committee retains discretion to decide the Time Critical nature of an item
- Time Critical definition - may need to be reviewed/amended
- May still go to a Policy Committee or directly to Council, per A&R
- [**Possible Add:** Council-level override/appeal if Author doesn't agree with the A&R decision on Time Critical nature of a Major Item].

PRE-SUBMISSION DETAILS

SPECIAL TOPIC # 2

- **Guidelines Format Mandatory** for all Major Items
- **Only Authors (no Co-Sponsors) allowed** at Pre-Submission and Committee stages, to reduce Brown Act issues
- Available: **Pre-Submission Consult with City Manager** to recommend internal subject matter experts for high-level input
- Required: **Pre-Submission Consult with City Attorney** to identify legal and drafting considerations
- *Consider role for **COMMISSIONS** in Pre-Submission Phase*

STRENGTHEN COMMITTEE REVIEW

SPECIAL TOPIC # 3

DEVELOP STANDARDS for review of Major Items:

- Relevance to Strategic Priorities or current needs/events
- Added value of program/policy
- Potential benefits/costs of program/policy to Community and COB
- Alternative means to achieve same or similar goals
- Phasing/timelines for implementation
- Staffing and Resources needed to Launch and Operate
- Evaluation/Metrics/Enforcement
- [Rate/Rank Major Items at end of Committee Session?]
- [Increase options re: positive and negative recommendations?]
- Other?

STRENGTHEN COMMITTEE REVIEW

SPECIAL TOPIC # 3

Public, Staff, City Attorney, Commission Inputs

- Active Outreach to all identifiable Stakeholders
- Multiple Hearings to allow for robust community, Staff, and City Attorney inputs + Discussion
- ENHANCE/EMPOWER City Attorney & Staff participation to ensure meaningful input, without requirement for formal reports
- Committee Schedule (set early October) will help ensure the right staff/attorneys are present for each item
- *Consider how to obtain/integrate input from Commissions*

PRIORITIZATION – SPECIAL *BACKLOGGED QUEUE*

Need a one-time process to “clear the backlog” of Major Items *currently* in queue. Suggest sending all pending (but not initiated) items to Policy Committees for review to suggest:

- Merging items and/or Updating Referrals
- Re-approval of items “as is”
- Recommendation to Sunset/Remove moot items
- Recommend disposition of all items, ranked By Lead Department
- Council reviews and approves Committee recommendations for consolidation, removal, restatement, and re-support of items
- May need some criteria - to ensure all council members get at least some of their priorities addressed
- May also include consideration of an RRV- or other kind of prioritization by full Council, organized by Lead Department and/or holistically

PRIORITIZATION – REGULAR

YEARLY QUEUE

- Enhanced Committee process should result in fewer or no backlogs and items implemented in a reasonable timeframe
- Prioritization becomes less of a BIG ISSUE

Prioritization in a rationalized system:

- More fully conceived and vetted items
- Committee scoring and/or ranking of items at end of Committee Season
- Council Ranking of items by Lead Department and Overall

Need Process & Criteria for funding Items at AA01 and AA02

High Level Suggestions – need input from Budget & Finance

- Only Time Critical and Rollover (previously approved but unfunded) items considered - *same rule for Council and City Manager items*
- Not all extra funds (if any) get allocated - reservation for the annual budget process so funds are available for Council initiatives going through yearly legislative process
- AA01 and 02 only for one-time and/or time sensitive needs, except special circumstances

IMPLEMENTATION

Once Major Item is passed + funded, move to Implementation

- **Implementation Lead** is assigned by City Manager – *Single Individual* Responsible for managing and ensuring implementation
- **Implementation Team** assembled by Lead + City Manager
- **Consult with Author(s)** to clarify intentions, sketch timelines, discuss opportunities, ideas, challenges
- Implementation Team prepares **LAUNCH** and **OPERATING** Plans
 - **LAUNCH** elements + Timeline
 - **OPERATING** Plan
- Long term/ongoing operation of program/policy

DISCUSSION + QUESTIONS

APPENDIX B. GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING AND WRITING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

APPENDIX B. GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING AND WRITING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

These guidelines are derived from the requirements for Agenda items listed in the Berkeley City Council Rules of Procedure and Order, Chapter III, Sections B(1) and (2), reproduced below. In addition, Chapter III Section C(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Order allows the Agenda & Rules Committee to request that the Primary Author of an item provide “additional analysis” if the item as submitted evidences a “significant lack of background or supporting information” or “significant grammatical or readability issues.”

These guidelines provide a more detailed and comprehensive overview of elements of a complete Council item. While not all elements would be applicable to every type of Agenda item, they are intended to prompt Authors to consider presenting items with as much relevant information and analysis as possible.

Chapter III, Sections (B)(1) and (2) of Council Rules of Procedure and Order:

2. Agenda items shall contain all relevant documentation, including the following as Applicable:
 - a. A descriptive title that adequately informs the public of the subject matter and general nature of the item or report and action requested;
 - b. Whether the matter is to be presented on the Consent Calendar or the Action Calendar or as a Report for Information;
 - c. Recommendation of the City Manager, if applicable (these provisions shall not apply to Mayor and Council items.);
 - d. Fiscal impacts of the recommendation;
 - e. A description of the current situation and its effects;
 - f. Background information as needed;
 - g. Rationale for recommendation;
 - h. Alternative actions considered;
 - i. For awards of contracts; the abstract of bids and the Affirmative Action Program of the low bidder in those cases where such is required (these provisions shall not apply to Mayor and Council items.);
 - j. Person or persons to contact for further information, with telephone number. If the Primary Author of any report believes additional background information, beyond the basic report, is necessary to Council understanding of the subject, a separate compilation of such background information may be developed and copies will be available for Council and for public review in the City Clerk Department, and the City Clerk shall provide limited distribution of such background information depending upon quantity of pages to be duplicated. In such case the agenda item distributed with the packet shall so indicate.

Guidelines for City Council Items:

1. Title
 2. Consent/Action/Information Calendar
 3. Recommendation
 4. Summary Statement/Current situation and its effects
 5. Background
 6. Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
 7. Actions/Alternatives Considered
 8. Consultation/Outreach Overview and Results
 9. Rationale for Recommendation
 10. Implementation, Administration and Enforcement
 11. Environmental Sustainability
 12. Fiscal Impacts
 13. Outcomes and Evaluation
 14. Contact Information
 15. Attachments/Supporting Materials
-

1. Title

A descriptive title that adequately informs the public of the subject matter and general nature of the item or report and action requested.

2. Consent/Action/Information Calendar

Whether the matter is to be presented on the Consent Calendar or the Action Calendar or as a Report for Information.

3. Recommendation

Clear, succinct statement of action(s) to be taken. Recommendations can be further detailed within the item, by specific reference.

Common action options include:

- Adopt first reading of ordinance
 - Adopt a resolution
 - Referral to the City Manager (City Manager decides if it is a short term referral or is placed on the RRV ranking list)
 - Direction to the City Manager (City Manager is directed to execute the recommendation right away, it is not placed on any referral list)
 - Referral to a Commission or to a Standing or Ad Hoc Council Committee
 - Referral to the budget process
 - Send letter of support
 - Accept, Approve, Modify or Reject a recommendation from a Commission or Committee
 - Designate members of the Council to perform some action
-

4. Summary Statement/ “Current situation and its effects”

A short resume of the circumstances that give rise to the need for the recommended action(s).

- Briefly state the opportunity/problem/concern that has been identified, and the proposed solution.
- Example (fictional):
Winter rains are lasting longer than expected. Berkeley’s winter shelters are poised to close in three weeks, but forecasts suggest rain for another two months. If they do not remain open until the end of the rainy season, hundreds of people will be left in the rain 24/7. Therefore, this item seeks authorization to keep Berkeley’s winter shelters open until the end of April, and refers to the Budget Process \$40,000 to cover costs of an additional two months of shelter operations.

5. Background

A full discussion of the history, circumstances and concerns to be addressed by the item.

- For the above fictional example, Background would include *information and data about the number and needs of homeless individuals in Berkeley, the number and availability of permanent shelter beds that meet their needs, the number of winter shelter beds that would be lost with closure, the impacts of such closure on this population, the weather forecasts, etc.*

6. Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws

Review, identify and discuss relevant/applicable Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws, and how the proposed actions conform with, compliment, are supported by, differ from or run contrary to them. What gaps were found that need to be filled? What existing policies, programs, plans and laws need to be changed/supplemented/improved/repealed? What is missing altogether that needs to be addressed?

Review of all pertinent/applicable sections of:

- The City Charter
- Berkeley Municipal Code
- Administrative Regulations
- Council Resolutions
- Staff training manuals

Review of all applicable City Plans:

- The General Plan
- Area Plans
- The Climate Action Plan
- Resilience Plan
- Equity Plan

- Capital Improvements Plan
- Zero Waste Plan
- Bike Plan
- Pedestrian Plan
- Other relevant precedents and plans

Review of the City's Strategic Plan

Review of similar legislation previously introduced/passed by Council

Review of County, State and Federal laws/policies/programs/plans, if applicable

7. Actions/Alternatives Considered

- What solutions/measures have **other jurisdictions** adopted that serve as models/cautionary tales?
- What solutions/measures are recommended by **advocates, experts, organizations**?
- What is the range of actions considered, and what are some of their major pros and cons?
- Why were other solutions not as feasible/advisable?

8. Consultation/Outreach Overview and Results

- Review/list external and internal stakeholders that were consulted
 - **External:** constituents, communities, neighborhood organizations, businesses and not for profits, advocates, people with lived experience, faith organizations, industry groups, people/groups that might have concerns about the item, etc.
 - **Internal:** staff who would implement policies, the City Manager and/or deputy CM, Department Heads, City Attorney, Clerk, etc.
- What reports, articles, books, websites and other materials were consulted?
- What was learned from these sources?
- What changes or approaches did they advocate for that were accepted or rejected?

9. Rationale for Recommendation

A clear and concise statement as to whether the item proposes actions that:

- Conform to, clarify or extend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
- Change/Amend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in **minor** ways
- Change/Amend existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws in **major** ways
- Create an exception to existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws
- Reverse/go contrary to or against existing Plans, Programs, Policies and Laws

Argument/summary of argument in support of recommended actions. The argument likely has already been made via the information and analysis already presented,

but should be presented/restated/summarized. Plus, further elaboration of terms for recommendations, if any.

10. Implementation, Administration and Enforcement

Discuss how the recommended action(s) would be implemented, administered and enforced. What staffing (internal or via contractors/consultants) and materials/facilities are likely required for implementation?

11. Environmental Sustainability

Discuss the impacts of the recommended action(s), if any, on the environment and the recommendation's positive and/or negative implications with respect to the City's Climate Action, Resilience, and other sustainability goals.

12. Fiscal Impacts

Review the recommended action's potential to generate funds or savings for the City in the short and long-term, as well as the potential direct and indirect costs.

13. Outcomes and Evaluation

State the specific outcomes expected, if any (i.e., *"it is expected that 100 homeless people will be referred to housing every year"*) and what reporting or evaluation is recommended.

14. Contact Information

15. Attachments/Supporting Materials

Systems Realignment Matrix - Updated 10-3-2023


	JM	LM	LM	JM	LM	LM	JM	JM
Item Date	City Manager's System's Realignment Proposal 4/26/2021	Droste Response 5/18/2021	Council Feedback from Work Session 5/18/2021	Hahn Proposal 6/15/2021	Harrison Proposal 6/15/2021	2021 Council Feedback 6/15/2021	Droste BERIPE Plan 3/14/2023	Hahn/City Clerk Proposal to A & R 10/10/2023
Item Summary				Thesis: Legislative process should support Council in passing legislation of important local concerns and value-based issues with impact locally and more broadly. New legislation should be thoroughly researched, revised and vetted with input from stakeholders, the public, City Staff and Council colleagues. City staff contribute with increased levels of input and participation as the legislation moves forward.		Thesis: Council recommendation was to review the proposal for systems alignment and provide edits and suggestions in order to compile Council feedback for the purpose of drafting a revised proposal for adoption. Sent back to A&R to prepare a new proposal and Council voices. No Councilmembers commented on the Consent Item during the meeting.		Thesis: Align with budget process, create consistency in process and proposal writing; ramp-up staff engagement as proposal moves through process. Create "seasons" (specific annual timeframes for development, policy committee, council and budget approval)
Decisions/ Actions Taken	Thesis: Councilmembers to return with thoughts/proposals	Thesis: Supports CM Proposal. Recommends template adjustments to increase effectiveness and clarify reason for proposal and its recommendations and increase effectiveness.	Thesis: Mayor proposed and Council approved continuing the item to the June 15, 2021 regular meeting to allow Councilmembers to submit written comments for the public record.					
Process for Council Items	A & R determines if Major Item If not major, agenda'd for Council meeting	Council Agenda Item Template recommended adjustments: - add: Define the Problem -Include Criteria Considered & -Rationale for Recommendation -Make Equity its own category Sample red-lined template in item	Some Councilmembers expressed concern about the yearly April deadline for Major items because it would create stale items and/or limit ability to respond to the concerns of the moment. CM reminded public and Council that this process is just for the 15 -20 Major items drafted each year.	Guideline Format drives development of Council, City Manager or Commission proposals All Major Items, regardless of where originated follow the prescribed process Council is encouraged to consult with staff during proposal development but may wait until during the Committee process CAO must provide preliminary review prior to initial submittal	Council Streamlines Existing Backlog of staff involved items through Policy Committees' review and recommendations to Council.	N/A		Built around June Budget Adoption Divided into Seasons with deadlines for each phase
Major Item Definition	- Cannot be operationalized over time with existing resources - Displaces an existing prioritized item - Not implementable with existing resources - Unable to sustain enforcement activities - Subject to legal challenge and/or pre-emption - Additional/new FTE on a temporary or permanent basis - Additional or new infrastructure or technology costs			Any law, program, or policy that represents a significant change or addition to existing law, program, or policy and/or is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis, or input from the community, staff or Council colleagues, and/or is likely to require significant new resources or staffing to implement.		N/A		Definition required
Major Item Determination	A & R in consultation with CM EXCEPTIONS: - Grant deadlines - Public Safety Issues - Declared local emergencies If exceptions granted, projects "in process" must be identified and delayed	Major Item Determination Checklist recommended adjustments: Define "smaller" and "less impactful" and state how that is determined.		(see definition above) Can originate from Councilmembers, City Manager (often as referral responses) or Commissions A & R makes determination if a submittal is a Major Item - can be sent back to originator for more information and compliance with Guidelines	Should be determined by Policy Committees, not Agenda Committee, via objective determination. No determination criteria given.	N/A	N/A	Submittal Season: Year round submittal September 30 cut off for consideration through process Submittals reviewed by A & R for Major Item Determination and compliance with Guidelines
Major Item Deadline	A & R agenda prior to April 30 to be considered in legislative year Agenda'd at A & R on rolling basis	none provided		none provided		N/A	LIMITS NUMBER OF MAYOR ITEM SUBMITTALS Councilmember limited to submitting 1 major legislative item or set of amendments to existing ordinances/yr Mayor limited to submitting 2 major legislative items or set of amendments to existing ordinances/yr DEADLINE TBD	September 30 for next fiscal year consideration

Systems Realignment Matrix - Updated 10-3-2023

Item Date	JM	LM	LM	JM	LM	LM	JM	JM	
	City Manager's System's Realignment Proposal 4/26/2021	Droste Response 5/18/2021	Council Feedback from Work Session 5/18/2021	Hahn Proposal 6/15/2021	Harrison Proposal 6/15/2021	2021 Council Feedback 6/15/2021	Droste BERIPE Plan 3/14/2023	Hahn/City Clerk Proposal to A & R 10/10/2023	
Item Distinction/ Process	Policy Committee Review	Referred by A & R Reviewed for completeness and alignment with Strategic Plan goals. Commission review. Once approved for consideration moves to Implementation Conference	Policy Committee Ranking Form recommended adjustments: -Use score rather than rank NOTE: CM presentation no longer recommends using the Ranking Form	A & R makes determination if a proposal meets information in Guidelines prior to sending on to Committees - Author has right to appeal Committees plan a timeline for hearing over multiple meetings and identify stakeholders and experts to provide input. Committee meetings to discuss proposal should be taken in order of the required components of the Guidelines Staff agendized to engage in every discussion and provides budget resources needs for Launch and	Policy Committees send their recommendation and finalized Implementation report to A & R for scheduling at Council.	N/A	N/A	Committee Season: October 1 - March 1 A & R - October: will require special meetings. determines completeness based on Major Items Guidelines edits must be completed by 3rd Friday in October in order to move to Committees Committees determine order of hearings, create calendar, group like items together, understand staffing impacts, follow Enhanced Review Process	
	Implementation Conference	CM or designee, CAO, Department Head or designee Collaborate with author to detail fiscal and operational impacts. Implementation Conference outcomes to be incorporated into Concil Report (see detail in 4.26.21 proposal, p3)	Implementation Conference Worksheet recommended adjustments: -Reduce amount of redundant components and specify what impact means. -Include similar additions as Council Item Template. -See sample redlined template in the item	Timing for conference: Earlier timing, perhaps just after referred to policy committee, before the Committee takes it up. Staff analysis: Former Auditor in her 2018 presentation talked about importance of Council needing a staff analysis, resource analysis and opportunity costs in their items. Councilmember noted incredible importance for Council to have this info before passing items. At the same time, don't want staff to spend too much time on an item that doesn't pass. Tension here. Definitions: Council needs to be comfortable with them.	The Policy Committee would facilitate an Implementation Conference hearing(s) with City staff, the author, and Committee members in order to prepare an Implementation Report. This happens during the Policy Committee Review.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Implementation Conference Deadline	August 31	No calendar deadline		No calendar deadline	No calendar deadline. Rolling basis.	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Initial Prioritization	July 31. Policy Committees make recs Submitted to City Council	Sunset current RRV process Committee to "score" each proposal			Prioritized on rolling basis. Upon Council adoption, the budget aspect of the item would proceed to either the June or November budget process.	N/A	N/A	ONE TIME clearing of backlog on current list of projects
	Council Approval and Final Prioritization	October Council Calendar Council approval, prioritization, assign fiscal year for implementation, identify removal of items that new initiatives will replace If Council does not approve, item can be reintroduced the following year November 30 deadline for all major item actions	Sunset current RRV process Committee to "score" each proposal		Author revises proposal to include required changes/clarifications and resources required for Launch and Implementation	Council approves before item goes through budget process.	N/A	Council prioritizes all new legislative submittals through RRV process. Year 1 ONLY: Combine new legislative submittals and outstanding/incomplete items for prioritization through RRV process. Council and staff should determine what can be reasonably accomplished by staff based on RRV outcome and delete those projects that did not rise to top of priorities and cannot be accomplished. Year 2 and ongoing: Only new legislative submittals will be prioritized	Council Season: Feb 1 - April 30 CAO must confirm compliance with Ordinances Prioritization: Council and Committee prioritize and send to Budget Committee

Systems Realignment Matrix - Updated 10-3-2023

Item Date	JM	LM	LM	JM	LM	LM	JM	JM
	City Manager's System's Realignment Proposal 4/26/2021	Droste Response 5/18/2021	Council Feedback from Work Session 5/18/2021	Hahn Proposal 6/15/2021	Harrison Proposal 6/15/2021	2021 Council Feedback 6/15/2021	Droste BERIPE Plan 3/14/2023	Hahn/City Clerk Proposal to A & R 10/10/2023
Budget & Strategic Planning	December/January Staff to incorporate approved items into Budget/workplan ranked by priority January - March Council and Staff revise the budget based on department presentations to BC May/June Budget hearings, adjustments and adoption			Budget Implementation Conference: approves moving toward implementation or implementation is declined to proceed	Council approved items go through the next budget process.	N/A	(see note above) Budget referrals and allocations must be explicitly tied to previously established or approved policy program, planning/strategy document and/or external funding opportunity related to one of these. No budget referral can directly fund a specific organization or event. Organizations receiving City funding must submit application that includes civic goals/purposes, previous funding history and quantitative/qualitative results/outcomes. Funding greater than \$20,000 must include data on number of persons served and other outcomes.	Budget Season: May 1 - June 30 Council prioritization to Budget committee not binding. Budget Committee makes recommendations to full Council Funded Council approved items move to Implementation Unfunded Council approved items rollover to future funding opportunities
Implementation						N/A	July (Month 1 of new fiscal year) Implementation Lead and Team assigned Meeting with Authors for clarity, timelines, challenges Implementation Team prepared Launch and Operational Plans	
Tools	Council Item template outlining required information Major Item checklist Implementation Conference Worksheet Major Item Deadline: April 30	Major Item Determination Checklist	Policy Committee Ranking Form	Guidelines for Proposals/Council Items	Alternate Systems Alignment Proposal flowchart.	N/A		Major Items Guidelines Format Enhanced Review Process
Consolidated Yearly Cycle	Implementation Conference Deadline: August 31 Council Prioritization Deadline: July 31 Council Approval Deadline: November 30 Budget Cycle: January -	none addressed	N/A	none addressed	Rolling basis rather than yearly cycle.	N/A	Based on "to be established" deadline to align with RRV process	Submittal Season: Year round with August 1 deadline for next fiscal year consideration Committee Season: Sept 1 - January 30 A & R and council committee review Council Season: Feb 1 - April 30 Budget Season: May 1 - June 30
Recommendations	1 - Staff input in legislative drafting is important							
Consensus	1 - Different timelines for different types of items (some staggered, some ongoing)							
Variable Differences	1 - What impact does this have on the RPP process? What needs to change? What limits revisions to a systems redesign process?							
Outstanding Questions								



Office of the City Manager

BACKGROUND MATERIAL

The following documents were previously submitted to the City Council for consideration, and are being provided with this item as background material.

The City Manager has removed staff's Systems Alignment Proposal from consideration. It is included in this attachment for reference and context.

Attachments:

March 14, 2023 Council Meeting

1. Bureaucratic Effectiveness and Referral Improvement and Prioritization Effort (BE RIPE)
 - a. Report – Submitted by Councilmember Droste

June 15, 2021 Council Meeting

2. Systems Alignment Proposal
 - a. Supplemental Material – Submitted by Councilmember Hahn
 - b. Supplemental Material – Submitted by Councilmember Harrison
 - c. Report – Submitted by City Manager

May 18, 2021 Council Meeting

3. Systems Alignment Proposal
 - a. Supplemental Material – Submitted by Councilmember Droste
 - b. Presentation – Submitted by City Manager
 - c. Report – Submitted by City Manager



Lori Droste
Councilmember, District 8

25

Action Calendar
March 14, 2023

To: Honorable Mayor Jesse Arreguín and Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Lori Droste

Subject: Bureaucratic Effectiveness and Referral Improvement and Prioritization Effort (BE RIPE)

Recommendation

In order to ensure that the City focuses on high-priority issues, projects, and goals and affords them the resources and funding such civic efforts deserve, the City Council should consult with the City Manager's Office to develop and adopt a suite of revisions to the City Council Rules of Procedure and Order that would implement the following provisions:

1. Beginning in 2023, Councilmembers shall submit no more than one major legislative proposal or set of amendments to any existing ordinance per year, with the Mayor permitted to submit two major proposals, for a maximum of ten major Council items per year.
2. In 2023 and all future years, Councilmembers shall be required to submit major items before an established deadline. Council shall then prioritize any new legislative items as well as any incomplete major items from the previous year using the Reweighted Range Voting (RRV) process. This will help establish clear priorities for staff time, funding, and scheduling Council work sessions and meetings. For 2023 alone, the RRV process should include outstanding/incomplete Council items from all previous years. In 2024 and thereafter, the RRV process should only incorporate outstanding/incomplete major items from the prior year. However, Councilmembers may choose to renominate an incomplete major policy item from an earlier year as their single major item.
3. During deliberations at a special worksession, Council retreat, and/or departmental budget presentations, Council and the City Manager should develop a work plan that establishes reasonable expectations about what can be accomplished by staff given the list of priorities as ranked by RRV. Council should also consult with the City Manager and department heads, particularly the City Attorney's office, Planning Department, and Public Works Department on workload challenges (mandates outside Council priorities, etc.), impacts, reasonable staff output expectations, and potential corrective actions to ensure that mandated deadlines are met, basic services are provided, and policy proposals are effectively implemented.
4. Budget referrals and allocations from City Council must be explicitly related to a previously established or passed policy/program, planning/strategy document, and/or an external funding opportunity related to one of these. As a good government practice, councilmembers and the Mayor may **not** submit budget referrals which direct funds to a

specific organization or event. Organizations which receive City funding must submit at least annually an application detailing, at a minimum: the civic goal(s)/purpose(s) for which City funds are used, the amount of City funding received for each of the preceding five years, and quantitative or qualitative accounting of the results/outcomes for the projects that made use of those City funds. Organizations receiving more than \$20,000 in City funds should be required to provide quantitative data regarding the number of individuals served and other outcomes.

5. Ensuring that any exceptions to these provisions are designed to ensure flexibility in the face of an emergency, disaster, or urgent legal issue/liability and narrowly tailored to be consistent with the goals of enhanced efficiency, effectiveness, fairness, and focus.

Policy Committee Recommendation

On February 14, 2023, the Agenda and Rules Committee adopted the following action: M/S/C (Hahn/Arreguin) to send the item to the City Council with a Qualified Positive Recommendation to refer the relevant concepts of the original item to the Agenda & Rules Committee for consideration under the existing committee agenda item regarding enhancements to the City's legislative process. Vote: All Ayes.

Current Situation and Its Effects

Over the past few years (excluding the COVID-19 state of emergency), City Council has grappled with potential options to reduce the legislative workload on the City of Berkeley staff. While a significant portion of this workload is generated from non-legislative matters and staffing vacancies, it is important to recognize that staff also continue to struggle to keep up with Council directives while still accomplishing the City's core mission or providing high quality public infrastructure and services.

Background and Rationale

Berkeley faces an enormous staffing crisis due in part to workload concerns; as such, Council should take steps to hone its focus on legislative priorities. [November 2022's Public Works Off-Agenda Memo](#) offers a benchmark for problems faced by City departments. Public Works staff struggles to complete its top strategic plan projects, respond to audit findings, and provide basic services, in addition to fulfilling legislative priorities by Council. While the "Top Goals and Priorities" outlined by Public Works is tied to 130+ directives by the City Council, it is not reasonable to assume that all will be implemented.

The challenges faced by the Public Works department are not an anomaly. Other departments share the same challenges. In addition to needing to ensure that the City can adopt a compliant state-mandated Housing Element, process permits, secure new grant funding, mitigate seismic risks, and advance our Climate Action Plan, Planning Department staff have been tasked with addressing multiple policy proposals from the City Council. The sheer number of referrals also impacts the ability of staff in the City Attorney's office to vet all ordinances, protect the City's interests, participate in litigation, and address the City's other various legal needs.

Best Practices

A number of nearby, similarly-sized cities were contacted to request information about how these cities approach Councilmember referrals and prioritizations processes. Cities contacted

included Richmond, Vallejo, Santa Clara, Concord, and Sunnyvale. Of these cities, Santa Clara, Concord, and Sunnyvale replied.

Santa Clara

Overall, Santa Clara staff indicated that—similar to Berkeley—the Council referrals and prioritization process is not especially formalized, with additional referrals being made outside of the prioritization process.

Each year, the Council holds an annual priority setting session at which the Council examines and updates priorities from the previous year and considers what progress was made toward those priorities. The prioritization process takes place in February so that any priorities that rise to the top may be considered for funding ahead of the budget process. In any given year, some priorities may go unfunded and even holding those priorities over to a second year is not necessarily a guarantee of funding.

Despite conducting this annual prioritization exercise, Councilmembers in Santa Clara often still do bring forward additional referrals outside of this process. Part of this less restricted approach in Santa Clara's 030 ("zero thirty") policy, which allows members of the the City Council to add items to the Council agenda with sufficient notice and even allows members of the public to petition to have items added to a special section of the Council agenda.

Despite the overall looseness of Santa Clara's approach. Council members still rely upon staff to provide direction with respect to what priorities are or are not feasible based upon available funding and staff bandwidth.

Concord

According to Concord City staff, although Concord—like Berkeley and Santa Clara—does have a process for Councilmembers to request items be added to Council agendas, Councilmembers generally agree not to add referrals outside of the formal priority-setting process.

Concord City staff only work on "new" items/policies that are mandated by law, recommended by the City Manager, and have been recommended for review/work of some kind by a majority (three of the five members) of the City Council.

In general, Councilmembers agree to not add work items outside of the Council's formal priority setting process. The Concord City Council has a once-a-year goal setting workshop each spring where the City plans its Tier 1 and Tier 2 priorities for the year (or sometimes for a 2-year cycle). Most Councilmembers abide by this process and refrain from bringing forward additional items. However any Councilmember may put forward a referral outside of the process and use the method outlined below.

Outside of the prioritization process, Councilmembers can request that their colleagues (under Council reports at any Council meeting) support placing an item on a future Council meeting agenda for a discussion. The Concord City Attorney has advised councilmembers that they can make a three sentence statement, e.g. "I would like my colleagues' support to agendize [insert item]" or "to send [insert item] to a Council standing committee for discussion." Followed by: "This is an important item to me or a timely item for the Council because [insert reasoning]. Do I have your support?" The other Councilmembers then cannot engage in any detailed discussion or follow up, but may only vote yes or no to agendizing the item.

If two of the Councilmember's colleagues (for a total of 3 out of 5) agree to the request to have the item agendized for a more detailed discussion by Council, then the item will be added to a future agenda for fuller consideration. An additional referral outside the prioritization process is suggested perhaps once every month in Concord, but the Concord City Council usually does not provide the majority vote to agendize these additional items.

Sunnyvale

Of all the cities surveyed, Sunnyvale has the most structured approach for selecting, rating, and focusing on City Council priorities. "Study issues" require support from multiple councilmembers before being included in the annual priority setting, and then must go through a relatively rigorous process to rise to the top as Council priorities. And, perhaps most importantly, policy changes *must* go through the priority setting process to be considered. The Sunnyvale City Council's Policy 7.3.26 Study Issues reads, in part:

Any substantive policy change (large or relatively small) is subject to the study issues process (i.e. evaluated for ranking at the Council Study Issues Workshop).

Policy related issues include such items as proposed ordinances, new or expanded service delivery programs, changes to existing Council policy, and/or amendments to the General Plan. Exceptions to this approach include emergency issues, and urgent policy issues that must be completed in the short term to avoid serious negative consequences to the City, subject to a majority vote of Council.

If a study issue receives the support of at least two Councilmembers, the issue will go to staff for the preparation of a study issue paper. Council-generated study issues must be submitted to staff at least three weeks ahead of the priority-setting session, with an exception for study issues raised by the public and carried by at least two Councilmembers, if the study issues hearing takes place less than three weeks before the priority setting.

At the Annual Study Issues Workshop, the Council votes whether to rank, defer, or drop study issues. If a majority votes to drop the issue, it may not return the following year; if the issue is deferred, it returns at the following year's workshop; and if a majority votes to rank an issue, it proceeds to the ranking process. Sunnyvale's process uses "forced ranking" for "departments" with ten or fewer issues and "choice ranking" for departments with eleven or more issues. (The meaning of "departments" and the process for determining the number of issues per department are not elucidated within the policy.) Forced ranking involves assigning a ranking to every policy within a given subset, while choice ranking only assigns a ranking to a third of policies within a given subset, with the others going unranked.

After the Council determines which study issues will be moving forward for the year based on the rankings, the City Manager advises Council of staff's capacity for completing ranked issues. However, if the Council provides additional funding, the number of study issues addressed may be increased.

In 2022, Sunnyvale had 24 study issues (including 17 from previous years and only 7 new ones) and **zero** budget proposals. Although Sunnyvale does consider urgency items outside the prioritization process, this generally happens only 1 to 3 times per year and usually pertains to highly urgent items, such as gun violence.

Status Quo and Its Effects

Council currently uses a reweighted range proportional representation voting method to determine which priorities represent both a) a consensus and b) district/neighborhood concerns. This process allows Council to coalesce around a particular common area of concern; but if there is a specific neighborhood or district issue that is not addressed by Council consensus, it also allows for that district's councilmember's top priority to be elevated in the ratings even without broad consensus, so long as there are not multiple items designated as that councilmember's "top" item. More information about this process can be found [here](#). This [system was established](#) in 2016 due to the sheer amount of referrals by Council and the lack of cohesive direction on which of the 100+ referrals the City Manager should act upon.

Subsequent to this effort, Council created a "short-term referral" pool which was intended to be light-lift referrals that could be accomplished in less than 90 days. However, that designation was always intended to be determined by the City Manager, not Council, with respect to what was operationally feasible in terms of the 90 day window. The challenge with Council determining what is a short-term referral is that it is not always realistic given other duties that the staff has to attend to and inappropriate determinations can stymie work on other long term priorities if staff have to drop everything they are doing to attend to an "short-term" or "emergency" referral.

An added challenge is that the City Auditor [reported in 2018](#) that the City of Berkeley's Code Enforcement Unit (CEU) had insufficient capacity to enforce various Municipal Code provisions. This was due to multiple factors, including understaffing—some of which have since improved. Nevertheless, the City Auditor wrote,

"Council passes some ordinances without fully analyzing the resources needed for enforcement and without understanding current staffing capacity. In order to enforce new ordinances, the CEU must take time away from other enforcement areas. This increases the risk of significant health and safety code violations going unaddressed. It also leads to disgruntled community members who believe that the City is failing to meet its obligations. This does not suggest that the new ordinances are not of value and needed. Council passes policy to address community concerns. However, it does mean that the City Council routinely approves policy that may never result in the intended change or protections."

Subsequent to that report, [an update](#) was published in September of 2022. A staffing and resource analysis for Code Enforcement is still needed to ensure that the laws Council passes can be implemented.

Fiscal Impacts

These reforms are likely to result in significant direct savings related to reduced staff time/overtime as well as potential decreases to costs associated with the recruitment/retention of staff.

Alternatives Considered

Alternatives were considered using effectiveness and efficiency as the evaluative criteria for referrals. One missing criterion that will be necessary in developing this process will be operational considerations so the City of Berkeley can continue to deliver basic services in an efficient manner.

All-Council determination

Council could vote *as a body* on the top 10 legislative priorities. The drawback of this method is that it, by default, eliminates any remaining priorities that have been passed by Council. It also eliminates “minority” voices which may disproportionately impact neighborhood-specific concerns as the remainder of the Council may not value district-specific concerns outside of their council district.

Councilmember parameters

Councilmembers could select their top two legislative priorities (as a primary author) for the year and the Mayor could select four legislative priorities for the year for a total of 10 legislative priorities per year. These “legislative priorities” would not include resolutions of support, budget referrals for infrastructure or traffic mitigations or other non-substantive policy items.....

Status Quo Sans Short-Term Referrals


The status quo of rating referrals is the fairest and most equitable if Council wishes to continue to pass the same quantity of referrals; however, it does not address the overall volume and that certain legislative items skip the prioritization queue due to popularity or perceived community support. Council enacts ordinances that fall outside of the priority setting process and designates items as short-term referrals. This loophole has made this process a bit more challenging. One potential option is to continue the prioritization process but eliminate the short-term referral option unless it is undeniably and categorically an emergency or time-sensitive issue.

Contact Person

Councilmember Lori Droste (legislative aide Eric Panzer)
erpanzer@cityofberkeley.info
Phone: 510-981-7180

Attachments

Update on Public Works’ Goals, Projects, Measures, and Challenges



Office of the City Manager

November 15, 2022

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
 From: *DWR* Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager
 Re: Update on Public Works' Goals, Projects, Measures, and Challenges

This memo shares an update on the department's *Performance Measures* and *FY 2023 Top Goals and Projects*, and identifies the department's highest priority challenge. I am proud of this department's work, its efforts to align its work with City Council's goals, and the department's dedication to improving project and program delivery.

Performance Measures

The department's performance measures were first placed on the department's website (<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/about-us/departments/public-works>) in 2020. They are updated annually in April. Progress continues in preventing trash from reaching the Bay, reducing waste, increasing bike lane miles, reducing the City fleet's reliance on gas, increasing City-owned electric chargers, expanding acres treated by green infrastructure, and reducing the sidewalk repair backlog. Challenges remain with the City's street condition and safety.

Top Goals and Projects

Public Works' top goals and projects are also on the department's website (<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/about-us/departments/public-works>). Department goals are developed annually. This year, after reviewing the 130+ directives from open City Council referrals, FY 2023 adopted budget referrals, audit findings, and strategic plan projects, staff matched existing resources with City Council's direction and the ability to deliver on this direction while ensuring continuity in baseline services.

The *FY 2023 Top Goals and Projects* is staff's projection of the work that the department has the capacity to advance this fiscal year. This list is intended to be both realistic and a stretch to achieve. More than three-quarters of the work on the *FY 2023 Top Goals and Projects* is tied to the existing 130+ directives from City Council referrals, budget referrals, audit findings, and strategic plan projects. The remainder are initiatives internal to the department aimed at increasing effectiveness and/or improving baseline services.

Public Works conducts quarterly monitoring of progress on the goals and projects, and status updates are shared on the department's website using a simple status reporting

Page 2

November 15, 2022

Re: Update on Public Works' Goals, Projects, Measures, and Challenges

procedure. Each goal or project is coded green, yellow, or red. A project coded green is either already completed or is on track and on budget. A project in yellow is at risk of being off track or over budget. A project in red either will not meet its milestone for this fiscal year or is significantly off track or off-budget. Where a project or goal has multiple sub-parts, an overall status is color-coded for the numbered goal and/or project, and exceptions within the subparts are identified by color-coding. Quarter 1's status update is [here](#). The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarter results will be posted at the same location.

Challenge

Besides the volume of direction, the most significant challenge in delivering on City Council's directions is the department's high vacancy rate. The Public Works Department is responsible for staff retention and serves as the hiring manager in the recruitment and selection process. Both retention and hiring contribute to the department's vacancy rate, and the department collaborates closely with the Human Resources Department to reduce the rate. Over the last year, the vacancy rate has ranged from 12% to 18%, and some divisions, such as Equipment Maintenance (Fleet), Transportation,¹ and Engineering, have exceeded 20%. While the overall vacancy rate is lower than in Oakland and San Francisco, it is higher than in Public Works Departments in Alameda, Albany, Emeryville, and San Leandro.

The high vacancy rate obviously reduces the number of services and projects that staff can deliver. It leaves little room for new direction through the course of the fiscal year and can lead to delays and diminished quality. It also detracts from staff morale as existing staff are left to juggle multiple job responsibilities over long periods with little relief. The department's last two annual staff surveys show that employee morale is in the lowest quarter of comparable public agencies and the vacancy rate is a key driver of morale.

Attachment 1 offers an excerpted list of programs and projects that the department is unable to complete or address in this fiscal year due to the elevated vacancy rate and/or the volume of directives.

Attachment 1: Selected list of program, project, referral, and audit finding impacts

cc: Paul Buddenhagen, Deputy City Manager
 LaTanya Bellow, Deputy City Manager
 Jenny Wong, City Auditor
 Mark Numainville, City Clerk
 Matthai Chakko, Assistant to the City Manager

¹ Three of the City's five transportation planner positions will be vacant by December 3. Before January 1, 2023, the City Manager will share an off agenda memo that explains the impact of transportation-specific vacancies on existing projects and programs.

Attachment 1: Selected list of program, project, referral, and audit finding impacts

Project and Program Impacts

- Major infrastructure planning processes are 6+ months behind schedule, including comprehensive planning related to the City's Zero Waste goal, bicycle, stormwater/watershed, sewer, and streetlight infrastructure.
- Some flashing beacon installations have been delayed for more than 18 months, new traffic maintenance requests can take 2+ months to resolve, and the backlog of neighborhood traffic calming requests stretches to 2019.
- The City may lose its accreditation status by the American Public Works Association because of a lack of capacity to gain re-accreditation.
- Some regular inspections and enforcement of traffic control plans for the City's and others' work in the right of way are missed.
- Residents experience missed waste and compost pickups as drivers and workers cover unfamiliar routes and temporary assignments.
- Illegal dumping, ongoing encampment, and RV-related cleanups are sometimes missed or delayed.
- The backlog of parking citation appeals has increased.
- Invoice and contracting approvals can face months-long delays.
- The Janitorial Unit has reduced service levels and increased complaints.
- Maintenance of the City's fleet has declined, with preventative maintenance happening infrequently, longer repair response times, and key vehicles being unavailable during significant weather events.

Prior Direction Deferred or Delayed

- Referral: Expansion of Paid Parking (DMND0003994)
- Referral: Long-Term Zero Waste Strategy (DMND0001282)
- Referral: Residential Permit Parking (PRJ0016358)
- Referral: Parking Benefits District at Marina (DMND0003997)
- Referral: Prioritizing pedestrians at intersections (DMND0002584)
- Referral: Parking Districts on Lorin and Gilman (DMND0003998)
- Budget Referral: Durant/Telegraph Plaza, 12/14/2021
- Referral: Traffic Calming Policy Revision (PRJ0012444)
- Referral: Public Realm Pedestrianization Opportunities (PRJ0019832)
- Referral: Long-Term Resurfacing Plan (PRJ0033877)
- Referral: Street Sweeping Improvement Plan (DMND0002583)
- Audit: Leases: Conflicting Directives Hinder Contract Oversight (2009)
- Audit: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal (2014)
- Audit: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity (2016)

**SOPHIE HAHN**

Berkeley City Council, District 5
2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-7150
shahn@cityofberkeley.info

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL

for Supplemental Packet 2


Meeting Date: June 15, 2021

Item Number: 3

Item Description: Systems Alignment Proposal

Submitted by: Councilmember Sophie Hahn

This Supplemental offers suggestions for a legislative process better aligned with the goal of creating and supporting meaningful and effective change. Our current system is strengthened by (1) supporting the completeness of Major Items as introduced by Authors by requiring adherence to the existing Guidelines, and (2) significantly strengthening the Committee process - to support robust analysis and community/stakeholder consultation and ensure items moving forward to Council include realistic estimates of resources required related to launch and implement new programs and policies.



SOPHIE HAHN
Berkeley City Council, District 5
2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-7150
shahn@cityofberkeley.info

CONSENT CALENDAR
June 15, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Councilmember Sophie Hahn (Author)
Subject: Systems Alignment Proposal

COMMENTS ON SYSTEMS REALIGNMENT

My Frame for Systems Realignment: *Systems Aligned to Support Change*

We are in a time of rapid change both locally and globally. The impacts of climate change, globalization, and inequality; growing threats to democracy; and the rise of a new generation of leaders illustrate that change is both a fact and an imperative.

Berkeley has been and should continue to be on the cutting edge of that change, and our legislative processes as well as our City organization must be designed to do more than just manage the status quo, with change viewed as a threat, cost, or nuisance. *Our systems must be aligned to stimulate, support, and implement meaningful change across all sectors - quickly.*

With that framing in mind, I believe the legislative process in Berkeley should be designed to support Councilmembers and the Mayor in producing and passing legislation that addresses important local concerns as well as value-based issues with both local and broader impact. Some legislation may simply strengthen the City of Berkeley as an organization - improving the basic functions and services we provide to our community. Other legislation is designed to address city, community, regional, national, and sometimes global needs, values and priorities.

Because of the City's commitment to progressive and democratic principles and its role as a leader and innovator across many sectors, legislation will often push the envelope, which I believe requires a nimble, can-do City organization. While logistics, staffing, costs and other elements of feasibility and implementation are key to the ultimate success of any new policy or program, I view the exploration of these questions as a supporting rather than driving force for legislation; internal feasibility under the status quo should not be an end unto itself.

Systems Aligned to Support Excellence and Effectiveness in Change:

While I believe change is an imperative and innovation should be core to our City systems, I also know that not every idea brought forward is ultimately optimal, relevant, or feasible. We are much more than an incubator for ideas and concepts - we serve a real community and must balance a wide variety of needs and viewpoints with every decision we make. I believe our systems must therefore be aligned to ensure new programs and policies are thoroughly researched, revised, and vetted for Berkeley - to meet the needs of our community without overwhelming the City organization. If the Council has priorities for which funds or capacity are not currently available, we must identify resources to build capacity.

To achieve these goals in this frame, I envision a process wherein major items of legislation that begin with the well-researched and articulated proposals of one or a few councilmember/mayor-authors are progressively reviewed and improved with input from stakeholders, members of the public, City staff and Council colleagues.

The end result should be high quality, relevant, thoughtfully tailored and right-sized programs and policies accompanied by realistic assessments of the resources required for successful launch and implementation. City staff, with their subject matter expertise and knowledge of operations play a uniquely important role in contributing to legislative success, and should actively partner throughout the process, *with progressively increased levels of input and participation as legislation is moved forward.*

The adoption of Guidelines for legislative items and the implementation of the Committee system provide a good foundation. By clarifying expectations and improving the value we derive from our existing processes we can avoid bogging things down with too many steps.

The following are my suggestions for a legislative process better aligned with the goal of creating and supporting meaningful and effective change. Our current system is strengthened by (1) supporting the completeness of Major Items as introduced by Authors by requiring adherence to the existing Guidelines, and (2) significantly strengthening the Committee process - to support robust analysis and community/stakeholder consultation and ensure items moving forward to Council include realistic estimates of resources required related to launch and implement new programs and policies.


Proposed Systems Alignment Improvements for Major Items:

PROCESS ELEMENT	CONTENT	NOTES
MAJOR ITEM SUBMISSION	<i>Strongly encourage Authors to present Major Items in the full Guidelines format, which prompts for deep research, analysis and consultation</i>	
Define Major Item	Any law, program, or policy that represents a significant change or addition to existing law, program, or policy, and/or is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis, or input from the community, staff, or Council colleagues, and/or is likely to require significant new resources or staffing to implement .	Major items are, essentially, “Policy Committee Track” items (see Rules) that are routed to a Policy Committee because they are substantial. <i>The adoption of a definition for Major Items clarifies a practice that is already in place.</i> Some items are not “Major” because they propose less significant changes or additions to existing law, programs or policies. In addition, some Major Items may be routed directly to the City Council due to urgency (“Time Critical Track”). <i>All of this is already reflected in the Rules governing Policy Committees.</i>
Major Item Routing	Major items may originate with Councilmembers, the City Manager (often as referral responses), or Commissions. Major Items generally should be routed to a Committee to be reviewed by Committee members and, if necessary, revised, with input from stakeholders, the public, and City staff.	Currently, only Councilmember/Mayor items are subject to review by Policy Committees. <i>The Rules should be amended to require all Major Items, regardless of where they originated, to be reviewed in Committee</i> unless they fall under the Time Critical Track or another exception.
Make Guidelines Mandatory for presentation of Major Items for review	Council/Mayor and Commission authors of Major Items should present their items in accordance with the Guidelines at Appendix B of the City Council Rules of Procedure and Order. Authors should make a good faith effort to undertake the research, analysis and consultation necessary to complete all sections in substance.	Need to specify format for “non-Major” items.
Staff Consultation is encouraged, but not required at the initial	Councilmembers and the Mayor are encouraged to consult with Staff before presenting Major Items, but may choose to engage with staff later, through the Committee process.	Staff should keep confidential and seek to support the positive development of ideas and initiatives of electeds who reach out for initial

development of a legislative item.		input. Concerns, if any, should be addressed with a problem-solving lens.
City Attorney Consultation	Authors should submit Major Items for preliminary review by the City Attorney to determine if there are any legal implications - which may need to be addressed before the item is submitted or could be developed/addressed later. The author should state in the section on consultation that the City Attorney has been consulted.	Not all items have legal implications. The City Attorney's role at this juncture would be to identify whether there are legal considerations, or not. If there are, the Author can work with the City Attorney's office to determine if the issues can be avoided/addressed, or if the legislation may not be possible/advisable.
Agenda Committee makes an initial determination of whether an Item is "Major" and will be referred to a Committee, with input from the Author(s).	<i>This tracks the current practice</i> - except that with an adopted definition of a Major Item the determination to send an item to Committee will be made according to more clearly articulated, objective standards.	Per the existing rules, proclamations, sponsorships, ceremonial and similar items; Time Critical Items; and "Policy Track" items that are complete and have minimal impacts are currently <i>not</i> referred to Committees. <i>This practice will be unchanged.</i>
The Agenda Committee may require a Major Item not presented and/or fully rendered according to the Guidelines to be more amply developed before being sent to Committee.	<p>Authors of Major Items should do substantial research, analysis, and consultation before sending them to a Committee for further input and development.</p> <p>The Agenda Committee should be authorized to request that a major item not presented according to the Guidelines, or not substantially meeting the requirements, be further developed by the Author(s) before being sent to Committee.</p>	Analysis should go beyond diagnosing the problem to be solved and focus on explaining and understanding the specific solutions/policies/programs being proposed, as well as alternatives considered.
Appeal/Override of Agenda Committee recommendation to revise Major Item before submission to a Committee	Authors should be offered the opportunity to discuss an Agenda Committee recommendation to rework a Major Item at the time the recommendation is made. If, after discussion, the lead author disagrees with the Agenda Committee's request for further elaboration according to the Guidelines, the item may be referred to a Committee "as is" with a note that the Agenda Committee had requested the item be revised.	Authors should have a means to appeal a decision of the Agenda Committee to send an item back to the author for revision/expanded research, analysis or consultation and still move their items forward if they disagree with the request.
Major Items that are Complete go to Committee (or items that are incomplete but subject to an override)	<i>Per existing rules</i> , Major Items will be routed to a policy committee unless an exception applies.	Exceptions are already listed in the Rules.

MAJOR ITEM COMMITTEE REVIEW	<i>Clarify and significantly improve process and substance of Major Item review @ Committee, including development of a preliminary launch and implementation plan and associated costs</i>	
Committee hears Major Item more than once - First hearing includes development of a plan for review	As a general matter, Committees should plan to schedule Major Items to be heard more than once. At the first hearing, the Committee should discuss the level of analysis and consultation envisioned, identify specific stakeholders and questions Committee members would like to explore, and sketch a process for moving the item forward over several Committee meetings.	Depending on how complex and significant the Major Item appears to be, the Committee can plan out its process of review and consultation.
Committee reviews specific elements of the proposed Major Item	<p>The Guidelines require, under bullets 5-9, (5) full background on the problem/issue to be addressed, (6) the existing regulatory/legal framework, (7) potential alternative solutions to address the identified concern, (8) consultation with stakeholders, and (9) a rationale for the recommendation.</p> <p>Each of these sections should be specifically agendized for discussion (can all be same day, but should be individually considered) to ensure robust consideration of the legislation as proposed.</p>	By requiring the Committee to focus on each of these elements as a baseline review, Committee members are encouraged to do a deep dive into the basis, rationales and alternatives for the Major Item.
Committee identifies and does specific outreach to Stakeholders and Experts	<p>The “public” is always welcome at Committee Meetings. In addition to general public notice, the Committee in its first meeting to review a Major Item should identify stakeholders and experts who may have valuable input. If needed, those individuals/groups should be invited by the Committee to share their perspectives.</p> <p>Staff can support outreach to ensure identified stakeholders and experts are aware of the opportunity to comment.</p>	Sectors/individuals that are supported or otherwise impacted by new policies and programs are well positioned to provide useful comments and input for the Committee. Subject matter experts may also be helpful to hear from.
Staff input is agendized and includes preliminary review of Launch and Implementation	<p>Staff is encouraged to provide input and answer questions throughout the Committee process. Staff should be encouraged to volunteer comments and Committee Chairs should call on staff to ensure time is provided for their comments throughout the process. <i>In addition, a specific time for staff input should be agendized.</i></p> <p>The Staff presentation should include <i>preliminary review of staffing and budget/resource needs for both Launch and Implementation.</i></p>	Launching a new program or policy and running it are two different undertakings. Staff should specify what will need to be in place to LAUNCH (development of regulations, preparation of informational mailings, website updates, back-end systems, funding, etc.) and to RUN/IMPLEMENT new programs and policies over the long run.

<p>Manage/reduce Staffing of Committees</p>	<p>With a better articulated “plan” for Committee review of Major Items, staffing of meetings can be more closely managed to reduce waiting time for staff members/City Attorney when not needed for one or another matter.</p>	<p>Only need Clerk + Staff Lead - Chair can work with Staff Lead to bring other Staff into discussions on as-needed basis. The City Attorney may be able to be on standby for advice when presence is not required.</p>
<p>Major Item moves forward to Council (all recommendations)</p>	<p>Lead Author must revise/update item to include information about resources required for Launch and Implementation of the Major Item, and to reflect any other changes, before submission to City Council.</p>	
<p>Major Item gets passed by Council</p>	<p>Goes to Budget Implementation Conference, or vote no and it's over</p>	



Kate Harrison
Councilmember District 4

REVISED AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 2

Meeting Date: June 15, 2021


Item Number: 3

Item Description: Systems Alignment Proposal

Submitted by: Councilmember Harrison

The attached item includes Councilmember Harrison's comments about the proposed Systems Alignment Proposal as well as an alternative proposal.

It is in the public interest that the Council consider this alternative proposal as part of the Mayor's development of a revised proposal for discussion and adoption at a later date.



Kate Harrison
Councilmember District 4

CONSENT CALENDAR
June 15, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Councilmember Harrison
Subject: Comments and Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal

COMMENTS AND ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

At the October 2019 Council retreat, the Council and the City Manager discussed various approaches to better align the legislative process to budget and implementation resources. These considerations are important and merit Council consideration and possible action. However, the proposed solution from the City Manager would also limit the voice of the public and the Council by restricting the time period for Council referrals to only four months per year.

At a Worksession on May 18, 2021 dedicated to the Systems Alignment proposal, the Council heard overwhelming public comment strongly opposed to such an approach.

A better solution lies in reexamining and modifying certain elements of the Policy Committee process as opposed to overhauling fundamental elements of Council duties.

This Supplemental discusses the shortcomings of the proposal in greater detail and advances an alternative and simpler approach to “Systems Alignment” achieving the original objective of the October 2019 retreat without sacrificing and abdicating fundamental values and responsibilities.

A. The Proposed Systems Alignment Proposal Unduly Limits Council Duties and Responsibilities Under the City Charter

The City Charter provides that the City Council is the “governing body of the municipality” and “shall exercise the corporate powers of the City, and... be vested with all powers of legislation in municipal affairs adequate to a complete system of local government.”

However, the proposal subjects “new significant legislation” to a labyrinth of new bureaucratic processes that will invariably and unduly limit the democratic organ of city government—the City Council—which is directly answerable to the will of the people.

Comments and Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal

The following list provides a non-comprehensive overview/discussion of the ways the current Systems Alignment Proposal could violate the letter and spirit of the Charter:

- The proposal limits Council from submitting “new significant legislation” to four months out of the year, effectively making the Council only responsive to the people’s “significant” needs on a part-time basis as any legislation that misses the deadline is inactive for the remainder of the year. Not only does this violate the necessity of providing the Council with “all powers of legislation in municipal affairs,” but it appears to contradict the voter’s will pursuant to Measure JJ, wherein they reaffirmed the scope and appropriate remuneration of Council’s myriad legislative and oversight responsibilities.
- The determination of which legislation will be subject to additional scrutiny and processes is based on *subjective* findings by the Agenda Committee in consultation with the City Manager. This is in contrast to alternative approaches, such as those adopted in other cities, which rely upon *objective* measures such as the consideration of a piece of legislation’s budgetary or staffing implications informed by thorough discussion and investigation by Policy Committees. Furthermore, pursuant to the Council’s historic rules of procedures, *subjective judgements* of legislation are appropriately the purview of the Council as a whole, not subcommittees. The current proposal adopts an inherently conservative and subjective framework that judges all legislation by whether it “represents a significant change or addition to existing law, program, or policy, or is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis, or input from staff.” Legislation meeting that definition is then subjected to lengthy bureaucratic processes of more than a year.

In short, the proposed framework stands in contrast to the current Policy Committee system, whereby subcommittees are tasked with improving the quality, thoroughness and comprehension of legislation, as opposed to a subjective consideration and determination of whether a given policy change is merited largely within the narrow confines of considering limited budget and staff resources.

- Under the Charter, the Council is responsible for adopting a biannual budget. However, the proposal limits Council’s ability to adopt significant new legislation with budget implications at only one of the two primary budget processes per year.
- Legislative consultation with City staff is absolutely necessary. But the proposal encourages authors to “initially consult[] with the City Manager or city staff regarding their proposed Major Item and [note] the substance of those conversations, and initial staff input” before the item is even introduced. This system could potentially create an inappropriate layer of staff power over Council legislative prerogative, a division that the Charter is very clear about.
- The proposal requires that items align with Strategic Plan goals. While these goals are important and represent a snapshot of Council and City Staff’s vision for the city, they do not necessarily represent the totality of the people’s will as expressed

through their elected representatives at any given time.

- The Council is artificially constrained from acting upon legislation receiving an unfavorable review at the Policy Committee level. Council is reduced to a choice between proceeding through the next phase, or to vetoing a matter for the remainder of the legislative calendar if a policy committee forwards a negative recommendation. Currently, under the committee system, items not acted upon in committee within 120 days are forwarded to the Council. In this way, the proposal violates the Charter by imposing unreasonable hurdles to the exercise of “all powers of legislation in municipal affairs adequate to a complete system of local government.”
- The proposal states that all significant legislation must be submitted by April 30, and City Council Policy Committees must complete review of all Major Items assigned to them no later than June 30 of each year. This raises the question of what the Council is engaged in for the majority of the year?
- Implementation Conferences, while a good idea, are currently crafted in a way that they will delay items unnecessarily and remove discussion of budgetary impacts from the substantive discussion by policy committees. Furthermore, the proposal imposes an artificial limit with respect to holding Implementation Conferences to once per year, which will further constrain the Council’s legislative obligations.
- After the implementation conference, Policy Committees are required to provide an additional subjective consideration of major items through prioritization. This is late in the life of an item. Additionally, under this proposal, the Council is expected to once again rank significant items as part of the RRV process (behind closed doors), despite the items having already endured the lengthy Systems Alignment process and final Council approval.
- When an item fails to receive Council approval, the author is barred from resubmitting it until the following year.

B. Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal

This item presents a simpler and less disruptive Systems Alignment proposal that conforms to the existing Council and Policy Committee processes and prioritizes research and investigation of items with significant budgetary and staff implications in order to better inform Council’s decision-making process as opposed to hard limits on legislation:

1. To address the backlog of outstanding items that may impact staff resources and availability to implement Council and other citywide priorities, the Council should immediately direct Policy Committees to review all such referrals and items in staff’s queue for which implementation work has not yet begun.

Comments and Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal

Upon this review, Policy Committees would be tasked with making a recommendation to the full Council to modify or reconsider certain items in the queue.

Next, the Council should schedule worksessions (outside of the RRV process) to consider Policy Committee recommendations in a public forum and prepare a Resolution potentially dispensing with and/or reprioritizing items in the queue.

In totality, this process would contribute to streamlining the existing queue, and facilitate staff resources for implementation and development of other new and existing legislative items. In sum, through revisiting the existing queue, Council can continue to conduct substantial legislative work throughout the year.

2. The Council should revise Policy Committee process with respect to the budget and legislative implementation.

Specifically, to address potential incongruity between Council items with significant budget implications, the Council should modify its Rules of Procedure to task Policy Committees (not the Agenda Committee) with making an initial and objective determination of whether a prospective item has significant budget and/or staffing impacts (**See Attachment 1** for a detailed flowchart of the Alternative Proposal):

- Upon an insignificant budget determination, the item and any related budget referral would proceed through the normal Policy Committee track process on a maximum 90-day timeline.
- Upon a significant determination, the item would be placed on a different Policy Committee track such that the Policy Committee would have a maximum of 120 days to research and investigate the budget and staffing implications of the item, any related budget referral, and policy implications, in order to *inform* Council's ultimate consideration. As part of the 120 day process, the Committee would facilitate an Implementation Conference hearing(s) with City staff, the author, and Committee members in order to prepare an Implementation Report.
- Once the Committee has made its policy recommendation and finalized its Implementation Report, the item would proceed to the Agenda Committee for scheduling at Council.
- Upon Council adoption of items with either significant or insignificant budget/staffing implications, the budget aspect of the item would proceed to either the June or November budget process pursuant to Council-established deadlines for consideration of budget items. For example, the

Comments and Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal

Council could establish deadlines of May and October for the respective budget processes. Therefore, the Budget Committee would only consider budget items that were passed ahead of the respective deadlines. Those that miss the deadline or are ultimately unfunded would be automatically carried over to the next budget process.

This alternative proposal would achieve the important goal of aligning Council items with significant budget and staff impacts with legislation in an objective way that is not detrimental to the Council's obligations under the Charter.

It is in the public interest that the Council consider this alternative proposal as part of the Mayor's development of a revised proposal for discussion and adoption at a later date.


CONTACT


Councilmember Kate Harrison
kharrison@cityofberkeley.info | 510-981-7140

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Flowchart of Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal

Alternative Systems Alignment Proposal







Office of the City Manager

CONSENT CALENDAR

June 15, 2021

(continued from May 18, 2021)

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager

Submitted by: David White, Deputy City Manager

Subject: Systems Alignment Proposal

RECOMMENDATION

Review the proposal for systems alignment and provide edits and suggestions in order to compile Council feedback for the purpose of drafting a revised proposal for adoption.

SUMMARY

The City Council discussed the Systems Alignment proposal at a Worksession on May 18, 2021. The item was continued to June 15 to allow Councilmembers to submit suggestions and changes to the original plan. The Mayor will consolidate the input from the Council and the public and return with a revised proposal for discussion and adoption at a later date.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

While the recommendation of this report would not entail fiscal impacts, if adopted, the proposal would have budgetary effects. Broadly speaking, the proposal is designed to better ensure adequate financial and staffing resources are identified and approved with any adopted significant legislation¹ (Major Item).

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

This report proposes a process to integrate various systems (e.g., budget, Strategic Plan, prioritization of referrals, etc.) to ensure that resources are appropriately allocated, to focus the organization and employees on those priorities established by the City Council and City Manager, and to enhance legislative and budget processes. Ultimately, aligning systems will help ensure our community's values as reflected in the policies of our City Council are implemented completely and efficiently, with increased fiscal prudence, while supporting more meaningful service delivery. In light of the economic and financial impacts of COVID-19 and resource constraints, it is imperative to improve

¹ New significant legislation is defined, with some explicit exceptions, as "any law, program, or policy that represents a significant change or addition to existing law, program, or policy, or is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis, or input from staff, Councilmembers or members of the public". See Council Rules of Procedure, https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_City_Council/City%20Council%20Rules%20of%20Procedure.pdf.

vetting and costing of new projects and legislative initiatives to ensure success. In addition, the purpose of this proposal will align our work with the budget process.

The proposed changes outlined in this memorandum will better guide and inform budget development, clarify tradeoffs by identifying operational impacts, and develop a more effective and time-efficient path to implementation. These changes support a clear and full realizing of City Council policies, programs, and vision. The major features of the proposal are:

- Changing the order of the legislative process to ensure that Major Items (defined below) passed by Council are funded, as well as folded into staff workplans and staffing capacity,
- Making the City Council Rules of Procedure Appendix B guidelines mandatory,
- Ensuring that Major Items that are adopted by City Council are vetted and clearly identify the resources needed for implementation,
- Consolidating and simplifying reporting and tracking of Major Items, and
- Creating a deadline for each year's Major Items that allows for alignment with prioritization, the Strategic Plan, and the budget process.

Additionally, the proposed Systems Alignment would advance the City's Strategic Plan goal to provide an efficient and financially-health City government.

PROPOSED PROCESS

The proposed process outlined in this memorandum replaces the current system of referrals (short and long term, as well as Commission referrals), directives, and new proposed ordinances, that is, all Major Items, regardless of "type" or origin will be subject to this process.

Step 1: Major Item Determination

The systems alignment proposal outlines a process for Major Items.

Defined in Council Rules of Procedure

Major Items are "new significant legislation" as defined in Appendix D of the [City Council Rules of Procedure](#):

Except as provided below, "new significant legislation" is defined as any law, program, or policy that represents a significant change or addition to existing law, program, or policy, or is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis, or input from staff, Councilmembers or members of the public.

The exceptions to the definition of new significant legislation and process state:

New significant legislation originating from the Council, Commissions, or Staff related to the City's COVID-19 response², including but not limited to health and

² If this proposal is adopted, "COVID-19" should be replaced with "declared emergency response" in the exception language.

economic impacts of the pandemic or recovery, or addressing other health and safety concerns, the City Budget process, or other essential or ongoing City processes or business will be allowed to move forward, as well as legislative items that are urgent, time sensitive, smaller, or less impactful.

The Agenda & Rules Committee, in consultation with the City Manager, will make the initial determination of whether something is a Major Item, using the Major Item Determination Checklist (see attachment 1). At any time in the process, if evidence demonstrates that the initial determination of the proposal as a Major Item proves incorrect, then it is no longer subject to this process. Additionally, if any legislation it originally deemed not to be a Major Item, the author or City Manager may appeal to the Agenda and Rules Committee or to the full Council and present evidence to the contrary.

Required Conformance and Consultation

All Major Items must use the agenda guidelines in Appendix B of the Council Rules, which require more detailed background information and analysis. The Agenda and Rules Committee can send the item back to the author if it is not complete and/or does not include all of the information required in Appendix B. The author must make a good faith effort to ensure all the guideline prompts are completed in substance not just in form.

Major Items must include a section noting whether the author has initially consulted with the City Manager or city staff regarding their proposed Major Item and the substance of those conversations, and initial staff input.

Required Submission Date

A Major Item must be submitted in time to appear on the agenda of an Agenda & Rules Committee meeting occurring no later than April 30 of every year. Any item submitted after that deadline, that does not meet an exemption, will be continued to the following year's legislative process.

Major Items will be referred by the Agenda & Rules committee on a rolling basis.

Step 2: Policy Committee Review

A Major Item, once introduced and deemed complete and in conformance by the Agenda and Rules Committee, will be referred to one of City Council's Policy Committees (i.e., Health, Life Enrichment, Equity and Community, Public Safety, etc.), for review, recommendation, and high-level discussion of implementation (i.e., ideas, rough cost estimates, benefits, etc.). Per the [*Council Rules of Procedure*](#),³ the Policy

³ https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_City_Council/City%20Council%20Rules%20of%20Procedure%20-%20Feb%2011%202020%20-%20FINAL.pdf

Committee will review the Major Item and the completed Major Item Determination Checklist to confirm Agenda & Rules initial determination that the Major Item is complete in accordance with Section III.B.2 and aligns with Strategic Plan goals. If the Major Item receives a positive or qualified positive recommendation, then it will go to an Implementation Conference (See step 3, Vetting and Costing).

If the Major Item receives a negative or qualified negative recommendation, then it will be returned to the Agenda and Rules Committee to be placed on a City Council Agenda. When heard at a City Council meeting, the author can advocate for the Major Item to be sent to an Implementation Conference. If the Major Item does not receive a vote by the majority of City Council at this step, it becomes inactive for that year's legislative calendar but may be reintroduced for the next year's calendar.

City Council Policy Committees must complete review of all Major Items assigned to them no later than June 30 of each year.

Step 3: Implementation Conference (Vetting and Costing)

At an Implementation Conference, the primary author will meet with the City Manager or designee, City Manager-selected staff subject matter experts, and the City Attorney or designee.

Identifying Fiscal, Operational and Implementation Impacts

The intended outcome of an Implementation Conference is a strong analysis containing all of the considerations and resources necessary to support implementation should Council choose to approve the Major Item.

The Implementation Conference is an informal meeting where the primary author can collaborate with the City Manager, City Attorney, and staff to better define the Major Item and identify more detailed fiscal and operational impacts, as well as implementation considerations. The information discussed during the Implementation Conference will be summarized in the Council Report as part of newly required sections (see attachment 2), in conformance with Appendix B:

- *Initial Consultation*, which
 - Lists internal and external stakeholders that were consulted, including whether item was concurrently submitted to a Commission for input,
 - Summarizes and confirms what was learned from consultation,
 - Confirms legal review addressing any legal or pre-emption issues, ensuring legal form,⁴
- *Implementation, Administration, and Enforcement*, which
 - Identifies internal and external benefits and impacts, and

⁴ While consultation with the City Attorney is mentioned in Appendix B, the legal review and "confirmations" recommended in this proposal is a more specific and robust requirement.

- Considers equity implications, launch/initiation of Major Item and its ongoing administration, and
- *Fiscal & Operational Impacts*, which
 - Summarizes any operational impacts,
 - Identifies necessary resources, including specific staff resources needed and costs.⁵

As part of the Implementation Conference, staff will provide a high level work plan, indicating major deliverables/milestones and dates. This information can be collected and recorded using the Implementation Conference Worksheet (see attachment 2).

Implementation Conferences will be date certain meetings held in July.

Revising the Major Item

After the Major Item's author revises the original Council Report based on information from the Implementation Conference, the Major Item will be submitted to the Council agenda process. If additional full time equivalent employee(s) (FTE) or fiscal resources are needed, the Major Item must include a referral to the budget process and identify the amount for implementation of the policy or program.

Step 4: Initial Prioritization

At their first meetings in September, Policy Committees must complete the ranking of the Major Items which were referred to them and also completed the Implementation Conference. The Policy Committees will provide these rankings in the form of a recommendation to the City Council. The Policy Committees prioritization will use the Policy Committee Ranking Form (see attachment 3) to standardize consideration of Major Items across Policy Committees. The Policy Committee priority rankings will be submitted to the City Council when the Council is considering items to move forward in the budget and Strategic Plan process.

Step 5: City Council Approval and Final Prioritization

Under this proposal, all Major Items that the City Council considers for approved prioritization must have:

1. Received a City Council Policy Committee review and recommendation,
2. Received a City Council Policy Committee prioritization,
3. Completed the Implementation Conference, and
4. Been placed on the Agenda for a regular or special Council meeting in October for approval and inclusion in the RRV process.

⁵ Appendix B does require a Fiscal Impacts section, but the inclusion of operational impacts and specific noting of required staff resources and costs recommended in this proposal is a more specific and robust requirement.

At the designated Council meeting in October, staff will provide the Council with a list of all approved Major Items, including the initial prioritization by Policy Committee. The Council will consider each Major Item for approval. All approved Major Items then will be added to the RRV process (i.e., with other items, referrals, etc) and ranked. The RRV ranking will begin in late October. These rankings will be adopted by Council and used to inform the development of the draft budget. Approved and ranked Major Items have multiple opportunities to be approved for funding, when the biennial budget or mid-cycle budget is adopted in June or when the Annual Appropriations Ordinances are adopted in May and November.

If a Major Item *does not receive the endorsement* of City Council at this step, it becomes inactive for that year's legislative calendar and may be reintroduced for the next year's calendar.

City Council must complete its Major Items approval, and RRV process no later than the final meeting in December of each year.⁶ This ensures that staff is able to develop the budget starting from and based on Council priorities.

Step 6: Budget & Strategic Plan Process


The Council's rankings are also forwarded to the Budget and Finance Committee for consideration as part of budget development. If the proposal is not ultimately funded in the biennial budget, mid-cycle budget or the Annual Appropriations Ordinance (mid-year budget amendment), then it does not move forward that year and will be added to a list of unfunded proposals for the future budget process.

During December and January, city staff will prepare budget proposals that incorporate the ranked City Council Major Items, Strategic Plan, and work plan development. In the late winter/early spring, the City Manager and Budget Office will present the draft budget to Council. This will be followed by department presentations to the Budget and Finance Policy Committee. From late March and through early May, Council and staff will refine the budget. Council will hold budget hearings in May and June, with adoption of the budget by June 30. Although the legislative process (i.e., Policy Committee review, Implementation Conference, Prioritization) is annual, staff recommends the budget process remain biennial. A significant mid-cycle budget update can easily accommodate additions to or changes in priorities arising through the legislative process.


The proposed process is depicted in Figure 1 and the proposed launch calendar in Figure 2.

⁶ Due to noticing requirements, an RRV process completed by November 30 may not appear on a City Council Agenda for adoption until January.

Figure 1, Proposed Process⁷




⁷ Major Items that are ordinances will need to be examined on a case-by-case basis. Once adopted, ranked, and, if requiring resources, budgeted, the ordinance will need to be given an effective date and scheduled for first and second readings at Council.



Office of the City Manager

Figure 2, Proposed Launch





Office of the City Manager

Next Steps

Staff will reach out to legislative aides for input and the City Manager will meet individually with Councilmembers to discuss this proposal. Staff will incorporate Council input from the worksession, and from subsequent input into a resolution and return to Council with a final Systems Alignment item for adoption by July 2021.

Benefits

The addition of an Implementation Conference will ensure that Major Items considered by Council are properly resourced, improving our City's responsible management of fiscal resources. Analysis from the Implementation Conference will help Council to balance and consider each Major Item within the context of related programs and potential impacts (positive and negative). When considered holistically, new policy implementation can be supportive of existing work and service delivery.

Since the proposed process places the City Council prioritization of Major Items immediately before budget preparation, the Prioritization will guide and inform budget development, including components such as the Strategic Plan and work plans. Fixing the sequencing of the process is a key benefit. Currently, with prioritization occurring in May and June, the budget process is nearing completion when City Council's priorities are finally decided. This leads to inconsistencies between adopted priorities and budgeting for those priorities.

Under the current process, an idea may go into prioritization, proceed to the short term referral list or referred to the budget process. However, the resulting Major Item may not have addressed operational considerations. Adding such items to a department's work at any given time of the year may lead to staff stopping or slowing work on other prioritized projects in order to develop and implement new Major Items. Also, it may be difficult for staff to prioritize their projects: is stopping/slowing of work that is already underway in order to address new items the preference of the full Council?

Also, because consideration of implementation currently occurs after the adoption of a Major Item, features of the adopted language may unintentionally constrain effective implementation, complicating and slowing progress on the Major Item and hindering the effectiveness of the new program or regulation.

With the proposed process, a Major Item does not go through prioritization until there is an opportunity for staff to identify operational considerations. Finally, since implementation only occurs after operational considerations are reported, and funds are

allocated, the resulting Major Item should move more quickly from idea to successful completion.

BACKGROUND

In October 2019, City Council held a half-day worksession to discuss systems realignment and provide direction on potential changes to the city's legislative process. The purpose of the meeting was to develop recommendations for how various systems (e.g., budget, Strategic Plan, RRV, etc) could better work together to ensure that the organization is able to focus on the priorities established by the City Council. The City Manager took direction from that meeting and worked with department directors and the Budget Office to create this proposal.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

By improving efficiency, ensuring adequate resources, and strengthening implementation, this proposal would increase the speed and full adoption of new significant legislation, including sustainability work.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The City of Berkeley is unique in comparison to many cities. It considers and approves many more policies, often at the cutting edge, than a typical city and especially for a city of its size. This proposal is a hybrid, incorporating city processes while mirroring State and Federal legislative processes which accommodate a larger number of policies and items in a given cycle. The disadvantage of this proposal is that it introduces additional steps, such as the implementation conference. The advantages of this proposal, are:

- Ensuring adopted legislation is adequately resourced, in terms of both staffing and budget;
- Providing adequate context for Council to balance and consider items in relation to potential positive and negative impacts; and
- Strengthening the effectiveness and efficiency of policy implementation.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

At the Council retreat in October 2019, a variety of approaches and ideas were discussed and considered. Additionally, the original version of this proposal was substantively revised through the Policy Committee process.

If the Council takes no action on this item, the existing process will continue to result in inadequately resourced adopted legislation and inefficient and complicated implementation.

CONTACT PERSON

David White, Deputy City Manager, (510) 981-7012

Attachments:

- 1: Major Item Determination Checklist
- 2: Council Report Template and Implementation Conference Worksheet
- 3: Policy Committee Ranking Form
- 4: Vice Mayor Droste Supplemental



Major Item Determination Checklist

Item Name:

Item Author:

Is this a Major Item?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Yes | No | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item represents a significant change to existing law, program, or policy. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item represents a significant addition to existing law, program, or policy. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis or input from staff, Councilmembers, or members of the public |

Is this eligible for an Exemption?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Yes | No | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is related the City's COVID-19 response. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is related to the City Budget process. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is related to essential or ongoing City processes or business. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is urgent. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is time-sensitive. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is smaller. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is less impactful. |

Agenda Committee Determination:

Major Item Exempted

Indicate name and date below.

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Policy Committee Confirmation:

Determination Confirmed Sent back to be agendized for full Council consideration

Indicate name and date below.

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____



[First Lastname]
Councilmember District [District No.]

[CONSENT OR ACTION]
CALENDAR
[Meeting Date (MM dd, yyyy)]

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: [Councilmember (lastname)]

Subject: [Brief Report Title (No underline and not all caps.)]

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution...
or Support ...
or write a letter to ___ in support of _____...
or other recommendation....

FINANCIAL-FISCAL & OPERATIONAL IMPACTS IMPLICATIONS

This section must include operational impacts, identify any staff resources (full time exempt employee/FTE) required, and financial costs.

IMPLEMENTATION, ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

This section must describe benefits and impacts to both internal and external stakeholders. It should also consider equity; the launch or initiation of the item; and its ongoing administration once implemented.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

For items that relate to one of the Strategic Plan goals, include a standard sentence in the Current Situation and Effects or Background section:

[Insert project name] is a Strategic Plan Priority Project, advancing our goal to [pick one:]

- provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities.
- provide an efficient and financially-health City government.
- foster a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy.
- create affordable housing and housing support service for our most vulnerable community members.
- create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.
- champion and demonstrate social and racial equity.
- be a global leader in addressing climate change, advancing environmental justice, and protecting the environment.

[Title of Report]

CALENDAR

Macrobutton NoMacro [Meeting Date (MM dd, yyyy)]

- 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.

BACKGROUND

INITIAL CONSULTATION

This section should list the external and internal stakeholders, indicate whether the item was submitted to a commission for input, and summarize what was learned from consulting with stakeholders.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember [First Lastname] Council District [District No.] 510-981-[XXXX]

Attachments: [Delete if there are NO Attachments]

1: Resolution

 Exhibit A: [Title or Description of Exhibit]

 Exhibit B: [Title or Description of Exhibit]

2: [Title or Description of Attachment]

3: [Title or Description of Attachment]

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

SHORT TITLE OF RESOLUTION HERE

WHEREAS, (Whereas' are necessary when an explanation or legislative history is required); and

WHEREAS, (Insert Additional 'Whereas Clauses' as needed); and

WHEREAS, enter text here; and

WHEREAS, enter text here; and

WHEREAS, (The last "Whereas" paragraph should contain a period (.).

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that (Action to be taken) - ends in a period (.).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that (for further action if needed; if not delete) - ends in a period (.).

Exhibits **[Delete if there are NO exhibits]**

A: Title of the Exhibit

B: Title of the Exhibit



Implementation Conference Worksheet

Item Name:

Item Author:

AUTHOR SECTION

The author of the item may complete this section to help record required information for the report.

Descriptive title:
Is this for Consent, Action, or Information Calendar?
Recommendation:
Summary statement:
Background (history, circumstances and concerns to be addressed by the item):
Plans, programs, policies and/or laws were taken into consideration:
Actions/alternatives considered:
Internal stakeholders consulted:
Name/date of Commission(s) item submitted to for input:
List of external stakeholders consulted:

Summary of what was learned from consulting stakeholders:
Rationale for recommendation:
Internal Benefits of Implementation:
Internal Impacts of Implementation:
External Benefits of Implementation:
External Impacts of Implementation:
Equity Considerations:
Launch and Implementation Milestones (see staff section)
Environmental Impacts:
Operational Impacts:
Staff Resources Needed: Number of FTE/hours: Type of staff resource needed:
Costs: Amount(s): Funding Source:

STAFF SECTION

Staff may complete section to provide required information for the report.

Estimated Launch/implementation Deliverables/Dates:	
<i>Month/Year</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>
Estimated Administration Deliverables/Dates:	
<i>Month/Year</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>

Legal Consultation:


Confirmed

Name/Date _____

Staff Consultation:

Confirmed

Name(s)/Date(s) _____



Lori Droste
Vice Mayor District 8

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 3


Meeting Date: May 18, 2021

Item Number: 2

Item Description: Systems Realignment

Submitted by: Vice Mayor Lori Droste

Subject: Comments on Systems Realignment



Lori Droste
Vice Mayor District 8

To: Mayor and Council
From: Vice Mayor Lori Droste
Subject: Comments on the Systems Realignment

P. 13- what is “smaller” and “less impactful” and how is that determined?

P. 14- the council item template should include a problem definition and frontload the evidence (background, consultation, review) and include criteria considered. Strategic plan alignment, fiscal and operational impacts, environmental sustainability can be embedded under this heading. I would also argue that “Benefit” or “Effectiveness” should be included in Criteria Considered. Also, equity and administrative feasibility are separate criteria to be considered. Council is not involved in enforcement so I recommend that it be eliminated. Furthermore, as currently written the Current Situation and Its Effects describes the Strategic Plan goals and not the status quo situation.

General Template Outline:

- 1) Recommendation
- 2) Problem Statement
- 3) Background and Consultation
- 4) Current Situation and Its Effects
- 5) Criteria Considered (*new heading*)
 - a) Benefit or Effectiveness (*new*)
 - b) Fiscal Considerations
 - c) Strategic Plan Alignment (pick a goal)
 - d) Environmental Sustainability
 - e) Equity
 - f) Operational and Administrative Considerations (*moved operational considerations to a separate category*)
- 6) Rationale for Recommendation (*new*)

P. 15 Implementation Conference Worksheet

I recommend reducing the amount of redundant components in the implementation conference worksheet and specifying what “impact” means. Does it mean benefit? Does it mean tradeoff? In either case, I believe it is covered by other elements of this worksheet.

P. 19- There is no description of *how* policy committee members' rankings will be aggregated. Furthermore, the "ranking" is orthogonal and could be completely contradictory to the staffing, benefit, and costs. Scoring legislative items instead of ranking them will allow for easier prioritization. A cardinal voting system like this is more expressive, accurate and easier to understand. It also lessens vote splitting.

[CONSENT OR ACTION] CALENDAR [Meeting Date (MM dd, yyyy)]

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council From: [Councilmember (lastname)]

Subject: [Brief Report Title (No underline and not all caps.)]

RECOMMENDATION Adopt a Resolution... or Support ... or write a letter to ___ in support of _____... or other recommendation....

PROBLEM STATEMENT

This section should identify the problem with specifics and enough context to explain why it merits public amelioration.

(Background and Evidence Should be Provided At the Beginning)

BACKGROUND **AND** INITIAL CONSULTATION This section should list the external and internal stakeholders, indicate whether the item was submitted to a commission for input, and summarize what was learned from consulting with stakeholders.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

This section should explain the status quo and how it attempts to address the defined problem.

CRITERIA CONSIDERED

- FINANCIAL FISCAL & OPERATIONAL IMPACTS IMPLICATIONS This section must include operational impacts, identify any staff resources (full time exempt employee/FTE) required, and financial costs.

~~IMPLEMENTATION, ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT This section must describe benefits and impacts to both internal and external stakeholders. It should also consider equity; the launch or initiation of the item; and its ongoing administration once implemented. Equity should be a standalone category separate from administrative feasibility. Rename this section Operational and Administrative Considerations~~

- ~~CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS~~ For items that relate to one of the Strategic Plan goals, include a standard sentence in the Current Situation and Effects or Background section: [Insert project name] is a Strategic Plan **Alignment** Priority Project, advancing our goal to [pick one:]
 - provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities.
 - provide an efficient and financially-health City government.
 - foster a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy.
 - create affordable housing and housing support service for our most vulnerable community members.
 - create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.
 - champion and demonstrate social and racial equity.

- be a global leader in addressing climate change, advancing environmental justice, and protecting the environment.
- 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.
- ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This section should describe how the author landed on the recommendation using the criteria considered. This section can also describe other alternatives considered.

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember [First Last Name] Council District [District No.] 510-981-[XXXX]

Attachments: [Delete if there are NO Attachments]


1: Resolution Exhibit A: [Title or Description of Exhibit] Exhibit B: [Title or Description of Exhibit]

2: [Title or Description of Attachment]

3: [Title or Description of Attachment]

Implementation Conference Worksheet

Descriptive Title
Consent Action or Information
Recommendation
<u>Problem Statement</u>
Background, etc
Plans, etc.
<u>Current Situation and Its Effects</u>
Actions/Alternatives Considered
<u>Stakeholders Consultation and Results</u>
Internal Stakeholders Consulted
Name/date of Commission(s) item submitted to for input
List of external stakeholders consulted
Summary of what was learned from consulting stakeholders
Rationale for Recommendation <i>should go at the end after evaluative criteria</i>
<u>Policy Benefit</u>
Internal Benefits of Implementation:
Internal Impacts of Implementation:
External Benefits of Implementation:
External Impacts of Implementation:
Equity Considerations
Environmental Considerations
Operational Impacts
<u>Strategic Plan Goal Alignment</u>
Staff Resources Needed (Number of FTE/hours, Type of staff resource needed):
Costs (Amount(s), Funding Source):
<u>Rationale for Recommendation</u> <i>(after analysis)</i>



Lori Droste
Vice Mayor District 8

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 3

Meeting Date: May 18, 2021

Item Number: 2

Item Description: Systems Realignment

Submitted by: Vice Mayor Lori Droste

Subject: Comments on Systems Realignment



Lori Droste
Vice Mayor District 8

To: Mayor and Council
From: Vice Mayor Lori Droste
Subject: Comments on the Systems Realignment

P. 13- what is “smaller” and “less impactful” and how is that determined?

P. 14- the council item template should include a problem definition and frontload the evidence (background, consultation, review) and include criteria considered. Strategic plan alignment, fiscal and operational impacts, environmental sustainability can be embedded under this heading. I would also argue that “Benefit” or “Effectiveness” should be included in Criteria Considered. Also, equity and administrative feasibility are separate criteria to be considered. Council is not involved in enforcement so I recommend that it be eliminated. Furthermore, as currently written the Current Situation and Its Effects describes the Strategic Plan goals and not the status quo situation.

General Template Outline:

- 1) Recommendation
- 2) Problem Statement
- 3) Background and Consultation
- 4) Current Situation and Its Effects
- 5) Criteria Considered (*new heading*)
 - a) Benefit or Effectiveness (*new*)
 - b) Fiscal Considerations
 - c) Strategic Plan Alignment (pick a goal)
 - d) Environmental Sustainability
 - e) Equity
 - f) Operational and Administrative Considerations (*moved operational considerations to a separate category*)
- 6) Rationale for Recommendation (*new*)

P. 15 Implementation Conference Worksheet

I recommend reducing the amount of redundant components in the implementation conference worksheet and specifying what “impact” means. Does it mean benefit? Does it mean tradeoff? In either case, I believe it is covered by other elements of this worksheet.

P. 19- There is no description of *how* policy committee members' rankings will be aggregated. Furthermore, the "ranking" is orthogonal and could be completely contradictory to the staffing, benefit, and costs. Scoring legislative items instead of ranking them will allow for easier prioritization. A cardinal voting system like this is more expressive, accurate and easier to understand. It also lessens vote splitting.

[CONSENT OR ACTION] CALENDAR [Meeting Date (MM dd, yyyy)]

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council From: [Councilmember (lastname)]

Subject: [Brief Report Title (No underline and not all caps.)]

RECOMMENDATION Adopt a Resolution... or Support ... or write a letter to ___ in support of _____... or other recommendation....

PROBLEM STATEMENT

This section should identify the problem with specifics and enough context to explain why it merits public amelioration.

(Background and Evidence Should be Provided At the Beginning)

BACKGROUND **AND** INITIAL CONSULTATION This section should list the external and internal stakeholders, indicate whether the item was submitted to a commission for input, and summarize what was learned from consulting with stakeholders.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

This section should explain the status quo and how it attempts to address the defined problem.

CRITERIA CONSIDERED

- FINANCIAL FISCAL & OPERATIONAL IMPACTS IMPLICATIONS This section must include operational impacts, identify any staff resources (full time exempt employee/FTE) required, and financial costs.

~~IMPLEMENTATION, ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT This section must describe benefits and impacts to both internal and external stakeholders. It should also consider equity; the launch or initiation of the item; and its ongoing administration once implemented. Equity should be a standalone category separate from administrative feasibility. Rename this section Operational and Administrative Considerations~~

- ~~CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS~~ For items that relate to one of the Strategic Plan goals, include a standard sentence in the Current Situation and Effects or Background section: [Insert project name] is a Strategic Plan **Alignment** Priority Project, advancing our goal to [pick one:]
 - provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities.
 - provide an efficient and financially-healthy City government.
 - foster a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy.
 - create affordable housing and housing support service for our most vulnerable community members.
 - create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.
 - champion and demonstrate social and racial equity.

- be a global leader in addressing climate change, advancing environmental justice, and protecting the environment.
- 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.
- ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This section should describe how the author landed on the recommendation using the criteria considered. This section can also describe other alternatives considered.

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember [First Last Name] Council District [District No.] 510-981-[XXXX]

Attachments: [Delete if there are NO Attachments]

1: Resolution Exhibit A: [Title or Description of Exhibit] Exhibit B: [Title or Description of Exhibit]

2: [Title or Description of Attachment]


3: [Title or Description of Attachment]

Implementation Conference Worksheet

Descriptive Title
Consent Action or Information
Recommendation
<u>Problem Statement</u>
Background, etc
Plans, etc.
<u>Current Situation and Its Effects</u>
Actions/Alternatives Considered
<u>Stakeholders Consultation and Results</u>
Internal Stakeholders Consulted
Name/date of Commission(s) item submitted to for input
List of external stakeholders consulted
Summary of what was learned from consulting stakeholders
Rationale for Recommendation <i>should go at the end after evaluative criteria</i>
<u>Policy Benefit</u>
Internal Benefits of Implementation:
Internal Impacts of Implementation:
External Benefits of Implementation:
External Impacts of Implementation:
Equity Considerations
Environmental Considerations
Operational Impacts
<u>Strategic Plan Goal Alignment</u>
Staff Resources Needed (Number of FTE/hours, Type of staff resource needed):
Costs (Amount(s), Funding Source):
<u>Rationale for Recommendation</u> <i>(after analysis)</i>

SYSTEMS ALIGNMENT

PROCESS PROPOSAL FOR VETTING & PRIORITIZING MAJOR ITEMS






THE TEAM



AGENDA & RULES COMMITTEE




BACKGROUND




OBJECTIVES

- Align timing of Council approval and resource (budget) allocation
- Communicate resource needs (and any tradeoffs) well
- Ensure Council priorities are resourced and implemented


STATE OR FEDERAL MODEL



HYBRID MODEL



PROPOSED MODEL



IMPLEMENTATION CONFERENCE?

- What: Strong analysis and collaborative consultation
 - Identify costs\benefits
 - Identify resource needs
 - Outline high level work plan
- Who:
 - Commission Input (e.g, Chair or Vice Chair)
 - Staff & Legal
 - External Stakeholders
- How:
 - Ensure you've done your due diligence with the above
 - Meet with staff/legal



VETTING IS TIME WELL SPENT!

Cousin Janice

- Researched online, in magazines
- Talked to friends, designer, contractor
- Obtained supplies
- Contractor starts work
- Moved out for **weeks**
- **Loves** the result

Friend Cathy

- Talked to contractor
- Contractor starts work
- Waited for supplies → Contractor stops work
- Supplies arrive → Contractor restarts work
- Moved out for **months**
- **Still refining** the result

WHY PRIORITIZE AT POLICY COMMITTEE

NOT RECOMMENDED

- Agenda & Rules Committee

- Appointees:

- Jesse Arreguin, [Mayor](#)
- Sophie Hahn, [Councilmember, District 5](#)
- Susan Wengraf, [Councilmember, District 6](#)

- Alternate: Lori Droste, [Councilmember, District 7](#)

- Budget & Finance Committee

- Appointees:

- Jesse Arreguin, [Mayor](#)
- Kate Harrison, [Councilmember, District 4](#)
- Rigel Robinson, [Councilmember, District 7](#)
- Susan Wengraf, [Councilmember, District 6](#)

- Public Safety, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability Committee

- Appointees:

- Terry Taplin, [Councilmember, District 2](#)
- Kate Harrison, [Councilmember, District 4](#)
- Rigel Robinson, [Councilmember, District 7](#)

- Alternate: Sophie Hahn, [Councilmember, District 5](#)

- Government, Equity & Community Committee

- Appointees:

- Rashi Kesarwani, [Councilmember, District 1](#)
- Terry Taplin, [Councilmember, District 2](#)
- Ben Bartlett, [Councilmember, District 3](#)

- Alternate: Rigel Robinson, [Councilmember, District 7](#)

- Land Use, Housing & Economic Development Committee

- Appointees:

- Sophie Hahn, [Councilmember, District 5](#)
- Rigel Robinson, [Councilmember, District 7](#)
- Lori Droste, [Councilmember, District 8](#)

- Alternate: Ben Bartlett, [Councilmember, District 3](#)

- Public Safety Committee

- Appointees:

- Rashi Kesarwani, [Councilmember, District 1](#)
- Ben Bartlett, [Councilmember, District 3](#)
- Susan Wengraf, [Councilmember, District 6](#)

- Alternate: Terry Taplin, [Councilmember, District 2](#)

A QUICK NOTE ON FORMS

- Major Item Determination Checklist
- Implementation Conference Worksheet
- Policy Committee Ranking Form
- Revised Report Template



Major Item Determination Checklist

Item Name:

Item Author:

Is this a Major Item?

Yes No

- Item represents a significant change to existing law, program, or policy.
- Item represents a significant addition to existing law, program, or policy.
- Item is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis or input from staff, Councilmembers, or members of the public

Is this eligible for an Exemption?

Yes No

- Item is related the City's COVID-19 response.
- Item is related to the City Budget process.
- Item is related to essential or ongoing City processes or business.
- Item is urgent.
- Item is time-sensitive.
- Item is smaller.
- Item is less impactful.

Agenda Committee Determination:

Major Item Exempted

Indicate name and date below.

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Policy Committee Confirmation:

Determination Confirmed Sent back to be agendized for full Council consideration

Indicate name and date below.

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____



Implementation Conference Worksheet

Item Name:

Item Author:

AUTHOR SECTION

Use this section to help record required information

Descriptive title:
Is this for Consent, Action, or Information Calendar?
Recommendation:
Summary statement:
Background (history, circumstances and context)
Plans, programs, policies and/or laws were taken into account:
Actions/alternatives considered:
Internal stakeholders consulted:
Name/date of Commission(s) item submitted to:
List of external stakeholders consulted:

Summary of what was learned from consultation:

Rationale for recommendation:

Internal Benefits of Implementation:

Internal Impacts of Implementation:

External Benefits of Implementation:

External Impacts of Implementation:

Launch and Implementation Milestones (see Environmental Impacts):

Operational Impacts:

Staff Resources Needed:

STAFF SECTION

Use this section to provide required information for the report.

Estimated Launch/implementation Deliverables/Dates:	
<i>Month/Year</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>
Estimated Administration Deliverables/Dates:	
<i>Month/Year</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>

Legal Consultation:

Confirmed

Name/Date _____

Staff Consultation:

Confirmed



[First Lastname]
Councilmember District [District No.]

[CONSENT OR ACTION]
CALENDAR
[Meeting Date (MM dd, yyyy)]

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: [Councilmember (lastname)]
Subject: [Brief Report Title (No underline and not all caps.)]

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution...
or Support ...
or write a letter to ___ in support of _____...
of other recommendation....

FISCAL IMPACTS

This section must include operational impacts, identify any staff resources (full time exempt employee/FTE) required, and financial costs.

IMPLEMENTATION, ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

This section must describe benefits and impacts to both internal and external stakeholders. It should also describe the launch or initiation of the item, as well as its ongoing administration once implemented.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

For items that relate to one of the Strategic Plan goals, include a standard sentence in the Current Situation and Effects or Background section:

[Insert project name] is a Strategic Plan Priority Project, advancing our goal to [pick one:]

- provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities.
- provide an efficient and financially-health City government.
- foster a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy.
- create affordable housing and housing support service for our most vulnerable community members.
- create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.
- champion and demonstrate social and racial equity.
- be a global leader in addressing climate change, advancing environmental

[Title of Report]

CALENDAR

- attract and retain a talented and diverse City government workforce.

BACKGROUND

CONSULTATION OVERVIEW

This section should list the external and internal stakeholders, indicate whether the item was submitted to a commission for input, and summarize what was learned from consulting with stakeholders.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember [First Lastname] Council District [District No.] 510-981-[XXXX]

Attachments: [Delete if there are NO Attachments]

- 1: Resolution
 - Exhibit A: [Title or Description of Exhibit]
 - Exhibit B: [Title or Description of Exhibit]
- 2: [Title or Description of Attachment]
- 3: [Title or Description of Attachment]


PROPOSED PROCESS

FLOW CHART




PROPOSED PROCESS

FLOW CHART




PROPOSED PROCESS

FLOW CHART



PROPOSED PROCESS


FLOW CHART






PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION

PHASE-IN OF SYSTEMS ALIGNMENT



PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION
 PHASE-IN OF SYSTEMS ALIGNMENT






PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION

PHASE-IN OF SYSTEMS ALIGNMENT

SEQUENCING & TIMING

Existing

1. Idea
2. Committee Consideration
3. Council Approval
4. Costing
5. Budget development
6. RRV



Uncertain Timeline


Proposed

1. Idea
2. Committee Consideration
3. Vetting & Costing
4. Council Approval
5. RRV
6. Budget development



Certain Timeline

WHAT'S DIFFERENT



- Mandatory Guidelines
- Implementation Conferences
- Policy Committee Prioritization
- Moving the RRV process
- New required forms and processes

APPENDIX B. GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING AND WRITING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

APPENDIX B. GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING AND WRITING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

These guidelines are derived from the requirements for Agenda items listed in the Berkeley City Council Rules of Procedure and Order, Chapter III, Sections B(1) and (2), reproduced below. In addition, Chapter III Section C(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Order allows the Agenda & Rules Committee to request that the Primary Author of an item provide "additional analysis" if the item as submitted evidences a "significant lack of background or supporting information" or "significant grammatical or readability issues."

These guidelines provide a more detailed and comprehensive overview of elements of a complete Council item. While not all elements would be applicable to every type of Agenda item, they are intended to prompt Authors to consider presenting items with as much relevant information and analysis as possible.

Chapter III, Sections (B)(1) and (2) of Council Rules of Procedure and Order:

2. Agenda items shall contain all relevant documentation, including the following as Applicable:

- a. A descriptive title that adequately informs the public of the subject matter and general nature of the item or report and action requested;
- b. Whether the matter is to be presented on the Consent Calendar or the Action Calendar or as a Report for Information;
- c. Recommendation of the City Manager, if applicable (these provisions shall not apply to Mayor and Council items.);
- d. Fiscal impacts of the recommendation;
- e. A description of the current situation and its effects;
- f. Background information as needed;
- g. Rationale for recommendation;
- h. Alternative actions considered;
- i. For awards of contracts; the abstract of bids and the Affirmative Action Program of the low bidder in those cases where such is required (these provisions shall not apply to Mayor and Council items.);
- j. Person or persons to contact for further information, with telephone number. If the Primary Author of any report believes additional background information, beyond the basic report, is necessary to Council understanding of the subject, a separate compilation of such background information may be developed and copies will be available for Council and for public review in the City Clerk Department, and the City Clerk shall provide limited distribution of such background information depending upon quantity of pages to be duplicated. In such case the agenda item distributed with the packet shall so indicate.

SO, HOW DO WE MAKE THIS HAPPEN?

- Adopting aligned timeline and new process
 - Incorporating vetting and costing (i.e., implementation conferences)
 - Prioritizing vetted Major Items (prioritize, assign fiscal year, identify projects to remove to accommodate new Major Items)
 - Revising City Council Rules of Procedure and Order
- Making Appendix B guidelines mandatory
- Addressing adopted, open referrals
- Addressing Council items under consideration

BENEFITS



Ensures **continuous improvements**



Provides adequate context and impacts of items to **enhance Council decision-making**



Identifies appropriate and necessary resources so that **adopted items are adequately resourced**



Aligns processes to **ensure efficient implementation/realization of Council items**



Increases collaboration among and between stakeholders

NEXT STEPS



Legislative aide roundtable




City Manager and Councilmember One-on-Ones



Revise and return item in July

THANK YOU.



Office of the City Manager

01

Worksession Item

WORKSESSION

May 18, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager

Submitted by: David White, Deputy City Manager

Subject: Systems Alignment Proposal

RECOMMENDATION

Direct the City Manager to bring back a resolution for adoption of the Systems Alignment proposal as described in this document and incorporating direction and input received from City Council during the worksession.

SUMMARY

This report proposes a process to integrate various systems (e.g., budget, Strategic Plan, prioritization of referrals, etc.) to ensure that resources are appropriately allocated, to focus the organization and employees on those priorities established by the City Council and City Manager, and to enhance legislative and budget processes. Ultimately, aligning systems will help ensure our community's values as reflected in the policies of our City Council are implemented completely and efficiently, with increased fiscal prudence, while supporting more meaningful service delivery. In light of the economic and financial impacts of COVID-19 and resource constraints, it is imperative to improve vetting and costing of new projects and legislative initiatives to ensure success. In addition, the purpose of this proposal will align our work with the budget process.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

While the recommendation of this report would not entail fiscal impacts, if adopted, the proposal would have budgetary effects. Broadly speaking, the proposal is designed to better ensure adequate financial and staffing resources are identified and approved with any adopted significant legislation¹ (Major Item).

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The proposed changes outlined in this memorandum will better guide and inform budget development, clarify tradeoffs by identifying operational impacts, and develop a more effective and time-efficient path to implementation. These changes support a clear and

¹ New significant legislation is defined, with some explicit exceptions, as "any law, program, or policy that represents a significant change or addition to existing law, program, or policy, or is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis, or input from staff, Councilmembers or members of the public". See Council Rules of Procedure, https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_City_Council/City%20Council%20Rules%20of%20Procedure.pdf.

full realizing of City Council policies, programs, and vision. The major features of the proposal are:

- Changing the order of the legislative process to ensure that Major Items (defined below) passed by Council are funded, as well as folded into staff workplans and staffing capacity,
- Making the City Council Rules of Procedure Appendix B guidelines mandatory,
- Ensuring that Major Items that are adopted by City Council are vetted and clearly identify the resources needed for implementation,
- Consolidating and simplifying reporting and tracking of Major Items, and
- Creating a deadline for each year's Major Items that allows for alignment with prioritization, the Strategic Plan, and the budget process.

Additionally, the proposed Systems Alignment would advance the City's Strategic Plan goal to provide an efficient and financially-health City government.

PROPOSED PROCESS

The proposed process outlined in this memorandum replaces the current system of referrals (short and long term, as well as Commission referrals), directives, and new proposed ordinances, that is, all Major Items, regardless of "type" or origin will be subject to this process.

Step 1: Major Item Determination

The systems alignment proposal outlines a process for Major Items.

Defined in Council Rules of Procedure

Major Items are "new significant legislation" as defined in Appendix D of the [City Council Rules of Procedure](#):

Except as provided below, "new significant legislation" is defined as any law, program, or policy that represents a significant change or addition to existing law, program, or policy, or is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis, or input from staff, Councilmembers or members of the public.

The exceptions to the definition of new significant legislation and process state:

New significant legislation originating from the Council, Commissions, or Staff related to the City's COVID-19 response², including but not limited to health and economic impacts of the pandemic or recovery, or addressing other health and safety concerns, the City Budget process, or other essential or ongoing City processes or business will be allowed to move forward, as well as legislative items that are urgent, time sensitive, smaller, or less impactful.

² If this proposal is adopted, "COVID-19" should be replaced with "declared emergency response" in the exception language.

The Agenda & Rules Committee, in consultation with the City Manager, will make the initial determination of whether something is a Major Item, using the Major Item Determination Checklist (see attachment 1). At any time in the process, if evidence demonstrates that the initial determination of the proposal as a Major Item proves incorrect, then it is no longer subject to this process. Additionally, if any legislation it originally deemed not to be a Major Item, the author or City Manager may appeal to the Agenda and Rules Committee or to the full Council and present evidence to the contrary.

Required Conformance and Consultation

All Major Items must use the agenda guidelines in Appendix B of the Council Rules, which require more detailed background information and analysis. The Agenda and Rules Committee can send the item back to the author if it is not complete and/or does not include all of the information required in Appendix B. The author must make a good faith effort to ensure all the guideline prompts are completed in substance not just in form.

Major Items must include a section noting whether the author has initially consulted with the City Manager or city staff regarding their proposed Major Item and the substance of those conversations, and initial staff input.

Required Submission Date

A Major Item must be submitted in time to appear on the agenda of an Agenda & Rules Committee meeting occurring no later than April 30 of every year. Any item submitted after that deadline, that does not meet an exemption, will be continued to the following year's legislative process.

Major Items will be referred by the Agenda & Rules committee on a rolling basis.

Step 2: Policy Committee Review

A Major Item, once introduced and deemed complete and in conformance by the Agenda and Rules Committee, will be referred to one of City Council's Policy Committees (i.e., Health, Life Enrichment, Equity and Community, Public Safety, etc.), for review, recommendation, and high-level discussion of implementation (i.e., ideas, rough cost estimates, benefits, etc.). Per the [Council Rules of Procedure](#),³ the Policy Committee will review the Major Item and the completed Major Item Determination Checklist to confirm Agenda & Rules initial determination that the Major Item is complete in accordance with Section III.B.2 and aligns with Strategic Plan goals. If the Major Item receives a positive or qualified positive recommendation, then it will go to an Implementation Conference (See step 3, Vetting and Costing).

³ https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_City_Council/City%20Council%20Rules%20of%20Procedure%20-%20Feb%2011%202020%20-%20FINAL.pdf

If the Major Item receives a negative or qualified negative recommendation, then it will be returned to the Agenda and Rules Committee to be placed on a City Council Agenda. When heard at a City Council meeting, the author can advocate for the Major Item to be sent to an Implementation Conference. If the Major Item does not receive a vote by the majority of City Council at this step, it becomes inactive for that year's legislative calendar but may be reintroduced for the next year's calendar.

City Council Policy Committees must complete review of all Major Items assigned to them no later than June 30 of each year.

Step 3: Implementation Conference (Vetting and Costing)

At an Implementation Conference, the primary author will meet with the City Manager or designee, City Manager-selected staff subject matter experts, and the City Attorney or designee.

Identifying Fiscal, Operational and Implementation Impacts

The intended outcome of an Implementation Conference is a strong analysis containing all of the considerations and resources necessary to support implementation should Council choose to approve the Major Item.

The Implementation Conference is an informal meeting where the primary author can collaborate with the City Manager, City Attorney, and staff to better define the Major Item and identify more detailed fiscal and operational impacts, as well as implementation considerations. The information discussed during the Implementation Conference will be summarized in the Council Report as part of newly required sections (see attachment 2), in conformance with Appendix B:

- *Initial Consultation*, which
 - Lists internal and external stakeholders that were consulted, including whether item was concurrently submitted to a Commission for input,
 - Summarizes and confirms what was learned from consultation,
 - Confirms legal review addressing any legal or pre-emption issues, ensuring legal form,⁴
- *Implementation, Administration, and Enforcement*, which
 - Identifies internal and external benefits and impacts, and
 - Considers equity implications, launch/initiation of Major Item and its ongoing administration, and
- *Fiscal & Operational Impacts*, which
 - Summarizes any operational impacts,

⁴ While consultation with the City Attorney is mentioned in Appendix B, the legal review and "confirmations" recommended in this proposal is a more specific and robust requirement.

- Identifies necessary resources, including specific staff resources needed and costs.⁵

As part of the Implementation Conference, staff will provide a high level work plan, indicating major deliverables/milestones and dates. This information can be collected and recorded using the Implementation Conference Worksheet (see attachment 2).

Implementation Conferences will be date certain meetings held in July.

Revising the Major Item

After the Major Item's author revises the original Council Report based on information from the Implementation Conference, the Major Item will be submitted to the Council agenda process. If additional full time equivalent employee(s) (FTE) or fiscal resources are needed, the Major Item must include a referral to the budget process and identify the amount for implementation of the policy or program.

Step 4: Initial Prioritization

At their first meetings in September, Policy Committees must complete the ranking of the Major Items which were referred to them and also completed the Implementation Conference. The Policy Committees will provide these rankings in the form of a recommendation to the City Council. The Policy Committees prioritization will use the Policy Committee Ranking Form (see attachment 3) to standardize consideration of Major Items across Policy Committees. The Policy Committee priority rankings will be submitted to the City Council when the Council is considering items to move forward in the budget and Strategic Plan process.

Step 5: City Council Approval and Final Prioritization

Under this proposal, all Major Items that the City Council considers for approved prioritization must have:

1. Received a City Council Policy Committee review and recommendation,
2. Received a City Council Policy Committee prioritization,
3. Completed the Implementation Conference, and
4. Been placed on the Agenda for a regular or special Council meeting in October for approval and inclusion in the RRV process.

At the designated Council meeting in October, staff will provide the Council with a list of all approved Major Items, including the initial prioritization by Policy Committee. The Council will consider each Major Item for approval. All approved Major Items then will be added to the RRV process (i.e., with other items, referrals, etc) and ranked. The RRV ranking will begin in late October. These rankings will be adopted by Council and

⁵ Appendix B does require a Fiscal Impacts section, but the inclusion of operational impacts and specific noting of required staff resources and costs recommended in this proposal is a more specific and robust requirement.

used to inform the development of the draft budget. Approved and ranked Major Items have multiple opportunities to be approved for funding, when the biennial budget or mid-cycle budget is adopted in June or when the Annual Appropriations Ordinances are adopted in May and November.

If a Major Item *does not receive the endorsement* of City Council at this step, it becomes inactive for that year's legislative calendar and may be reintroduced for the next year's calendar.

City Council must complete its Major Items approval, and RRV process no later than the final meeting in December of each year.⁶ This ensures that staff is able to develop the budget starting from and based on Council priorities.

Step 6: Budget & Strategic Plan Process


The Council's rankings are also forwarded to the Budget and Finance Committee for consideration as part of budget development. If the proposal is not ultimately funded in the biennial budget, mid-cycle budget or the Annual Appropriations Ordinance (mid-year budget amendment), then it does not move forward that year and will be added to a list of unfunded proposals for the future budget process.

During December and January, city staff will prepare budget proposals that incorporate the ranked City Council Major Items, Strategic Plan, and work plan development. In the late winter/early spring, the City Manager and Budget Office will present the draft budget to Council. This will be followed by department presentations to the Budget and Finance Policy Committee. From late March and through early May, Council and staff will refine the budget. Council will hold budget hearings in May and June, with adoption of the budget by June 30. Although the legislative process (i.e., Policy Committee review, Implementation Conference, Prioritization) is annual, staff recommends the budget process remain biennial. A significant mid-cycle budget update can easily accommodate additions to or changes in priorities arising through the legislative process.

The proposed process is depicted in Figure 1 and the proposed launch calendar in Figure 2.

⁶ Due to noticing requirements, an RRV process completed by November 30 may not appear on a City Council Agenda for adoption until January.

Figure 1, Proposed Process⁷





⁷ Major Items that are ordinances will need to be examined on a case-by-case basis. Once adopted, ranked, and, if requiring resources, budgeted, the ordinance will need to be given an effective date and scheduled for first and second readings at Council.



Office of the City Manager

Figure 2, Proposed Launch





Office of the City Manager

Next Steps

Staff will reach out to legislative aides for input and the City Manager will meet individually with Councilmembers to discuss this proposal. Staff will incorporate Council input from the worksession, and from subsequent input into a resolution and return to Council with a final Systems Alignment item for adoption by July 2021.

Benefits

The addition of an Implementation Conference will ensure that Major Items considered by Council are properly resourced, improving our City's responsible management of fiscal resources. Analysis from the Implementation Conference will help Council to balance and consider each Major Item within the context of related programs and potential impacts (positive and negative). When considered holistically, new policy implementation can be supportive of existing work and service delivery.

Since the proposed process places the City Council prioritization of Major Items immediately before budget preparation, the Prioritization will guide and inform budget development, including components such as the Strategic Plan and work plans. Fixing the sequencing of the process is a key benefit. Currently, with prioritization occurring in May and June, the budget process is nearing completion when City Council's priorities are finally decided. This leads to inconsistencies between adopted priorities and budgeting for those priorities.

Under the current process, an idea may go into prioritization, proceed to the short term referral list or referred to the budget process. However, the resulting Major Item may not have addressed operational considerations. Adding such items to a department's work at any given time of the year may lead to staff stopping or slowing work on other prioritized projects in order to develop and implement new Major Items. Also, it may be difficult for staff to prioritize their projects: is stopping/slowing of work that is already underway in order to address new items the preference of the full Council?

Also, because consideration of implementation currently occurs after the adoption of a Major Item, features of the adopted language may unintentionally constrain effective implementation, complicating and slowing progress on the Major Item and hindering the effectiveness of the new program or regulation.

With the proposed process, a Major Item does not go through prioritization until there is an opportunity for staff to identify operational considerations. Finally, since implementation only occurs after operational considerations are reported, and funds are

allocated, the resulting Major Item should move more quickly from idea to successful completion.

BACKGROUND

In October 2019, City Council held a half-day worksession to discuss systems realignment and provide direction on potential changes to the city's legislative process. The purpose of the meeting was to develop recommendations for how various systems (e.g., budget, Strategic Plan, RRV, etc) could better work together to ensure that the organization is able to focus on the priorities established by the City Council. The City Manager took direction from that meeting and worked with department directors and the Budget Office to create this proposal.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

By improving efficiency, ensuring adequate resources, and strengthening implementation, this proposal would increase the speed and full adoption of new significant legislation, including sustainability work.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The City of Berkeley is unique in comparison to many cities. It considers and approves many more policies, often at the cutting edge, than a typical city and especially for a city of its size. This proposal is a hybrid, incorporating city processes while mirroring State and Federal legislative processes which accommodate a larger number of policies and items in a given cycle. The disadvantage of this proposal is that it introduces additional steps, such as the implementation conference. The advantages of this proposal, are:

- Ensuring adopted legislation is adequately resourced, in terms of both staffing and budget;
- Providing adequate context for Council to balance and consider items in relation to potential positive and negative impacts; and
- Strengthening the effectiveness and efficiency of policy implementation.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

At the Council retreat in October 2019, a variety of approaches and ideas were discussed and considered. Additionally, the original version of this proposal was substantively revised through the Policy Committee process.

If the Council takes no action on this item, the existing process will continue to result in inadequately resourced adopted legislation and inefficient and complicated implementation.

CONTACT PERSON

David White, Deputy City Manager, 510-981-7012

Attachments:

- 1: Major Item Determination Checklist
- 2: Council Report Template and Implementation Conference Worksheet
- 3: Policy Committee Ranking Form



Major Item Determination Checklist

Item Name:

Item Author:

Is this a Major Item?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Yes | No | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item represents a significant change to existing law, program, or policy. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item represents a significant addition to existing law, program, or policy. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is likely to call for or elicit significant study, analysis or input from staff, Councilmembers, or members of the public |

Is this eligible for an Exemption?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Yes | No | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is related the City's COVID-19 response. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is related to the City Budget process. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is related to essential or ongoing City processes or business. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is urgent. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is time-sensitive. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is smaller. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Item is less impactful. |

Agenda Committee Determination:

Major Item Exempted

Indicate name and date below.

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Policy Committee Confirmation:


Determination Confirmed Sent back to be agendized for full Council consideration

Indicate name and date below.

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____



[First Lastname]
Councilmember District [District No.]

[CONSENT OR ACTION]
CALENDAR
[Meeting Date (MM dd, yyyy)]

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: [Councilmember (lastname)]

Subject: [Brief Report Title (No underline and not all caps.)]

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution...
or Support ...
or write a letter to ___ in support of _____...
or other recommendation....

FINANCIAL-FISCAL & OPERATIONAL IMPACTS IMPLICATIONS

This section must include operational impacts, identify any staff resources (full time exempt employee/FTE) required, and financial costs.

IMPLEMENTATION, ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

This section must describe benefits and impacts to both internal and external stakeholders. It should also consider equity; the launch or initiation of the item; and its ongoing administration once implemented.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

For items that relate to one of the Strategic Plan goals, include a standard sentence in the Current Situation and Effects or Background section:

[Insert project name] is a Strategic Plan Priority Project, advancing our goal to [pick one:]

- provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities.
- provide an efficient and financially-health City government.
- foster a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy.
- create affordable housing and housing support service for our most vulnerable community members.
- create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.
- champion and demonstrate social and racial equity.
- be a global leader in addressing climate change, advancing environmental justice, and protecting the environment.

[Title of Report]

CALENDAR

Macrobutton NoMacro [Meeting Date (MM dd, yyyy)]

- 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.

BACKGROUND

INITIAL CONSULTATION

This section should list the external and internal stakeholders, indicate whether the item was submitted to a commission for input, and summarize what was learned from consulting with stakeholders.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember [First Lastname] Council District [District No.] 510-981-[XXXX]

Attachments: [Delete if there are NO Attachments]

1: Resolution

 Exhibit A: [Title or Description of Exhibit]

 Exhibit B: [Title or Description of Exhibit]

2: [Title or Description of Attachment]

3: [Title or Description of Attachment]

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

SHORT TITLE OF RESOLUTION HERE

WHEREAS, (Whereas' are necessary when an explanation or legislative history is required); and

WHEREAS, (Insert Additional 'Whereas Clauses' as needed); and

WHEREAS, enter text here; and

WHEREAS, enter text here; and

WHEREAS, (The last "Whereas" paragraph should contain a period (.) .

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that (Action to be taken) - ends in a period (.).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that (for further action if needed; if not delete) - ends in a period (.).

Exhibits **[Delete if there are NO exhibits]**

A: Title of the Exhibit

B: Title of the Exhibit



Implementation Conference Worksheet

Item Name:

Item Author:

AUTHOR SECTION

The author of the item may complete this section to help record required information for the report.

Descriptive title:
Is this for Consent, Action, or Information Calendar?
Recommendation:
Summary statement:
Background (history, circumstances and concerns to be addressed by the item):
Plans, programs, policies and/or laws were taken into consideration:
Actions/alternatives considered:
Internal stakeholders consulted:
Name/date of Commission(s) item submitted to for input:
List of external stakeholders consulted:

Summary of what was learned from consulting stakeholders:
Rationale for recommendation:
Internal Benefits of Implementation:
Internal Impacts of Implementation:
External Benefits of Implementation:
External Impacts of Implementation:
Equity Considerations:
Launch and Implementation Milestones (see staff section)
Environmental Impacts:
Operational Impacts:
Staff Resources Needed: Number of FTE/hours: Type of staff resource needed:
Costs: Amount(s): Funding Source:

STAFF SECTION

Staff may complete section to provide required information for the report.

Estimated Launch/implementation Deliverables/Dates:	
<i>Month/Year</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>
Estimated Administration Deliverables/Dates:	
<i>Month/Year</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>

Legal Consultation:

Confirmed

Name/Date _____

Staff Consultation:

Confirmed

Name(s)/Date(s) _____



Policy Committee Ranking Form

Starting on the right, think about and then indicate whether each consideration is high (H), medium (M) or low (L). Then rank the list of priorities. The highest priority would be “1”, the next highest “2” and so on.

Priority 1 is highest	Major Item Name	Major Item Author	Considerations H high M medium L low		
			Staff Resources	Cost	Benefits/ Savings

Policy Committee Determination:

Indicate name and date below.

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

Per Committee Member _____

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BERKELEY SPECIAL MEETING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2023

Unofficial Text File

>> GOOD AFTERNOON.

THANK YOU FOR WAITING PAITENTLY.

I WOULD NOW LIKE TO CALL TO ORDER THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10TH, 2023 AT 4 P.M..

IF THE CITY CLERK CAN PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

[ROLL CALL]

>> CLERK: COUNCILMEMBER KESARWANI.

>> R. KESARWANI: HERE.

>> CLERK: TAPLIN.

>> T. TAPLIN: PRESENT.

>> CLERK: BARTLETT.

>> B. BARTLETT: HERE.

>> CLERK: HARRISON.

>> K HARRISON: HERE.

>> CLERK: HAHN.

>> S. HAHN: PRESENT.

>> CLERK: WENGRAF.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

>> S. WENGRAF: PRESENT.

>> CLERK: ROBINSON.

>> R. ROBINSON: PRESENT.

>> CLERK: HUMBERT.

>> M. HUMBERT: PRESENT.

>> CLERK: AND MAYOR ARREGUIN.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: PRESENT.

>> CLERK: OKAY.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: OKAY.

ALL MEMBERS ARE PRESENT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

SO THIS IS A SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING TO HOLD A WORK SESSION TO POTENTIAL PROPOSALS FOR THE REDESIGN OF OUR CITY COUNCIL'S LEGISLATIVE PROCESS.

AND I JUST WANT TO PROVIDE SOME INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS AND THEN TURN IT OVER TO COUNCILMEMBER HAHN, WHO IS GOING TO GO THROUGH PRESENTING THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK THAT WE WANTED COUNCIL INPUT ON.

AND THEN, I'LL GIVE COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON AN OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT ON HER CONCEPTS AS WELL.

SO AS THE COUNCIL KNOWS, WE HAVE BEEN DISCUSSING A REDESIGN OF OUR LEGISLATIVE SYSTEM FOR SEVERAL YEARS NOW.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

ADD OUR RETREAT IN OCTOBER, 2019, WE HAD I THINK A VERY EXCELLENT DISCUSSION AROUND POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE PROCESS IN WHICH WE INTRODUCE AND REVIEW AND APPROVE LEGISLATION AT THE CITY COUNCIL LEVEL.

AND THERE WERE SEVERAL GOALS WE WANTED TO ACHIEVE. ONE, WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE WAS ALIGNMENT OF OUR LEGISLATIVE PROCESS WITH THE BUDGET PROCESS.

BECAUSE WHILE WE MAY ADOPT LAWS OR PROPOSED COUNCIL REFERRALS, IF THOSE LAWS OR PROGRAMS ARE NOT FUNDED, AND WE DON'T HAVE STAFF RESOURCES OR FUNDING ALLOCATED, THEN THEIR IMPLEMENTATION WILL NOT BE EFFECTUATED, IT WILL BE DELAYED.

IN ORDER TO FULLY REALIZE THE IMPACT OF THE LEGISLATION WE ADOPT WE WANTED TO ALIGN THE ADOPTION OF MAJOR ITEMS IN LEGISLATION WITH OUR BUDGET PROCESS TO MAKE SURE WE CAN CONSIDER THE BUDGET NEEDS, TO MAKE SURE WE CAN SET ASIDE FUNDING IN THE BUDGET FOR CITY STAFF AND IMPLEMENTATION.

ANOTHER AREA WAS LOOKING AT HOW CAN WE ENSURE MORE THOROUGH REVIEW OF ITEMS.

TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY HAVE COMPLETE INFORMATION AND ARE LOOKING AT PHYSICAL IMPACTS.

ANOTHER ISSUE WAS LOOKING AT WHAT WOULD BE AN EFFECTIVE PROCESS FOR THESE ITEMS IT BE CONSIDERED TO ALIGN WITH OUR BUDGET PROCESS, TO ALIGN WITH THE A.A.O.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND ON TOP OF THAT WE HAD A PRIORITIZATION PROCESS.

WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS AND THIS PROCESS.

SO WE HAD A LOT OF GOOD DISCUSSION WITH THE CITY MANAGER CAME FORWARD AFTER THAT WITH A PROPOSAL THAT WE DISCUSSED IN 2021.

AND/OR THE CITY MANAGER PUT THAT FORWARD TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION.

SHE SAID TO THE AGENDA COMMITTEE SHE HAS WITHDRAWN THAT PROPOSAL.

SO THAT IS NOT, SHE'S NOT PRESENTING THAT FOR ACTION AT THE PRESENT TIME BY COUNCIL.

BUT THAT DID SPARK A LOT OF REALLY GOOD IDEAS THAT HAD BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS, ALL OF WHICH WERE INCLUDED IN THE PACKET.

WE WANT TODAY MAKE SURE THE PROPOSALS AND IDEAS THAT COUNCILMEMBERS CURRENTLY PROPOSED AROUND HOW TO IMPROVE AND STREAMLINE THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS.

THOSE WERE INCLUDED SO WE CAN LOOK AT THE COMPREHENSIVE RECORD.

AND SO, THE AGENDA RULES COMMITTEE TASKED BY THE CITY COUNCIL TO NOT JUST APPROVE THE DRAFT AGENDA BUT TO ALSO REVIEW AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON CHANGES TO OUR COUNCIL RULES.

HAS BEEN DISCUSSING FOR SEVERAL YEARS NOW THE CHANGES TO OUR LEGISLATIVE PROCESS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND OUT OF THAT, COUNCILMEMBER HAHN HAS BEEN WORKING WITH, I THINK THE CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT, THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE AND OTHERS TO COME UP WITH A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK TO PRESENT SOME IDEAS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION.

SO THAT WE CAN GATHER INPUT AND COME BACK WITH A PROPOSAL SO WE CAN FINALLY MOVE THIS CONVERSATION FORWARD.

THE PURPOSE OF TONIGHT'S WORK SESSION IS NOT TO TAKE ACTION BUT TO HEAR THE WHOLE COUNCIL'S INPUT.

BECAUSE THE AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE THERE ARE ONLY THREE MEMBERS THAT SIT ON THAT COMMITTEE, WE CANNOT ASK FOR YOUR IDEAS, UNFORTUNATELY.

SO REALLY, THIS IS WE'RE THE AGENDA RULES COMMITTEE PUTTING THIS FORWARD TO HEAR THE WHOLE COUNCIL'S IDEAS, SO WE CAN TAKE BACK THAT INPUT AND COME FORWARD WITH A RECOMMENDATION IN THE COMING MONTHS.

SO I REALLY APPRECIATE COUNCILMEMBER HAHN COMING FORWARD WITH A CONCEPTUAL, THOUGHTFUL FAKE WORK.

THE COMMITTEE DID NOT APPROVE THIS, I WANT TO CLARIFY.

WE WANT TO SEND IT FORWARD TO ALL COUNCIL, SO THE WHOLE COUNCIL CAN PROVIDE ITS FEEDBACK AND WE CAN TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION AS WE'RE DELIBERATING ON IT.

I APPRECIATE COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON AND ROBINSON AND TAPLIN'S INPUT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THERE MAY BE OTHER IDEAS WE HEAR TONIGHT.

THIS IS INTENDED TO BE A DISCUSSION, AN OPPORTUNITY FOR COUNCIL INPUT AND OUR GOAL IS TO TAKE ALL THESE GOOD IDEAS, AND TO COME BACK WITH A PROCESS THAT WORKS FOR OUR CITY COUNCIL, OUR STAFF AND COMMUNITY, FOR OUR COMMISSIONS.

AND SO, WITH THE GOAL OF TRYING TO HAVE A PROCESS THAT HELPS REALIZE THE IMPACTS OF THE LEGISLATION WE'RE ADOPTED FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PEOPLE OF BERKELEY.

AND I THINK AN IMPORTANT PART IS OUR BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND THE ROLE THEY PLAY ALSO IN REVIEWING A MAJOR LEGISLATION.

SO WITH THAT INTRODUCTION IN MIND, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING WE'RE NOT TAKING ACTION TONIGHT BUT INTENDED FOR DISCUSSION.

I WANT TO TURN IT OVER TO COUNCILMEMBER HAHN WHO WILL PRESENT ON THE SORT OF THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK THAT WAS PRESENTED AT THE AGENDA RULES COMMITTEE AND THEN COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON THEREAFTER.

>> S. HAHN: THANK YOU SO MUCH, MAYOR.

SOME PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

AND I'LL ASK THE CITY CLERK IF THEY CAN GO AHEAD AND PUT UP THE FIRST PAGE.

FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO CLARIFY THAT THE AGENDA COMMITTEE WAS WE WERE DELEGATED THE TASK OF COMING BACK TO COUNCIL WITH SOMETHING.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND AS YOU ALL KNOW FROM YOUR OWN COMMITTEES YOU CANNOT WORK TWO PEOPLE ON A COMMITTEE CANNOT WORK TOGETHER BEHIND THE SCENES. I WAS DESIGNATED AS A PERSON WHO WOULD WORK ON BRINGING SOMETHING FORWARD.

AND I DID I WAS ABLE TO WORK WITH THE CITY MANAGER AND THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE, NOT JUST TO GET THEIR INPUT BUT BECAUSE I NEEDED BUDDIES TO HELP DEVELOP THIS AND HAD NO OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH MY COLLEAGUES.

I ALSO JUST WANT TO BE REALLY CLEAR, I'M EXTREMELY PROUD OF THE WORK PRODUCT BEING BROUGHT FORWARD AS A THOUGHT EXERCISE HERE TODAY.

BUT THIS IS NOT MY PROPOSAL.

THE PACKET HAS MY PROPOSAL.

MY PROPOSAL IS ON PAGE 43 OF THE PACKET.

AND IF ANYONE WANTS TO KNOW WHAT MY PROPOSAL IS, THAT IS IT.

I AM HAPPY TO TAKE CREDIT FOR HAVING LISTENED TO MANY DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS AND LOOKED AT MANY DIFFERENT PROPOSALS THAT ARE HERE IN THE RECORD.

AND TO HAVE WORKED, TO PUT SOMETHING TOGETHER THAT HOPEFULLY REFLECTS AN AMALGAMATION OF MANY DIFFERENT IDEAS AND THAT PROVIDES A CONVERSATION OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WHOLE COUNCIL, WHICH IS WHAT WAS ALWAYS INTENDED.

SO I JUST, I DO THINK THERE HAS BEEN A LITTLE CONFUSION.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND I WANTED TO CLARIFY WHILE I'M PROUD TO HAVE DONE WORK ON THIS, THIS IS NOT MY PROPOSAL.

MY PROPOSAL IS ELSEWHERE IN THE PACKET.

I ALSO WANTED TO JUST BRING YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS FIRST PAGE. PROCESS SKETCH FOR DISCUSSION.

WE NAMED IT THAT FOR A REASON.

IT'S ACTUALLY NOT A PROPOSAL.

IT IS A SKETCH OF A POTENTIAL PROCESS.

THAT IS INTENDED TO SPARK CONVERSATION.

IT'S NOT A PROPOSAL.

I WANTED TO MAKE THAT CLEAR AS WELL.

GIVEN THE VARIETY OF WORK PRODUCT THAT WE HAD TO GO BACK AND LOOK AT, AND TO KIND OF DIGEST AND PULL TOGETHER, IT'S NOT POSSIBLE FOR A SINGLE SKETCH TO INCLUDE ABSOLUTELY ALL THE IDEAS AT ONCE.

AND I THINK AS THE REASON WHY WE AS THE AGENDA COMMITTEE DID NOT APPROVE THIS AS A BODY IS BECAUSE WE WANT YOUR INPUT.

WHAT WE MIGHT FINALLY BRING FORWARD MAYBE VERY DIFFERENT FROM THIS.

BUT YOU HAVE TO START SOMEWHERE WITH A CONVERSATION.

AND I REALLY WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT ANY MISCHARACTERIZATION OF WHAT IS HERE IS CLEARED UP.

ALL RIGHT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

SO LET'S GO THROUGH THIS SKETCH.

AND THE PURPOSE TODAY IS FOR US TO GET ALL YOUR IDEAS AND INPUT.

AND THERE IS NO DECISION POINT TODAY.

I ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT AS WE WERE GOING THROUGH THIS, IT'S ACTUALLY VERY COMPLEX.

AND THERE IS A LOT OF MOVING PIECES AND THERE IS A LOT OF PLACES WHERE YOU WANT TO STEP INTO A MORE COMPLICATED CORNER AND GO DOWN THAT LITTLE RABBIT HOLE.

THE WAY IT'S ORGANIZED THERE IS KIND OF AN OVERVIEW AND WE ACTUALLY DID A LITTLE WAYS DOWN A FEW RABBIT HOLES TO SORT OF SUGGEST SOME OF THE CONSIDERATIONS IN EACH OF THOSE SPECIAL TOPICS.

BUT IT IS OUR INTENT THAT WITH AN OVER-- CLEAR WITH THE OVERVIEW WE WOULD THEN TOGETHER DEVELOP AND REFINE SOME OF THE SPECIAL TOPICS.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: CAN I ADD ONE THING, COUNCILMEMBER HAHN, IF I MAY.

I FORGOT TO MENTION THAT WHAT WE INCLUDED IN THE PACKETS WAS A MATRIX, WHICH SUMMARIZED ALL THE DIFFERENT PROPOSALS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT FORWARD IN THE LAST WHAT THREE OR FOUR YEARS, INCLUDING THE MOST RECENT PROPOSAL THAT COUNCILMEMBER HAHN IS ABOUT TO PRESENT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND KIND OF REALLY BROKE IT DOWN BY SORT OF ISSUE AREA, MAJOR
ITEM DEFINITION PROCESS.

SO YOU CAN SEE ACROSS WHERE EACH PROPOSAL HAPPENED AND -- LANDED
AND THE EVOLUTION THAT LED TO THIS PROPOSAL THAT COUNCILMEMBER
HAHN WILL PRESENT.

I WANT TO THANK MY STAFF, JACQUELINE MCCORMICK AND LAURIE, AND
COUNCILMEMBER WENGRAF'S OFFICE WHO WORKED QUICKLY TO PUT THIS
TOGETHER SO WE HAD SOMETHING TO LOOK AT FOR COMPARATIVE
PURPOSES.

BACK TO YOU.

>> S. HAHN: THANK YOU.

I ALSO WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND THAT CAN THEM.

AS YOU CAN SEE BY LOOKING AT THE MATRIX, IT WAS VERY FORGET
COMPLICATED.

AND THERE WERE A LOT OF DIFFERENT IDEAS THAT HAD BEEN FLOATED
OVER TIME.

AND AGAIN, THIS SKETCH IS ONE OF MANY POTENTIAL PATHS FORWARD.

LET'S GO AHEAD AND WALK DOWN THE SKETCH PATH.

HOPEFULLY, THAT WILL TRIGGER MANY IDEAS AND INPUTS.

SO FIRST OF ALL, LET'S GO TO THE -- WELL, LET ME START HERE BY
SAYING THIS IS BY MAJOR ITEMS.

SO VERY QUICKLY, YOU HAVE TO IMAGINE THAT THERE IS LOTS OF ITEMS
THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED THAT ARE NOT BEING DISCUSSED.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

WHAT IS A MAJOR ITEM?

CURRENTLY, WE HAVE A DEFINITION.

SO IT'S NOT -- WE CALL IT A POLICY COMMITTEE TRACK ITEM.

THAT WAS TOO MUCH A MOUTHFUL.

WE'LL CALL THEM MAJOR ITEMS.

BUT IT IS THE SAME DEFINITION THAT WE HAVE CURRENTLY.

THIS IS NOT A NEW DEFINITION.

THIS IS THE OPERATIVE DEFINITION IN OUR COUNCIL RULES AND PROCEDURE AND ORDER, AND I HAVE NOT HEARD ANY CONCERNS ABOUT THE DEFINITION TO DATE.

IT IS THE ONE WE'VE BEEN USING FOR A COUPLE OF YEARS.

HOWEVER, AS WITH EVERYTHING THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT TODAY, IT'S ENTIRELY POSSIBLE FOR US TO ADJUST THE DEFINITION.

SO THAT'S NOT SET IN STONE.

IT'S JUST TO EXPLAIN WHERE WE GOT THAT TERMINOLOGY FROM.

WE CAN GO TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

THESE BIG IDEAS YOU CAN EACH BRING YOUR OWN TO THIS.

THIS WAS SORT OF THE BIG IDEAS, AGAIN, I WASN'T ABLE TO WORK TOGETHER WITH ANY OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

SO THE BIG IDEA FOR COUNCIL THAT CAME FROM MYSELF, SUCCESSFULLY DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT STATE OF THE ART AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAM AND POLICIES TO SERVE BERKELEY AND MODEL BEST PRACTICES FOR OTHER JURISDICTIONS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THE CITY CLERK'S BIG IDEA WAS CONSISTENCY IN PROCESS FOR MAJOR ITEM DEVELOPMENT, BUDGETING AND IMPLEMENTATION.

OBVIOUSLY, CITY ATTORNEY IS INTERESTED IN ENSURING LEGAL AND DRAFTING COMPLIANCE.

AND THE CITY MANAGER'S BIG IDEA WAS TO HELP THE ORGANIZATION DELIVER WITHOUT OVERWHELM, AND HELP STAFF BE SUCCESSFUL IN THEIR WORK.

AND I THINK THAT EVEN THOUGH THOSE ARE COME FROM ONE INDIVIDUAL EACH, I THINK THEY ACTUALLY REALLY REFLECT WHAT THESE DIFFERENT ROLES MIGHT HAVE TOP OF MIND.

BUT OBVIOUSLY, YOU ALL MAY HAVE YOUR OWN RENDITIONS OF THIS AS WELL.

GOING TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

SO OBVIOUSLY, THIS IS A BIG POTENTIAL CHANGE.

BUT NOT AT ALL NECESSARY.

BUT THE IDEA OF YEARLY CYCLE REALLY I WOULD SAY IS BUILT BACKWARDS FROM THE IDEA THAT WE WANT TO GET TO A PLACE WHERE WE DON'T HAVE BACKLOGS, WHERE ITEMS WE PASS AND EVEN THAT WE FUND DON'T GET IMPLEMENTED FOR YEARS.

AND WE'RE -- THERE IS KIND OF A TIGHTER AND LOGICAL PROGRESSION FROM PROPOSALS TO BEING VET, TO BEING ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING, TO RECEIVING FUNDING, TO HOPEFULLY BEING IMPLEMENTED PRETTY MUCH IMMEDIATELY AFTER.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

SO THAT THE CONVERSATION ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION BEGINS ESSENTIALLY AFTER THE ITEM IS FUNDED.

SO WHILE IT COULD ENTAIL A LONGER TIMELINE BEFORE AN ITEM IS PASSED AND BUDGETED, IT IS INTENDED TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT IT TAKES FROM APPROVAL OR BUDGET TO IMPLEMENTATION.

AND THERE ARE OTHER WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS.

AND PEOPLE MAY WISH TO FRONT LOAD THE WEIGHT OR BACK LOAD THE WEIGHT OR DISTRIBUTE IT DIFFERENTLY.

BUT -- I DID WANT TO EXPLAIN WHY THE IDEA OF A YEARLY CYCLE SEEMED LIKE SOMETHING WE MIGHT WANT TO PUT FORWARD.

SO, IF THERE WAS A YEARLY CYCLE, AGAIN ALL OF THESE DATES CAN BE CHANGED.

LOOKING AT IT WITH THE CITY MANAGER AND THE CITY CLERK, AND TRYING TO UNDERSTAND SORT OF THE DEADLINES BY WHICH THE BUDGET COMMITTEE NEEDS THINGS AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS, WE CAME TO THE IDEA THAT JULY THROUGH SEPTEMBER COUNCIL WOULD BE FINALIZING ITEMS, NOW JUST TO BE CLEAR, THEY COULD DEVELOP AND SUBMIT THEM AT ANY TIME DURING THE YEAR.

BUT THERE WOULD BE FOUR MONTHS WHERE -- THREE MONTHS WHERE YOU COULD REALLY FOCUS ON THAT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

DURING THAT TIME, THE CITY MANAGER WOULD BE FOCUSED ON STARTING TO IMPLEMENT ITEMS FROM THE PREVIOUS YEAR THAT HAD JUST BEEN FUNDED.

OCTOBER TO MARCH WOULD BE COMMITTEE SEASON.

RECOGNIZING THAT THERE IS PROBABLY A PRETTY BIG GAP IN DECEMBER.

AND THERE MIGHT BE QUITE A FEW ITEMS AND THE COMMITTEES WOULD BE DOING ROBUST REVIEWS AND WOULD NEED TO HEAR ITEMS MORE THAN ONCE.

AND THEN, APRIL THROUGH JUNE WOULD BE THE TIME WHEN COUNCIL WOULD REVIEW AND APPROVE ITEMS AND THE BUDGET WOULD FUND THOSE ITEMS THAT COUNCIL DEEMED READY TO FUND THAT YEAR.

SO IT'S BUILT BACK FROM THAT JUNE 30 BUDGET ADOPTION.

THE NEXT SLIDE.

SO SOME OF THE BENEFITS WERE WRITTEN HERE.

OBVIOUSLY, THERE IS DOWN SIDES AS WELL.

EVERYTHING CHOICE WE ME, INCLUDING THE CHOICE WE HAVE RIGHT NOW HAS UP SIDES AND DOWN SIDES.

BUT IN INTRODUCING A NEW IDEA, WE THOUGHT WE WOULD SHARE WHAT SOME OF THE BENEFITS MIGHT BE.

A YEARLY OPPORTUNITY.

THE FOUR SUBJECT MATTER COMMITTEES WOULD HAVE MORE OF A SEASON.

ALTHOUGH, THEY ABSOLUTELY COULD MEET AT ANY TIME.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

STAFF WOULD HAVE A PERIOD OF TIME WHEN THEY COULD FOCUS IN A MUCH MORE ROBUST WAY THAN THEY DO NOW.

ON IMPLEMENTATION AND COUNCILMEMBER SAID DURING THAT TIME WOULD ALSO HAVE SORT OF MORE FREE TIME, QUOTE/UNQUOTE, WITHOUT COMMITTEE MEETINGS TO FINALIZE ITEMS THEY WANTED TO SUBMIT BY THE DEADLINE.

AND AGAIN, THE IDEA BEING TO REDUCE THE GAP BETWEEN APPROVAL AND IMPLEMENTATION.

AND JUST TO BE CLEAR, WE DON'T REALLY HAVE EXPLICIT DEADLINES FOR ITEMS.

BULT BECAUSE WE HAVE A BUDGET CYCLE, THERE IS A DEADLINE, THERE IS A DATE AFTER WHICH AN ITEM CAN NO LONGER BE CONSIDERED FOR THAT BUDGET CYCLE.

EXACTLY.

SO WE DON'T HAVE THOSE DEADLINES DELINEATED VERY CLEARLY RIGHT NOW.

AND I THINK THAT CAN BE A PROBLEM.

BECAUSE PEOPLE DON'T REALLY KNOW HOW MUCH TIME THEY HAVE TO SUBMIT AN ITEM THAT MIGHT HAVE TO GO TO COUNCIL.

AND THEY DON'T KNOW IF THEY WILL MISS BEING CONSIDERED FOR ONE OR ANOTHER BUDGET CYCLE.

BY CLARIFYING, IT WOULD BE VERY FAIR AND EVERYONE WOULD BE ON NOTICE.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THIS IS THE DATE BY WHICH YOUR ITEMS HAVE BEEN TO BE IN IN ORDER
TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THIS CYCLE.

THERE IS OBVIOUSLY DOWN SIDES AS WELL, TRADEOFFS.

AND I THINK IT'S SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE HERE TO CONSIDER.

SO LET'S GO TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

MAJOR ITEM DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION.

AGAIN, YOU WOULD HAVE ALL YEAR TO SUBMIT.

IT'S NOT THAT YOU WOULD ONLY BE ABLE TO SUBMIT DURING A THREE-
MONTH PERIOD.

BUT THAT YOU WOULD HAVE LESS OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES DURING THAT
TIME AND YOU COULD FOCUS MORE.

SO FIRST THE MAJOR ITEM GUIDELINES WOULD BECOME MANDATORY.

RIGHT NOW THEY ARE RECOMMENDED AND I THINK A LOT OF PEOPLE DON'T
REALIZE THEY ARE RECOMMENDED.

AND THE AGENDA COMMITTEE HAS NOT NECESSARILY BEEN CONSISTENT AND
APPLYING THAT.

FIRST IDEA WOULD BE MAJOR ITEM GUIDELINES.

WHY?

BECAUSE THEY REQUIRE ROBUST RESEARCH AND CONSULTATION.

AND THAT WOULD MEAN THAT ITEMS CAME TO US AS A COUNCIL MORE
FULLY FORMED.

THEN THE SEPTEMBER 30 SUBMISSION DEADLINE.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BUT ITEMS CAN BE SUBMITTED PRIOR AND THEY COULD BE REVIEWED BY THE AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE JUST FOR THE QUESTION OF DO THEY COMPLY WITH THE GUIDELINES.

TIMELINE ALLOWS FOR COUNCILMEMBERS TO WORK ALL YEAR WITH CONCENTRATED OPPORTUNITY JULY THROUGH SEPTEMBER.

AND ALSO STAFF INPUT AT THE PRESUBMISSION LEVEL AND INPUT FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY WOULD BE MORE FORMALIZED.

RATHER THAN SORT OF CATCH US IF YOU CAN AND SOMETIMES A DEPARTMENT HEAD HAS TIME TO WORK WITH YOU AND SOMETIMES THEY DON'T.

IT WOULD BE EXPLICIT, THE LEVEL OF INPUT AND CONSULTATION AVAILABLE TO COUNCILMEMBERS AS THEY ARE DEVELOPING THEIR ITEMS.

WE CAN GO TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

SO IN OCTOBER, AGAIN, MAYBE OCTOBER, IT'S ALL UP TO YOUR COMMENT.

WE WOULD HAVE THE AGENDA COMMITTEE WOULD REVIEW ALL MAJOR ITEMS THAT CAME IN TOWARDS THE DEADLINE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES.

COMPLIANT MAJOR ITEMS WOULD GO TO COMMITTEES.

IF AN ITEM WAS NONCOMPLIANT THERE WOULD BE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE AUTHOR TO RESUBMIT AND STILL CATCH THAT CYCLE.

NEXT SLIDE.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

OCTOBER THROUGH MARCH, THE POLICY COMMITTEES WOULD ORGANIZE THEMSELVES.

MID OCTOBER THEY WOULD PLAN THEIR SESSION.

MAYBE THERE ARE SEVERAL ITEMS ON A SIMILAR TOPIC AND IT MAKES MORE SENSE TO HEAR THEM TOGETHER.

MAYBE THERE ARE ITEMS THAT THEY FEEL ARE GOING TO REQUIRE VERY SIGNIFICANT OUTREACH AND THEY WANT TO SCHEDULE THEM IN THAT WAY. AND THIS OF COURSE IS HOW IT IS DONE IN COMMITTEES, COMMITTEE SYSTEMS THAT HAVE AN ANNUAL CYCLE AT THE STATE LEVEL AND IN OTHER CITIES.

AND IT'S NOT UNCOMMON THAT THERE IS A TIME WHEN THE COMMITTEE IS ESSENTIALLY PLANS OUT THEIR HEARINGS.

THE MAJOR ITEMS WOULD BE REVIEWED ON A ROLLING BASIS.

AND ALL THE ITEMS WOULD BE OUT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE BY MARCH 30.

THIS BULLET POINT WITH COMMITTEES MAY PRIORITIZE OR SCORE ITEMS THEY REVIEW.

THE REASON IT'S IN BRACKETS BECAUSE IT'S A BIG QUESTION MARK.

SO MAYBE THEY WOULD MAYBE THEY WOULDN'T.

BUT THAT IS IN BRACKETS BECAUSE IT'S REALLY A QUESTION MARK HERE.

NEXT SLIDE.

SO, IN APRIL ALL MAJOR ITEMS WOULD HAVE BEEN VOTED ON.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THEY ARE NOT ALL VOTED ON IN APRIL.

BUT THEY WOULD ALL BE VOTED ON BY APRIL 30.

MAY MIGHT REQUIRE US, IT MIGHT REQUIRE A SPECIAL MEETING IN APRIL.

THERE WERE A WHOLE LOT OF THEM.

THE CITY ATTORNEY WOULD SIGN OFF ON THE DRAFTING AND LEGAL CONFORMITY OF THE ORDINANCE AS RESOLUTIONS AND FORMAL POLICIES.

AND APPROVE ITEMS WOULD GO TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE.

AND THEN NEXT SLIDE.

AND THEN, POSSIBLY, AGAIN, POSSIBLY MAJOR ITEMS.

AND JUST TO BE CLEAR, THAT'S NOT THE SAME AS ALL ITEMS

PRIORITIZATION, BUT POSSIBLY THERE WOULD BE A PROCESS OF TAKING

ALL THOSE MAJOR ITEMS FROM THAT CYCLE AND HAVING A

PRIORITIZATION OF THEM.

AND SENDING THAT IN BY THE MIDDLE OF MAY.

AND THAT WOULD BE GOING TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE.

BUT NOT BE BINDING.

IT WOULD BE A NONBINDING PRIORITIZATION.

AND NEXT SLIDE.

THEN THE BUDGET COMMITTEE WOULD HAVE ALL THESE.

THE PRIORITIZATIONS AGAIN IN BRACKETS AND COMMITTEE WITH A

QUESTION MARK WOULD GO TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE AS GUIDES BUT NOT

BE BINDING.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BUT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE WOULD ALREADY HAVE AN IDEA OF WHAT THE COUNCIL THOUGHT WHERE THE PRIORITIZATIONS.

THE BUDGET COMMITTEE WOULD DO NORMAL RECOMMENDATION TO THE FULL COUNCIL.

THE BUDGET WOULD GET PASSED.

MAJOR ITEMS THAT WERE FUNDED WOULD MOVE FORWARD TO IMPLEMENTATION.

THAT MEANS IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION.

AND THAT IS ONE OF THE BIG CHANGES THAT THIS KIND OF A SET UP HOPEFULLY WOULD ALLOW.

AS WE ALL KNOW, RIGHT NOW MAJOR ITEMS THAT ARE PASSED AND FUNDED GO INTO A BIG BUCKET AND OFTEN TIMES ARE NOT BROUGHT FORWARD TO FRUITION FOR MANY YEARS, SOMETIMES 10 YEARS.

WE HAVE SEEN THINGS LIKE THAT.

ITEMS PASSED BY COUNCIL BUT NOT FUNDED WOULD GET AN AUTOMATIC ROLL OVER TO BE CONSIDERED AT FUTURE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES.

TO BE CLEAR, THAT ISN'T THE NEXT YEAR.

THAT'S NOT 12 MONTHS LATER.

IT WOULD BE A FUTURE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.

NEXT SLIDE.

THIS IS REALLY, I THINK REALLY THE DOMAIN OF THE CITY MANAGER.

AND THIS SLIDE REFLECTS I THINK AND CITY MANAGER PLEASE STEP IN IF I DON'T PRESENT THIS CORRECTLY.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BUT THIS REFLECTS HER THINKING.

AND I THINK WE ALL KNOW THAT SHE HAS BEEN VERY FOCUSED ON IMPLEMENTATION.

SHE WANTS THE WORK THAT WE DO TO BE SUCCESSFUL.

AND IT IS HER DREAM THAT WE ARE ABLE TO CLEAR OUR BACKLOGS AND THAT WE ACTUALLY START IMPLEMENTING RIGHT AWAY.

AND THAT THESE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES SEE THE LIGHT OF DAY SOON AFTER THEY ARE APPROVED AND FUNDED.

SO THE IDEA WOULD BE THAT THE CITY MANAGER WOULD ASSIGN A SINGLE IMPLEMENTATION LEAD, THAT THE LEAD AND CITY MANAGER WOULD ASSEMBLE THEIR TEAM, THAT MIGHT BE A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT DEPARTMENT HEADS.

THAT THEY MIGHT MEET WITH THE AUTHORS TO CLARIFY ANY INTENTIONS OR TO SKETCH TIMELINES OR DISCUSS OPPORTUNITIES, IDEAS OR CHALLENGES.

AND LET ME BE CLEAR, THOSE ARE AROUND IMPLEMENTATION.

NOT CHALLENGES WITH THE LEGISLATION ITSELF.

WHEN YOU SIT DOWN TO ACTUALLY DO AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, IT'S VERY DIFFERENT FROM KIND OF THE HIGH LEVEL THINKING ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION THAT OBVIOUSLY HAS TO HAPPEN BEFORE THE ITEM IS APPROVED.

THE IMPLEMENTATION TEAM HAS PREPARED TWO SEPARATE THINGS.

ONE IS A LAUNCH PLAN AND ONE IS AN OPERATING PLAN.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND THAT IS THE CITY MANAGER REALLY RECOGNIZING THAT LAUNCHING SOMETHING AND RUNNING IT ARE TWO DIFFERENT THINGS.

BUILDING A STRUCTURE AND KEEPING IT FUNCTIONING OVER TIME ARE DIFFERENT THINGS.

PUTTING IN A GARDEN AND KEEPING IT GOING OVER TIME ARE TWO DIFFERENT THINGS.

AND SO BOTH OF THOSE WOULD BE DEVELOPED AND THEN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, THE PROGRAM OR POLICY WOULD BE LAUNCHED AND IMPLEMENTED.

SO LET'S GO TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

SO THAT IS, THAT WAS IT FOR THE OVERVIEW OF WHAT A WHOLE CYCLE MIGHT LOOK LIKE.

NOW, WE'RE GOING INTO WHAT I CALL SPECIAL TOPICS.

THESE ARE SOME OF THOSE THINGS THAT WE CAME UPON AS WE WERE THINKING THESE THINGS THROUGH.

THAT WOULD BE QUESTIONS WE PROBABLY WOULD WANT TO MAKE SURE WE HAD COVERED.

AND BY THE WAY, OUR SPECIAL TOPICS ARE NOT DEFINITIVE.

THERE ARE MANY MORE.

WE CHOOSE TO JUST GIVE YOU A LITTLE BIT OF A NIBBLE AND HAVE YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WE DIDN'T NOT THINK ABOUT THESE THINGS.

SO THE FIRST OBVIOUSLY IMPORTANT THING IS WHAT DID YOU DO IF THERE ARE A TIME CRITICAL MAJOR ITEM?

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

IF WE'RE STUCK IN A CYCLE WHAT DO WE DO IF THERE IS AN URGENT NEED AND WHAT COMES TO MIND FOR ME IS AFTER GEORGE FLOYD WAS MURDERED, THERE WAS A VERY, VERY INTENSE DESIRE ON THE PART OF THE COMMUNITY AND OUR COUNCIL TO BE ABLE TO BE RESPONSIVE VERY QUICKLY WITH PRETTY COMPREHENSIVE IDEAS THAT WERE PUT FORWARD. I DON'T THINK ANY OF US WOULD WANT SOMETHING LIKE THAT TO HAVE TO SIT AND WAIT FOR SEVERAL MONTHS TO BE SENT TO A COMMITTEE OR TO BE CONSIDERED.

SO THE OVERRIDE FOR TIME CRITICAL ITEMS IS A CRITICAL COMPONENT OF THIS.

WE ALREADY HAVE SOME TERMS FOR OVERRIDE IN OUR COUNCIL RULES AND PROCEDURE AND ORDER.

AN ITEM THAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE ASSIGNED TO A POLICY COMMITTEE MAY BY-PASS, IF IT'S DEEMED TIME CRITICAL.

AND THE AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE DETERMINES WHETHER IT IS TIME CRITICAL.

LIKE EVERY THING WE COULD EXPAND THIS, WE COULD REWRITE IT, WE COULD MAKE IT HAVE MORE SPECIFICITY.

BUT THE IDEA THAT WE WOULD HAVE A SAFETY VALVE FOR TIME CRITICAL ITEMS IS VERY IMPORTANT.

AND I THINK BECOMES MORE IMPORTANT IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A PROCESS THAT IS A YEARLY PROCESS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

ANOTHER IDEA THAT I THINK IS IMPORTANT FOR US TO CONSIDER, IS THAT IF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE GETS TO MAKE THESE DECISIONS WE MAY ACTUALLY WANT TO HAVE AN OVER RIDE THAT TAKES THAT DETERMINATION TO THE FULL COUNCIL.

SO LET'S SAY A COUNCILMEMBER BRINGS SOMETHING FORWARD, THEY THINK IT'S TIME CRITICAL, THE AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE DOESN'T AGREE.

THEY COULD THEN BRING THAT DECISION TO THE FULL COUNCIL AND THE FULL COUNCIL WOULD BE ABLE TO WEIGH IN ON WHETHER THAT ITEM WAS TIME CRITICAL.

ALL RIGHTY.

NEXT TOPIC.

MOVING TO ANOTHER SPECIAL TOPIC.

THE DETAILS OF PRE SUBMISSION.

THE GUIDELINES FORMAT WOULD BE MANDATORY.

ANOTHER SUGGESTION IS THAT AT THIS STAGE THERE WOULD ONLY BE AUTHORS AND NO CO-SPONSORS AND THAT WOULD HELP WITH BROWN ACT ISSUES AS THINGS MOVE THROUGH COMMITTEE.

THAT A PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WITH THE CITY MANAGER WOULD BE AVAILABLE.

EXPLICITLY AVAILABLE SO THAT PEOPLE DON'T FEEL LIKE THEY ARE KIND OF BUGGING SOMEBODY BY REACHING OUT AND ASKING FOR HELP OR ADVICE ON SOMETHING THEY ARE THINKING OF DEVELOPING.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND THEN A REQUIRED PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WITH THE CITY ATTORNEY SO HER OFFICE HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL LEGAL AND DRAFTING CONSIDERATIONS VERY EARLY IN THE PROCESS. I THINK IT'S PROBABLY A GOOD IDEA FOR THE CITY ATTORNEY TO DECIDE IF THERE ARE ISSUES.

AND THIS WOULD PROVIDE NOT JUST OPPORTUNITY BUT A REQUIREMENT TO RUN THINGS BY THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.

THE LAST BULLET POINT IS VERY IMPORTANT.

HOW DO WE FOLD IN COMMISSIONS.

THIS IS SOMETHING BIG THAT THE AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE MEMBERS FELT VERY STRONGLY ABOUT.

I HAVE TO SAY THAT JUST TRYING TO HARNESS A SKETCH FOR THE COUNCIL PROCESS WAS A LOT.

BUT WE'RE VERY CLEAR THAT WHATEVER PROCESS WE STICK WITH OR MOVE TOWARDS, WE HAVE TO HAVE MORE EXPLICIT ABOUT HOW OUR COMMISSIONS ARE CONSULTED AND HOW WE GET THEIR IMPORTANT ADVICE AND REVIEW AND HOW THAT GETS WOVEN IN.

WE THOUGHT THERE MIGHT BE AN IMPORTANT ROLE FOR THAT IN THE PRE SUBMISSION PHASE.

LET'S SAY YOU START DEVELOPING SOMETHING EARLY IN THE CYCLE, IT'S POSSIBLE THAT IT COULD GO TO A COMMISSION BEFORE YOU EVEN SUBMIT IT.

THERE MIGHT BE OTHER WAYS AND OTHER TIMES IN THE PROCESS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BUT I REALLY WANT TO HIGHLIGHT THAT AS WE GO THROUGH THIS, THE AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE WAS VERY CONCERNED THAT THE COMMISSIONS NOT BE SIDE LINED AND ON THE CONTRARY, THAT WE FIND EXPLICIT WAYS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS AND THOUGHTS AND OPINIONS TO BE INTEGRAL TO THE PROCESS OF MOVING LEGISLATION FORWARD.

OKAY.

NEXT SLIDE.

STRENGTHENING THE COMMITTEE REVIEW.

LOTS OF IDEAS FOR HOW TO DO THAT.

AND I'M SURE THERE IS GOING TO BE A LOT MORE.

BUT SOME OF THE IDEAS OBVIOUSLY WOULD BE THAT FOR EVERY ITEM THERE IS A WHOLE SERIES OF QUESTIONS, A CHECKLIST IF YOU WANT TO CALL IT.

BUT A SERIES OF INQUIRIES THE COMMITTEE IS REQUIRED TO MAKE SO EVERY ITEM OF LEGISLATION IN COMMITTEE AND ACROSS COMMITTEES IS GETTING THE SAME SCRUTINY AND SAME OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT.

ONE IDEA IS RELEVANCE TO STRATEGIC PRIORITIES.

ADDED VALUE OF THE PROGRAM OR POLICY.

BENEFITS AND COSTS OF THE PROGRAM OR POLICY TO THE COMMUNITY AND THE CITY.

POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE MEANS TO ACHIEVE THE SAME OR SIMILAR GOALS THAT MIGHT BE MORE FRUITFUL OR MORE QUICK OR LESS EXPENSIVE.

PHASING IN TIMELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

STAFFING AND RESOURCES NEEDED.

HOW THE PROGRAM OR POLICY WOULD BE EVALUATED.

HOW IT WILL BE ENFORCED.

AND THEN AGAIN, IN BRACKETS ARE THINGS WITH A REAL QUESTION MARK.

WOULD THE COMMITTEE DO SOME KIND OF RATING OR RANKING, YES OR NO, POSSIBLY.

SHOULD WE INCREASE THE OPTIONS AROUND THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS.

I THINK YOU ARE ALL FAMILIAR.

WE HAVE ONLY FOUR OPTIONS.

WHEN WE SEND SOMETHING TO CITY COUNCIL, MAYBE THERE IS SOME ROOM TO CHANGE OR REFINE THINGS THERE.

OTHER WITH A QUESTION MARK.

THIS QUESTION OF STRENGTHENING COMMITTEES REGARDLESS OF OUR OVERALL PROGRAM IS A SPECIAL TOPIC THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO ADDRESS AS A COUNCIL.

GOING TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

CONTINUING ON THE STRENGTHENING COMMITTEES IDEA, WE WOULD ALSO NEED TO CONSIDER HOW ARE WE GOING TO GET THE INPUTS WE NEED FROM THE PUBLIC, FROM STAFF, FROM CITY ATTORNEY.

THE COMMITTEES WOULD NEED TO DO ACTIVE OUTREACH WITH STAFF SUPPORT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

ACTUALLY IDENTIFY STAKEHOLDERS THAT WOULD EITHER BE IMPACTED OR WOULD NEED TO TAKE ACTION ON ONE OR ANOTHER PRIORITY AND DO ACTIVE OUTREACH, NOT JUST HOPE THAT THEY MIGHT HAPPEN UPON AN AGENDA SOMEWHERE.

MULTIPLE HEARINGS TO ALLOW FOR A BEST COMMUNITY STAFF AND CITY ATTORNEY INPUTS AND DISCUSSION.

ENHANCE AND EMPOWER THE CITY ATTORNEY AND STAFF PARTICIPATION. SO THAT THEY COULD GIVE MEANINGFUL VERBAL INPUT WITHOUT THE REQUIREMENT FOR A FORMAL REPORT.

AND I KNOW THAT BOTH THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND THE CITY MANAGER ARE VERY HESITANT TO GIVE US AND HAVE THEIR STAFF GIVE US SORT OF PRELIMINARY ADVICE THAT DOES NOT REFLECT FULL AND DEEP CONSIDERATION.

AND I THINK THIS WILL BE SOMETHING FOR THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE TO THINK ABOUT WHAT KIND OF INPUT THEIR STAFF COULD PROVIDE THEY WOULD FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH THAT WOULD BE SUBSTANTIAL AND MOVE THINGS ALONG.

THE COMMITTEE SCHEDULE.

HAVING A SCHEDULE AHEAD OF TIME COULD HELP THE CITY ATTORNEY AND THE CITY MANAGER SEND THE RIGHT PEOPLE TO EACH MEETING.

KNOWING AHEAD OF TIME WHAT ITEMS ARE GOING TO BE CONSIDERED AT DIFFERENT TIMES, I THINK COULD ALLOW US TO HAVE THE RIGHT PEOPLE THERE AND MORE ROBUST INPUT FROM OUR IMPORTANT PARTNERS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND THEN, AGAIN CONSIDER HOW TO ATTAIN AND INTEGRATE INPUT FROM COMMISSIONS.

AGAIN, WE DID NOT GO DEEP THERE.

BUT WE IDENTIFIED IT AS SOMETHING CRITICALLY IMPORTANT.

NEXT SLIDE.

SO ANOTHER SPECIAL TOPIC.

PRIORITIZATION.

AND WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT THIS A LOT, BUT IN DISCUSSING THIS WITH THE CITY MANAGER, I THINK WE CAME TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS KIND OF TWO ISSUES.

ONE IS THAT WE WHILE REDUCED, WE STILL HAVE THE BACKLOG NOW.

WE HAVE A BIG BACK LOG.

AND SO WE NEED TO FIGURE OUT SORT OF AN END GAME FOR HOW WE'RE GOING TO DEAL WITH THOSE BACKLOG ITEMS.

AND THE END GAME MIGHT BE THAT WE SORT OF FIGURE OUT WHAT TO DO.

THE SECOND TOPIC AROUND PRIORITIZATION IS ASSUMING THE DREAM OF A SYSTEM THAT HAS NO BACKLOGS, WE STILL WOULD HAVE TO DO

PRIORITIZATION.

SO LOOKING AT THE BACKLOG QUEUE, ONE IDEA WAS A ONE TIME PROCESS FOR MAJOR ITEMS THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN THE QUEUE THAT ALL PENDING BUT NOT INITIATED ITEMS EXPONENTIALLY WOULD GO BACK TO THE POLICY COMMITTEES FOR LIKE A REREVIEW.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND THE POLICY COMMITTEES WOULD LOOK AT THEM AND CONSIDER
MERGING ITEMS OR UPDATING REFERRALS IN CASE THEY ARE STALE OR
OTHER INITIATIVES THAT COME FORWARD THAT MAYBE MAKE THEM, MAKE
IT WORTH CHANGING THEM A LITTLE BIT.
REAPPROVAL OF ITEMS AS IS.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO SUNSET OR REMOVE ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN
SUPERSEDED MAYBE BY STATE LAW, MAYBE BY SOMETHING ELSE THE CITY
HAS DONE.
RECOMMEND DISPOSITION OF ALL THE ITEMS.
POTENTIALLY RANKED BY LEAD DEPARTMENT.
AND BRING ALL THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EACH COMMITTEE TO THE
COUNCIL FOR US TO DECIDE WHAT WE WANT TO CONSOLIDATE, WHAT WE
WANT TO REMOVE, WHAT DO WE WANT TO RESTATE AND WHAT DO WE WANT
TO RESUPPORT.
WE MIGHT NEED SOME CRITERIA.
WE MIGHT NEED SOME KIND OF R.R.V.
THE POINT HERE IS WE WOULD HAVE TO DEAL WITH A BACKLOG IN ORDER
TO GET TO THAT BEAUTIFUL DAY WHERE EVERY YEAR, THE ITEMS THAT
WERE APPROVED AND FUNDED COULD BE IMPLEMENTED OR THE
IMPLEMENTATION COULD BEGIN RIGHT AWAY.
SO NEXT SPECIAL TOPIC.
IS THE PRIORITIZATION ON AN ONGOING BASIS OF A YEARLY QUEUE WITH
THE DREAM OF THE BACKLOG HAVING BEEN CLEARED.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

FIRST OF ALL, IT IS HOPED THE ENHANCED COMMITTEE PROCESS WOULD RESULT IN FEWER BACKLOGS, AND THAT ITEMS WOULD BE IMPLEMENTED IN A REASONABLE TIMEFRAME.

AND THEREFORE, PRIORITIZATION WOULD BECOME LESS OF AN ISSUE. OBVIOUSLY WHEN YOU HAVE 150 ITEMS YOU HAVE TO PRIORITIZE.

IF YOU HAVE 10 OR 15, IT'S MUCH LESS OF A CHALLENGE.

BUT IN A RATIONALIZED SYSTEM, ONE, YOU WOULD HAVE MORE FULLY CONCEIVED AND VETTED ITEMS.

MAYBE YOU WOULD HAVE COMMITTEE SCORING AND/OR RANKING.

AND THEN, COUNCIL RANKING.

AND IT IS SUGGESTED THAT WOULD BE EITHER BY LEAD DEPARTMENT OR OVERALL.

I THINK WE'VE ALL SEEN A SITUATION WHERE WE RANK EVERYTHING TOGETHER.

AND IT TURNS OUT THE FIRST 15 ITEMS ARE FOR PUBLIC WORKS OR PLANNING.

AND THEN OTHER DEPARTMENTS THEIR ITEMS ARE SPRINKLED IN THE QUEUE.

WE MAY WANT TO LOOK AT RANKING BY DEPARTMENT RATHER THAN JUST DOING THE UNIVERSAL RANKING.

AND AGAIN, THESE ARE ALL IDEAS.

IT'S BIG.

THERE WAS A LOT FOR US TO COVER.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

ALL RIGHT.

NEXT SPECIAL TOPIC.

WE WOULD NEED A PROCESS AT THE MIDYEAR BUDGET OPPORTUNITIES.

HERE YOU SEE IN BLUE VERY HIGH-LEVEL SUGGESTIONS.

WE'LL FELT THIS WOULD BE A TOPIC THAT WOULD HAVE TO GO TO

BUDGET AND FINANCE.

ONE IDEA WAS THAT ONLY TIME CRITICAL AND ROLL OVER ITEMS

PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BUT UNFUNDED WOULD BE CONSIDERED.

NOT JUST FOR COUNCIL ITEMS BUT ALSO FOR CITY MANAGER ITEMS.

ANOTHER WOULD BE THAT NOT ALL THE EXTRA FUNDS WOULD GET

ALLOCATED AND MORE FUNDS WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR THE ANNUAL

BUDGET PROCESS FOR COUNCIL INITIATIVE SAID THAT GO THROUGH THE

YEAR PROCESS.

AND POSSIBLY THAT A.A.O.1 AND 2 ARE ONE TIME OR SENSITIVE NEEDS,

EXCEPT IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

REALLY WE FELT THIS SHOULD GO TO BUDGET AND FINANCE TO THINK

ABOUT SHOULD WE ADOPT SOMETHING LIKE A YEARLY PROCESS.

BUT WITH ANY PROCESS, THESE THINGS WOULD NEED TO BE CLARIFIED.

ALL RIGHT, NEXT SPECIAL TOPIC.

IMPLEMENTATION.

WE ALREADY SAW WHAT THAT LOOKS LIKE.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BUT I THINK THE CITY MANAGER REALLY WOULD WANT TO WORK ON FILLING OUT WITH MORE DETAIL WHAT THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS WOULD LOOK LIKE.

AND I KNOW SHE'S VERY COMMITTED TO HAVING A LEAD SO THAT EVERYBODY KNOWS WHO SAID RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING SOMETHING HAPPEN.

BUT ALSO, HAVING A TEAM AND ALSO MAKING SURE THAT THERE IS CLARITY ABOUT INTENTIONS AND OFTEN TIMES AN AUTHOR WILL HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION.

AND HAVE SOME GOOD IDEAS.

WE'LL HAVE CONSULTED WITH STAKEHOLDERS AND THE COMMUNITY AND MAY HAVE SOME ADDITIONAL HELPFUL IDEAS BUT ULTIMATELY, IT'S UP TO THE CITY MANAGER TO DETERMINE IMPLEMENTATION, THAT CONSULTATION IS OBVIOUSLY A COURTESY, WHICH I THINK SHE IS VERY GENEROUSLY INTERESTED IN EXTENDING.

AND I CAN'T REMEMBER DO WE HAVE ONE MORE SPECIAL TOPIC?

NO.

WE DON'T.

THAT'S IT.

SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: THE LAST PIECE ON IMPLEMENTS, THAT HAS BEEN HOW WE HAVE DONE -- IMPLEMENTATION, IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR NEW LAWS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

IS AFTER WE WHILE WE'RE DEVELOPING IT AND WE GET INPUT ON OPERATIONAL IMPACTS, IMPLEMENTATION, THEN WE REFER TO THE CITY MANAGER DEVELOP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, RESOURCE THAT AND THEN IMPLEMENTATION.

SO I THINK IT'S OPERATIONALIZING THE KIND OF AD HOC PRACTICE THAT WE'VE IMPLEMENTED.

I WANT TO TURN IT OVER TO COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON.

>> K HARRISON: FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO THANK YOU COUNCILMEMBER HAHN FOR HER HARD WORK.

IT IS NOT EASY TO TACKLE SUCH A BROAD TOPICKISM SOMEONE HAS TO START.

IF YOU DON'T START YOU NEVER GET ANYWHERE.

SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THAT.

I REALLY COMMEND YOU FOR LEADING THIS EFFORT.

SINCE WE FIRST DISCUSSED IT IN 2021, AND THE CITY MANAGER CONTRIBUTION AND DEFERRING TO COUNCIL FOR THE SHAPE ANY CHANGES TAKE.

I HEARD HER SAY A COUPLE OF TIMES, IT IS NOT HER PROPOSAL.

I WANT TO MAKE THAT STATEMENT.

I'M NOT ON THE AGENDA COMMITTEE.

AND AS YOU NOTED, I WASN'T ABLE TO WORK WITH YOU, BUT I WORKED WITH COUNCILMEMBERS ROBINSON AND TAPLIN.

THANK YOU TO BOTH.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND I THINK COUNCILMEMBER BARTLETT IS INTERESTED IN THE PROPOSAL ABOUT TO DISCUSS, TO UPDATE AND BUILD ON IT.

I SUBMITTED AN ALTERNATIVE.

THIS IS NOT AN ALTERNATIVE TO COUNCIL HAHN, IT WAS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THEN COUNCILMEMBER DROSTE'S PROPOSAL IN 2021.

WHICH WAS MUCH MORE CONVEIN STRAINING OF US.

CONSTRAINING OF US.

I UPDATED TO RESPOND TO COUNCILMEMBER HAHN.

IT'S MEANT TO BE TAKEN CONSIDERATION HERE AND THE PUBLIC AND COUNCIL AND THE AGENDA COMMITTEE.

THERE IS REALLY POSITIVE ASPECTS OF COUNCILMEMBER HAHN'S PROPOSAL I WANT TO HIGHLIGHT.

AND I THINK WE SHOULD MOVE AHEAD.

COUNCIL ITEMS SHOULD FOLLOW THE GUIDELINES ALREADY PROMULGATED RATHER THAN USING THEM AS RECOMMENDATIONS.

WE GET THINGS IN VERY DIFFERENT FORMAT SAID IN COMMITTEES.

AND IT MEANS WE DON'T HAVE FAIR CRITERIA AGAINST WHICH THINGS ARE EVALUATED.

I THINK WE NEED TO ADOPT THESE AS BEING MANDATORY.

I LIKE THE IDEA OF A FORMAL PROCESS FOR CITY STAFF TO PROVIDE HIGH LEVEL CONCEPTUAL INPUT TO AUTHORS BEFORE SUBMITTING PROPOSALS.

I ALWAYS DO THAT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I PROBABLY NEVER SUBMIT ANYTHING WITHOUT FIRST TALKING TO THE DEPARTMENTS AND THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.

I THINK THIS IS GOOD PRACTICE AND WE'RE PROBABLY ALL DOING IT.

I LIKE THE PROCESS FOR ADDRESSING THE BACKLOG OF UNFUNDED ITEMS.

I DON'T THINK IT SHOULD BE IN THE POLICY COMMITTEE.

I'LL EXPLAIN MORE IN A MINUTE.

I LIKE THE ENHANCED CHECKLIST FOR THE POLICY COMMITTEE.

I THINK WE NEED THAT.

WE OFTEN STRUGGLING, AS CHAIR OF ONE OF THEM.

EXCLUDING THE PROPOSAL THAT WE RATE ITEMS.

I DON'T WANT TO RANK ITEMS.

I'M IN A THREE PERSON COMMITTEE.

WE ALL BRING THINGS FORWARD.

I DON'T WANT TO SAY, I'M GOING TO RANK MINE AHEAD OF

COUNCILMEMBER TAPLIN.

THAT IS AWKWARD.

IT'S THE JOB OF THE FULL COUNCIL TO DO THE RANKING.

AND I DO LIKE THE IDEA OF SOMEHOW GETTING BETTER INPUT FROM

COMMISSIONS.

BUT I DON'T WANT TO DO BEFORE AN ITEM GOES BEFORE COUNCIL.

WE DON'T WORK FOR THE COMMISSION.

THAT STRUCK ME AS A LITTLE ODD, THERE ARE TIMES I HAVE WRITTEN

LEGISLATION, ASKED THEM TO HOLD HEARINGS, WHICH IS SOMETHING WE

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

CAN CONSIDER DOING IF IT'S COMPLICATED AND WE BENEFIT FROM A LOT OF MORE HEARINGS THAN WE'RE ABLE TO HAVE.

BUT I DON'T WANT IT TO BE MANDATORY ANYWAY.

AND I GUESS MY MAJOR CONCERN ABOUT PROPOSALS, I'M A REALLY STRONG SUPPORTER OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE SYSTEM.

THAT COUNCILMEMBER HAHN ACTUALLY PROPOSED.

AND I DON'T BELIEVE OUR CENTRAL PROCESS IS FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED ON MAJOR ITEMS.

I THINK WE'RE DOING A GOOD JOB ON THAT.

I'M GOING TO DESCRIBE IN A MINUTE WHY THE PROCESS WILL GO THROUGH A LENGTHY PROCESS AND DELAY US GETTING THINGS DONE.

I THINK THE MAIN THINGS WE'RE NOT DOING AS GOOD A JOB ON ARE REFERRALS AND BUDGET REQUESTS.

AND WHAT I SEE EMBEDDED IN BUDGET REQUESTS, BEING ON THE BUDGET COMMITTEE IS A LOT OF POLICY QUESTIONS NOBODY ANSWERED YET.

AND THAT REALLY CONCERNED ME.

IF WE CAN'T REALLY DISCUSS THE MONEY UNTIL WE KNOW HOW IT WILL WORK.

I'M HOPING YOUR INTENTION WAS TO INCLUDE IN THE GROUP OF ITEMS ORDINANCES WE WRITE NOW, REFERRALS, AND BUDGET REQUESTS OVER A CERTAIN DOLLAR AMOUNT.

I'M GOING TO MAKE A PROPOSAL HOW TO DO THAT.

I DON'T WANT TO SEE BUDGET REFERRALS JUST GO THROUGH.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I THINK THAT'S NOT GOOD EITHER WHEN THEY ENTAIL A LOT OF BUDGETARY, POLICY ASPECTS.

A COUNTER EXAMPLE.

RECENTLY COUNCILMEMBER KESARWANI RECOMMENDED PUTTING MORE MONEY IN PAVING.

THAT DIDN'T NEED TO GO TO A POLICY COMMITTEE BECAUSE IT WASN'T CHANGING THE PAVING PLAN ANY WAY.

IT WAS SAYING PUT MORE MONEY IN.

IT WAS STRICTLY A BUDGET THING.

I'M NOT SURE WHY WE HAD IT AT OUR COMMITTEE.

OTHER TIMES WE HAVE THINGS THAT HAVE A LOT OF POLICY IMPLICATIONS BUT NOT MUCH MONEY AND GOING STRAIGHT TO BUDGET AND WE'RE LEFT AT BUDGET SAYING HOW ARE WE GOING TO DO THIS.

I THINK THAT IS THE WRONG PLACE TO ASK THOSE QUESTIONS.

I THINK THAT SHOULD GET WORKED OUT IN ADVANCE.

SOME OF THE MY CONCERNS ABOUT THE PROPOSAL I HAVE I AM GRATEFUL FOR, I THINK IT'S SIGNIFICANTLY LIMITS ACCESS TO THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS BY EXTENDING TIMELINES.

RIGHT NOW, MAJOR ITEMS CAN BE SUBJECT TO NEARLY 300 DAYS.

THIS COMPARES THE CURRENT 120 DAYS IN COMMITTEE.

THAT HAPPENS BECAUSE OF THE SEPTEMBER DEADLINE.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

IF YOU TURN SOMETHING IN IN OCTOBER THAT IS NOT TIME CRITICAL BUT NONETHELESS IMPORTANT TO THE COMMUNITY IT WILL SIT THERE UNTIL NEXT YEAR.

AND THEN IT WILL SIT THERE UNTIL THE JUNE BUDGET PROCESS, THE WAY I READ IT NOW.

WE COULD BE LOOKING AT 18 MONTHS.

I DON'T THINK WE NEED TO BUILD IN EXTRA TIME.

SO I'M GOING TO SUGGEST WAYS TO NOT DO THAT.

IT ALSO DOESN'T ALIGN TIMELY LEGISLATIVE ITEMS WITH THE FALL BUDGET PROCESS.

THIS HAS BEEN A HUGE CONFUSION.

I HEARD THIS IN TWO DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS FROM THE CITY MANAGER.

ONE, SHE WOULD LIKE US TO GET ALL OF OUR PROPOSALS IN BEFORE THE JUNE BUDGET.

BUT TWO, ALSO SHE WOULD LIKE US TO NOT SUBMIT ANYTHING EXCEPT FOR THE A.A.O.

THAT'S WHEN WE KNOW MORE ABOUT REVENUES.

WE NEED A DEFINITIVE ANSWER ABOUT THE BEST PROCESS.

BUT I DO NOT WANT TO ASSUME THE BUDGET PROCESS.

I PERSONALLY THINK WE CAN HAVE TWO CYCLES.

ONE OF WHICH IS TO JUNE AND ONE OF WHICH IS TO A.A.O.

I THINK I'M RECOMMENDING WE DO THAT.

THAT WILL GET THINGS THROUGH MORE QUICKLY.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I REALLY DON'T WANT POLICY COMMITTEES TO PRIORITIZE AS I'VE
ALREADY DISCUSSED.

AND I THINK THAT IS REALLY A COUNCIL JOB.

ALSO, THERE IS SOMEWHERE IN HERE AN IMPLICATION THE POLICY
COMMITTEES ARE A TIME COMMITMENT BURDEN. ON STAFF AND THE
COUNCIL.

I THINK IT'S THE OPPOSITE.

PERSONALLY FOR ME THE STUFF WE GET AT COUNCIL IS SO MUCH BETTER
BECAUSE OF YOUR SYSTEM, COUNCILMEMBER HAHN, OF SETTING OF THESE
COMMITTEES AND REVIEW IT GOES THROUGH THAT I THINK THE STAFF
BURDEN IS LESS.

AND SO THE BURDEN ON THE PUBLIC VERY CONFUSING PROPOSALS IS
LESS.

THINGS ARE BETTER BECAUSE THEY HAVE GONE THROUGH THESE
COMMITTEES.

SO I REALLY DON'T THINK WE SHOULD BE LIMITING THE COMMITTEES TO
OPERATING SIX MONTHS OF THE YEAR.

WHEN WE DON'T HAVE SOMETHING TO DO.

I THINK IT'S OKAY TO KEEP THEM OPERATING DURING THE ENTIRE TIME
THE COUNCILMEMBER IS MEETING AND TAKE THINGS UP AS THEY COME
ALONG.

I'M GOING TO PROPOSE THAT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND THEN FINALLY, I DON'T LIKE THE IMPLEMENTATION TEAM AT THE
END AFTER THE ITEM HAS GONE OUT OF THE COMMITTEE, INCLUDING THE
COUNCILMEMBER.

IT FEELS LIKE, BECAUSE IT INDICATES THEY WOULD BE ESTABLISHING
CLARITY OF INTENTIONS, TIMELINES, OPPORTUNITIES, IDEAS AND
CHALLENGES.

THAT SHOULD ALL HAPPEN AT THE COMMITTEE PROCESS.

IF WE HAVEN'T FIGURED OUT TIMELINES AND OPPORTUNITIES THEN, I
DON'T THINK I'M COMFORTABLE WITH ONE COUNCILMEMBER BEING IN
CHARGE OF THAT.

EVEN WHEN IT'S MINE, I DON'T THINK I LIKE THAT.

THAT I'M NOW I'M NEEDING TO FIGURE OUT HOW WE'RE REALLY GOING TO
DO IT.

THAT SHOULD HAVE ALL BEEN TALKED ABOUT UP FRONT IN A COMMITTEE
PROCESS.

SO I HAVE A FLOW CHART THAT TRIES TO SHOW WHERE THE DIFFERENCES
ARE.

BUILDING OUNCILMEMBER HAHN'S EXCELLENT WORK.

GIVE ME ONE SECOND.

I'M ALWAYS TERRIBLE AT THIS.

I DON'T KNOW HOW TO SHARE A SCREEN.

HOLD ON A MINUTE PLEASE.

YOU WILL LAUGH AT ME BECAUSE I'M NOT GOOD AT THIS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I JUST FOUND IT.

THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.

I SO APPRECIATE THAT.

HERE'S MY FLOW CHART, WHICH TRIES TO SHOW WHERE THERE ARE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO PROPOSALS.

I'M PROPOSING THAT WE STILL SUBMIT ITEMS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.

I THINK YOU SAID YOU WERE INTENDING FOR THE COUNCIL TO DO THAT.

A BIG DISTINCTION FOR ME IS ANOTHER THING THAT DOESN'T GO THROUGH THIS RIGOROUS ANALYSIS YOU ARE CALLING FOR ARE CITY MANAGER ITEMS.

AND I WOULD LIKE THOSE TO ALL GO THE COMMITTEE PROCESS.

THAT'S HOW THEY DO IT IN ON THE GROUND AND SAN FRANCISCO.

MY STAFF SPEND TIME LOOKING AT THOSE RULES.

IF IT'S A SIGNIFICANT THING, IT SHOULD BE USING THE SAME PROCESS THAT WE USE FOR OUR THINGS.

WE ARE THE BODY, WE APPROVE THE BUDGET AND THE ITEMS.

SO I WANT MAJOR ITEMS FROM THE CITY MANAGER TO ALSO GO TO THESE COMMITTEES.

AND I WANT TO DO IT ALL YEAR.

I ALSO WANT SOME OBJECTIVE CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING FROM THE AGENDA COMMITTEE, WHAT IS MAJOR.

I THINK RIGHT NOW THE LANGUAGE NEEDS TO BE TIGHTENED UP BUT IT IS A GOOD START.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I THINK WE NEED TO IS SAY BUDGET ITEMS MORE THAN "X" DOLLAR.

BUDGET ITEMS THE DOLLARS THAT CAUSE OPERATIONAL DIFFERENCES OR SOMETHING.

BUT WE NEED SOME CRITERIA IN THERE.

AND I WOULD HAVE THE POLICY COMMITTEES CONTINUE TO MEET DURING THE ENTIRE PERIOD.

AND AGAIN, KEEP THINGS FOR 120 DAYS MAXIMUM IN THE POLICY COMMITTEE HOPPER.

ALTHOUGH I THINK THE MAYOR WAS THINKING WE WANT TO EXTEND THAT TIME.

I THINK WE START WITH THE 120 AND IF WE NEED TO EXTEND, WE CAN ALWAYS GET ACCOMMODATIONS FROM OUR COLLEAGUES ON THAT.

ISSUING THE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AGAINST THE ENHANCED REVIEW CHECKLIST, WHICH IS I THINK IS REALLY CRITICAL.

GOES BACK TO THE AGENDA COMMITTEE.

THEN IT GOES TO COUNCIL MEETING.

THEN IT GOES TO ONE OR THE OTHER OF THE BUDGET PROCESSES

DEPENDING ON WHAT TIME OF YEAR YOU ARE IN THROUGH THE BUDGET COMMITTEE.

AND THEN IT'S ADOPTED AS PART OF THE BUDGET.

A COUPLE OF OTHER COMMENTS I WANTED TO MAKE.

I'M NOT CERTAIN I THINK ALL BUDGET PROPOSALS SHOULD AUTOMATICALLY ROLL TO THE NEXT PERIOD.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THE MAYOR HAS A UNIQUE AND DIFFERENT ROLE IN OUR GOVERNMENT.

WE DO HAVE A STRONG CITY MANAGER FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

AND WE DO HAVE A COLLABORATIVE COUNCIL IN WHICH HE SITS.

BUT THE CHARTER IS REALLY CLEAR THE MAYOR PRESENTS A BUDGET.

IF HE DOESN'T LIKE SOMETHING OR THINKS IT SHOULD NEVER BE

BUDGETED, I WANT HIM TO HAVE THAT OPPORTUNITY.

I'VE ACTUALLY NEVER SEEN YOU DO THAT.

BUT THERE COULD COME A TIME WHEN IT COULD HAPPEN.

AND SO I THINK THAT TAKING THAT AWAY FROM YOU IS NOT A GOOD

THING.

I DON'T THINK EVERYTHING SHOULD ROLL.

I THINK WE CAN HAVE A WORKING EXPECTATION THINGS WILL ROLL OVER

BUT I DON'T WANT EVERYTHING TO ROLL.

BECAUSE YOU MIGHT HAVE SOMETHING THAT ISN'T YOU THINK IS NOT A

GREAT IDEA OR THE CITY MANAGER MIGHT SAY THAT IS NEVER GOING TO

WORK BUDGETARILY SO DON'T DO THAT.

AND WE WANT TO MOVE ON WITH IT.

I ALSO FEEL WE HAVE TO VERY CLEARLY ESTABLISH THESE CRITERIA FOR

WHAT IS A SIGNIFICANT ITEM.

AND AGAIN IT SHOULD APPLY TO EVERYTHING FROM THE CITY MANAGER

AND FROM US.

AND ORDINANCES, REFERRALS AND BUDGET REQUESTS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

MOST OF THE PROBLEMS I'VE SEEN IN MY COMMITTEE ARE NOT
ORDINANCES.

WE ALREADY HAVE A GOOD PROCESS ON ORDINANCES.

THE PROBLEM ARE REFERRALS.

AND I WOULD BE PANICKED IF I WERE YOU I SAW THAT LONG LIST LIKE
OH, MY GOD.

I JUST CAN'T GET THROUGH IT.

SO WE DO NEED, AND I SHOULD HAVE SAID THIS IN A POSITIVE ASPECT
PARTS.

WE NEED AN ACTIVE PROCESS FOR GETTING RID OF REFERRALS.

AND I'M GOING TO SAY ON MY OWN BEHALF, I'M THE ONLY ONE IN THE
LAST THREE CYCLES THAT HAS IDENTIFIED OTHER PEOPLE'S REFERRALS
TO GET RID OF OTHER THAN MY OWN OR MY PREDECESSORS.

AND YOU KNOW WHAT, WE'VE SEEN THE ENEMY, AND IT IS US.

WE KEEP PUSH STUFF FORWARD.

WE DON'T WANT TO SAY NO TO EACH OTHER.

OUR PROBLEM IS US.

AND I THINK WE HAVE TO BE BRAVER IN SAYING I DON'T WANT TO
PRIORITIZE THIS AT ALL.

I DON'T CARE IF IT COMES IN 43.

I REALLY DON'T THINK WE SHOULD BE DOING THIS THING OR 43 FITS
WITH 22.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BECAUSE NOW I'M "D" AND I HAVE 43 ITEMS AND I'M NEVER GOING TO DO 43.

OKAY. IT'S NEVER GOING TO HAPPEN BUT IT IS STILL THERE.

SOMEBODY IS STILL GOING TO CALL AND SAY WHAT THE HECK HAPPENED TO THAT THING WITH THE REFRIGERATORS FOR THE HOMELESS, WHICH I NOTICED WAS STILL ON THE LIST LAST YEAR.

SO YOU KNOW, WE SHOULD KILL IT.

IF WE DON'T LIKE IT, LET'S GET RID OF IT.

LET'S BE BRAVE HERE, PEOPLE.

LET'S DO OUR JOB SO DEE CAN DO HERS.

I THINK THAT'S KIND OF ONE OF MY BASIC PREMISES HERE.

I WANT US TO BE A LOT OF MORE SYSTEMATIC ABOUT THAT REFERRAL LIST.

AND I THINK WITH THOSE CHANGES, I THINK THAT I LIKE THIS GENERAL FLOW.

AGAIN, A FEW THINGS I DON'T WANT POLICY COMMITTEES DOING A COUPLE THINGS I WANT BETTER DEFINED.

AND I DON'T WANT THIS LONG TIMELINE.

I THINK IT'S WAY TOO LONG.

WE CAN DO MORE WORK THAN THIS.

WE'VE BEEN DOING MORE WORK THAN THIS.

AND I THINK WOULD BE KEEP IT UP WITH SOME BETTER STANDARDS AND FORMS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

SO THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER HAHN.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: OKAY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

WE'LL GO TO COUNCILMEMBER HUMBERT.

>> M. HUMBERT: YES, THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.

THOSE TWO PRESENTATIONS ARE HARD ACTS TO FOLLOW CERTAINLY.

I WANT TO SAY HOW MUCH I APPRECIATE ALL OF THE WORK THAT AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE DID TO REVIEW AND SUMMARIZE THE PROPOSALS CURRENTLY ON THE TABLE.

AND TO ESPECIALLY THANK THE MAYOR, COUNCILMEMBER WENGRAF AND THEIR STAFF FOR THE WORK THEY DID TO CREATE THE MATRIX.

IT WAS A LOT OF MATERIAL.

THE MATRIX TO ME WAS REALLY HELPFUL IN BEING ABLE TO DO A MORE APPLES TO APPLE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE PROPOSALS THAT HAVE COME DOWN DURING A SIGNIFICANT PERIOD OF HISTORY.

AND HOW THEY WOULD POTENTIALLY IMPACT VARIOUS COMPONENTS OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS.

I ALSO WANT TO DEEPLY THANK COUNCILMEMBER HAHN FOR HER WORK IN PRESENTING A MORE STRUCTURED PROCESS THAT IMPLEMENTED WOULD CERTAINLY HELP ENSURE THE DETAILS AND POLICIES AND PROPOSALS ARE DRILLED INTO WELL BEFORE THEY REACH THE COUNCIL STAGE.

I ALSO WANT TO THANK COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON, ALONG WITH COUNCILMEMBERS TAPLIN AND ROBINSON FOR THEIR WORK TO PUT FORWARD AN ALTERNATIVE LEGISLATIVE CYCLE APPROACH.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I APPRECIATE HAVING DIFFERENT OPTIONS TO CONSIDER.

AND I THINK THIS ALTERNATIVE HAS SOME ADDITIONAL POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS.

INCLUDING SIMPLICITY THAT MERIT STRONG CONSIDERATION.

OVERALL THOUGH I HAVE TO AGREE, ALTHOUGH I AGREE THAT PROPOSALS SOMETIMES NEED MORE WORK BEFORE COMING TO COUNCIL, BASED ON MY LIMITED EXPERIENCE ON COUNCIL, I DON'T NECESSARILY FEEL THAT A LACK OF COMPLETENESS IS THE BIGGEST PROBLEM WE FACE IN TERMS OF COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO MAJOR ITEMS.

I THINK THAT OUR EXISTING COMMITTEE APPROACH AND EXTREMELY CAPABLE STAFF ALREADY DO A PRETTY GOOD JOB OF ENSURING ITEMS EITHER GET TO COUNCIL OR COME OUT OF COUNCIL IN DESCENT SHAPE. AND THERE IS ALSO THE FACT THAT COUNCIL WAS A POLICY SETTING BODY WITH IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATIONS BEING THE PROVINCE OF STAFF.

I DON'T KNOW THAT COUNCIL AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES GETTING EVEN MORE INTO THE WEEDS ON MINUTE DETAILS IS NECESSARILY GOING TO HELP STAFF DO THEIR JOBS.

IT MIGHT EVEN HAVE THE OPPOSITE EFFECT FOR POLICIES AND PROGRAMS AND HAVE LESS FLEXIBILITY.

THIS BRINGS ME TO WHAT I THINK IS THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM WITH OUR APPROACH TO LEGISLATING, WE DO TOO MUCH OF IT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I THINK THE CITY MANAGER HAS BEEN JUST ABOUT AS CLEAR AS SHE CAN BE IN TELLING US WE NEED TO SLOW OUR GENERATION OF REFERRALS WHEN IT COMES TO THE MAJOR POLICIES AND PROGRAMS COMING OFF OF THIS DAIS.

AND I JUST DON'T FEEL A LEGISLATIVE SEASON APPROACH REALLY TACKLES THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE.

THAT'S WHY I LEAN STRONGLY TOWARD USING MY PREDECESSOR FORMER COUNCILMEMBER DROSTE BE RIGHT PROPOSAL AS A STARTING POINT WORKING OUT FROM THERE.

IN GENERAL, I'M RELUCTANT TO SUPPORT A LEGISLATIVE OVER HAUL WITHOUT LIMITS ON COUNCIL ITEMS OR TIME OUR REWEIGHTED RANGE VOTING PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE TO TAKE PLACE BEFORE STAFF AND COMMITTEES REALLY DIVE INTO THE DETAILS OF PROPOSALS THAT COULD CLEAR OUT SOME OF THE ITEMS EFFICIENTLY.

THIS LEGISLATIVE SEASON APPROACH SEEMS POISED TO RESEARCH OUTREACH AND NATIONAL BURDENS ASSOCIATED WITH ANY GIVEN ITEM, BOTH FOR COUNCIL STAFF AND POTENTIALLY OTHER CITY STAFF.

WITHOUT SOME LIMITS ON COUNCIL ITEMS THIS PROPOSAL SEEMS LIKELY TO INCREASE THE COMPLEXITY AND WORKLOAD ASSOCIATED WITH ITEMS COMING FROM COUNCIL.

IN ADDITION, BECAUSE ALL MAJOR ITEMS WOULD BE HELD TO THE SAME TIMELINE OR SAME TIMELINES THESE INCREASED NEEDS FOR REVIEW

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

HEARINGS, AND ANALYSIS SEEM LIBEL TO EXACERBATE CRUNCH TIMES DURING THE YEAR AND POSSIBLY EVEN CREATE NEW ONES.

I THINK THAT THE HARRISON, TAPLIN, ROBINSON PROPOSAL IS BETTER THAT WOULD REDUCE STAFF EFFORTS AND AVOID GIVING COMMITTEES AN APPROPRIATE VETO POWER OVER COUNCIL REFERRALS.

AGAIN, THAT SAID, I STILL THINK THIS ALTERNATIVE ALSO GIVES SHORT SHIFT TO THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE, THE SHEER VOLUME OF COMPLEX AND WORK INTENSIVE POLICY AND PROGRAMS COMING OUT OF COUNCIL.

THIS REMAINS THE NUMBER ONE ISSUE TO ME.

AND THIS FEELS CONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE HEARD FROM THE CITY MANAGER.

I'M NOT GOING TO SUGGEST A MORATORIUM ON NEW MAJOR NONEMERGENCY ITEMS WOULD BE IN ORDER.

I'M SURE I WOULDN'T FIND SUPPORT AND MAYBE IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE BUT A CAP OF SOME SORTED AND PERHAPS A TEMPORARY NUMERICAL CAP IS WHAT WE SHOULD AIM FOR.

I DON'T FEEL LIKE IN SUPPORT ANY PROPOSAL THAT DOESN'T SET A FIRM LIMIT ON MAJOR COUNCIL ITEMS.

BUT I DO WANT TO THANK EVERYBODY FOR ALL THE REALLY COMPLICATED AND HARD WORK THAT THEY PUT IN ON THIS.

AND I'VE SPENT A LOT OF TIME LOOKING AT THESE PROPOSALS.

AND THANK YOU SO MUCH.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: OKAY.

COUNCILMEMBER HAHN WANT TO MAKE A CLARIFYING COMMENT.

AND THEN, ARE THERE ANY OTHER CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS THAT HAVE COMMENTS?

WE NEED TO TAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS AS WELL.

>> S. HAHN: THANK YOU.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON, I WANT TO BETTER UNDERSTAND.

I COMPLETELY AGREE WITH YOU THAT CITY MANAGER ITEMS WOULD ALSO BENEFIT FROM THE SAME REVIEW.

BUT I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHERE THAT COMES UP, BECAUSE MOST OF WHAT THEY BRING TO US ARE REFERRAL RESPONSES.

AND I WAS TRYING TO REMEMBER A TIME WHEN THE CITY MANAGER SORT OF BROUGHT US SOMETHING NEW THAT HADN'T BEEN REFERRED BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

THE ONLY THING I CAN THINK OF WAS THE KIOSKS IS WHEN THE REFERRAL RESPONSE COMES BACK THAT RESPONSE SHOULD THEN BE VETTED BY A COMMITTEE?

IF YOU COULD CLARIFY WHAT YOU MEAN BY THAT.

>> K HARRISON: YES, MANY PAST REFERRALS WERE SO VAGUE THAT WE, AND WE HAD COMPLETELY DIFFERENT PEOPLE ON COUNCIL THAT I WOULD HOPE THEY WOULD COME BACK TO US.

IF WE START DOING A BETTER JOB OF REFERRALS, THE WON'T BE AS BIG AN ISSUE.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I THINK SOMETIMES STAFFING IN THE DARK TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO RESPOND.

IT MIGHT NOT BE ON POINT WITH WHAT WE WERE THINKING.

I CAN'T THINK OF AN EXAMPLE.

THERE HAVE BEEN EXAMPLES ABOUT HOMELESS POLICY, SHE'S TRYING TO DO SOMETHING REASONABLE BUT MANY THINGS HAVE CHANGED IN THE LEGAL LANDSCAPE THAT HAVE CHANGED WHAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO OR NOT DO.

FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAD CERTAIN POLICIES ABOUT SLEEPING IN CARS AND THAT CHANGED AS YOU RECALL, THEN IT CAME BACK.

I THINK IF THAT'S GOING TO BE SOMETHING WITH A LOT OF IMPLICATIONS, IT SHOULD GO TO COMMITTEE.

>> S. HAHN: NOT NECESSARILY SOMETHING WRITTEN, A CHANGE IN POLICY.

>> K HARRISON: I THINK SHE WAS COMING BACK WITH CHANGE IN WRITTEN POLICY BASED ON CHANGE IN THE LAW.

>> S. HAHN: I SEE.

>> K HARRISON: SO I THINK AT THAT POINT DEPENDING ON HOW COMPLEX IT IS, CRITERIA, IT WOULD GO TO A COMMITTEE.

MANY THINGS AREN'T THAT COMPLEX.

SO OBUT AND STILL THINK THERE ARE ITEMS --

>> S. HAHN: YEAH.

>> K HARRISON: -- [MULTIPLE SPEAKERS]

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

>> S. HAHN: I WAS TRYING TO UNDERSTAND EXACTLY WHAT YOU WERE REFERRING TO.

WE'RE JUST TAKING NOTES AND WE'LL TAKE IT BACK TO THE AGENDA AND RULES COMMITTEE.

BUT I WONDERED, I THINK THE CITY MANAGER MIGHT HAVE HAD, MAYOR, IF I MAY, I THOUGHT IT LOOKED THE CITY MANAGER MIGHT HAVE A COMMENT ON THAT.

>> I JUST WANTED TO ECHO YOUR CONCERNS, COUNCILMEMBER HAHN, THAT WE RARELY IN EVER BRING FORWARD OUR OWN MAJOR, I DON'T BRING FORWARD POLICY.

I'M RESPONDING TO THIS BODY'S POLICY.

BUT IF THAT'S THE ROUTE THAT IS BEING RECOMMENDED WE BRING IT BACK TO A POLICY COMMITTEE BEFORE BRINGING IT TO THE FULL COUNCIL FOR ADOPTION, WE'RE OPEN TO THAT AS WELL.

>> S. HAHN: OKAY.

ANYTHING ELSE COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON, FOR US TO FULLY UNDERSTAND YOUR VISION ON THIS?

>> K HARRISON: AS AN EXAMPLE.

I THINK THE RESPONSE TO A.L.P.R.'S IS A GOOD EXAMPLE.

WE HAD A REFERRAL A LONG TIME AGO.

WE HAVE SO MUCH COMPLICATION, THE PARKING L.P.R.'S, THE OTHER CAMERAS THAT DID FINALLY GO TO PUBLIC SAFETY BUT IT WENT TO BUDGET FIRST.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND THAT WAS ODD.

SO IT'S REALLY NEED THAT NEEDED THAT PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
REVIEW.

AND YOU GUYS DID A GREAT JOB BUT THAT WAS A BIG DEAL.
IT IS THINGS LIKE THAT.

I DON'T THINK IT WILL COME UP EVERY DAY.

BUT WE'RE DEALING, YOU ARE DEALING WITH A LOT NOW, CITY MANAGER,
MADAM CITY ATTORNEY, COMPLICATED ITEMS, AND I THINK SOMETIMES
THEY BENEFIT FROM THAT FORUM.

THE COMMITTEES ARE BETTER FOR HAVING PUBLIC INPUT.

ONE REASON I LOVE THEM, WE REDUCED CONFUSION AT THE COUNCIL
ABOUT WHAT THINGS ARE.

IT'S BEEN VERY HELPFUL.

>> THANK YOU.

VERY HELPFUL FOR US TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE VISION ON THAT.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: COUNCILMEMBER ROBINSON.

>> R. ROBINSON: SURE.

GOOD AFTERNOON, I'LL TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO JUMP IN.

AND FIRST, THANK YOU TO THE AGENDA COMMITTEE WHO HAVE BEEN
ENGAGING WITH THE DISCUSSION AND INCREDIBLY DEEP LEVEL.

THE REST ARE STUCK OUTSIDE WITH OUR FACES PUSHED AGAINST THE
WINDOW EAVESDROPPING AND UNABLE TO PARTICIPATE.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

COUNCILMEMBER HAHN, IT IS SO MUCH EASIER FOR THE REST OF US TO
POKE AT PROPOSALS AND IDENTIFY THINGS WE'RE CRITICAL OF TO
ASSEMBLE FOR CONSIDERATION.

THANK FOR THE HEAVY LIFTING.

MY FEEDBACK IS LARGELY REFLECTED IN THE SERIES OF NOTES WITH
COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON.

I'M GLAD THE COMMITTEE WILL BE ABLE TO WEIGH THAT AND CONSIDER
ALL PATHS AVAILABLE TO US.

REALLY I THINK COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON, TAPLIN, AND I, IT'S NOT
REALLY A PROPOSAL.

IT'S A STRING OF IDEAS AND PRIORITIES REALLY FOR THE PROPOSAL
THAT I THINK WILL BE SHAPED BY THE AGENDA COMMITTEE.

I'LL FOCUS MY COMMENTS ON THE TINY HANDFUL OF THOUGHTS IN MY
TIME SITTING HERE.

ONE, WHICH I THINK COUNCILMEMBER HUMBERT ALLUDED TO, BUT WE
HAVEN'T TALKED TO SUPER DIRECTLY.

THE IDEA OF QUANTITATIVE LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF PIECES OF LIMITED
LEGISLATION THAT COUNCILMEMBERS AND INTRODUCE, THIS HAS BEEN
FLOATED BEFORE AND IT'S SOMETHING I THINK CANDIDLY INITIALLY I
HAD A BIT MORE HOSTILE OF A REACTION TO.

I THINK IT FELT A LITTLE UNDEMOCRATIC IF YOU WILL.

WE'RE REPRESENTATIVES OF OUR DISTRICTS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I THINK WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO INTRODUCE THE VOLUME OF LEGISLATION THAT OUR RESIDENTS EMPOWER US TO.

BUT THAT SAID, WE HAVE A REAL ISSUE HERE.

AND I THINK IF I'M A LITTLE HONEST WITH MYSELF, I THINK THERE IS PROBABLY NUMBERS OUT THERE, MAYBE IT'S FIVE.

A NUMBER OF MAJOR ITEMS THAT ONE COUNCIL MEMBER COULD INTRODUCE THAT IS HIGHER THAN THE NUMBER OF MAJOR ITEMS I OR SOMEONE WAS GOING TO INTRODUCE ANYWAY BUT COULD HAVE AN INTERESTING SELECTIVE AFFECT IN OUR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, TO EXERCISE JUST A LITTLE BIT MORE HESITATION TO VET AN IDEA JUST A LITTLE BIT MORE BECAUSE YOU KNOW THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY COST TO INTRODUCING IT.

THAT LEVEL OF ANALYSIS, THAT LEVEL OF PATIENCE, REALLY THAT LEVEL OF HESITATION I THINK IS VALUABLE.

AND COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON, AS YOU SAID, IF THE PROBLEM IS US, IT'S REALLY HARD TO DEFINE RULES THAT WILL SHAPE THAT.

BUT I THINK THERE IS PROMISE THERE.

I THINK THERE ARE LIMITS SO WE COULD PUT IN PLACE THAT REALLY DON'T MEANINGFULLY CURTAIL THE EXTENT TOO MUCH WE CAN BE INNOVATIVE AND PUT THINGS ON THE TABLE AND FORCE US TO ASK OURSELVES BEFORE WE THROW SOMETHING ON THE HOPPER IF IT'S THE HILL WE WANT TO DIE ON.

I'M RUMINATING ON THAT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

OPEN TO POSSIBILITY SAID THERE.

A LOT OF OTHER THINGS I LIKE THAT ARE IN THE MIX ACROSS PROPOSALS, I THINK REQUIRING THE ITEM GUIDELINES WE HAVE BE IN PLACE WOULD BE VALUABLE.

I'M CERTAINLY NOT ALWAYS THE BEST AT FOLLOWING THEM.

I THINK EXPLICIT CLARITY ABOUT ITEM DEADLINES FOR BUDGETING/IMPLEMENTATION WILL BE VALUABLE.

I THINK IT WILL BE GOOD, REALLY WE'RE DOING THIS CYCLE I THINK IT'S A GOOD PRACTICE TO MAKE PERMANENT TO BE CLEAR ABOUT WHAT THE ROLE OF BUDGET REFERRALS FOR A.A.O. ONE AND TWO SHOULD BE. AS ONE TIME OR SENSITIVE NEEDS.

THAT I THINK WOULD BE REALLY POSITIVE.

AND I CALLED TOGETHER A LIST OF THINGS I WOULDN'T EVEN SAY I'M OPPOSED TO BUT THINGS I WORRY A LITTLE ABOUT.

IN CONTEMPLATING SORT OF THE IDEA OF A SESSION.

OBVIOUSLY THAT WORKS AT A LOT OF OTHER LEVELS OF GOVERNMENTS.

I FIND MYSELF BEING ANXIOUS THE SURGES OF CERTAIN TYPES OF WORKLOAD AT CERTAIN TIMES MIGHT BE UNTENABLE.

I THINK OF THE WORK THAT OUR COMMITTEES ARE DOING RIGHT NOW SOMETIMES THEY EBB AND FLOW, SOMETIMES THEY HAVE SWELLS, SOMETIMES A LITTLE BACK LOG THAT TAKES MONTHS, SOMETIMES I GO FOUR MONTHS WITHOUT A LAND USE MEETING.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

TO DO THAT AT ONCE, TO HAVE PACKED AGENDAS FOR THAT COMMITTEE, WE HAVE A HARD TIME GETTING TO TWO AGENDA ITEMS AT THE COMMITTEE LEVEL.

I THINK AT OUR TUESDAY EVENING COUNCIL MEETINGS THERE IS OFTEN A LOT ON THE AGENDA AND WE HAVE AN INCENTIVE TO BE BRISK AND MAKE SURE WE GET TO WHATEVER ELSE WE HAVE.

I THINK THE BEAUTIFUL THING ABOUT THE POLICY COMMITTEE, WE CAN RUN IN CIRCLES AND ASK ALL SORTS TECHNICAL SMALL QUESTIONS TO REALLY VET SOMETHING AND SPEND THREE HOURS WITH ONE ITEM WORKSHOPPING IT.

AND SO I THINK I HAVE LOGISTICAL WORRIES ABOUT WHAT IT WOULD LOOK LIKE TO PACK THAT STAGE TO HAVE THE POLICY VETTING PROCESS FOR THE WHOLE CYCLE INTO A FEW MONTHS.

I SHARE AND WANT TO RESONATE WITH COMMENTS MADE ABOUT A ROLE FOR COMMITTEES PRIORITIZING OR SCORING ITEMS.

I THINK IT'S VERY VALUABLE THAT IS COMING FROM THE FULL COUNCIL. AND ALSO, WANTS US TO STIR AWAY FROM BEING LIMITED TO ONLY HAVING AUTHORS NOT CO-SPONSORS AT THE PRE-SUBMISSION STAGE.

I FLOAT AROUND A LOT OF IDEAS WITH COLLEAGUES AND I THINK HAVING THE OPPORTUNITY TO BRAINSTORM AND VET SOMETHING WITH OTHER COUNCILMEMBERS BEFORE I BRING IT FORWARD IS VALUABLE AND OFTEN RESULTS IN ME NOT INTRODUCING THINGS BECAUSE THERE IS A BETTER WAY TO GO ABOUT IT OR SOMETHING I DIDN'T KNOW.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THAT IS VALUABLE AND I DON'T WANT TO MAKE THAT HARDER TO DO.

IN SUMMATION, THANK YOU TO EVERYONE WHO PUT ITEMS ON THE TABLE.

I DO NOT ENVY THE COMMITTEE TO FIGURE OUT A PATH FORWARD.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: COUNCIL WENGRAF.

>> S. WENGRAF: YEAH, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

FIRST, I WANT TO THANK COUNCILMEMBER HAHN FOR DOING ALL OF THE HARD WORK.

AND TAKING ON THE BURDEN OF FORMULATING THIS WITH THE CLERK, CITY MANAGER AND PRESENTING IT TO US.

I THINK IT WAS A HUGE TASK.

AND I'M VERY GRATEFUL TO HER FOR DOING IT.

AND AS SHE EXPLAINED, THE MAYOR AND I COULD NOT PARTICIPATE BECAUSE OF THE BROWN ACT.

SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH, COUNCILMEMBER HAHN.

I ALSO WANT TO THANK COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON FOR PUTTING FORWARD AN ALTERNATIVE.

BUT THESE ARE NOT THE ONLY TWO THINGS THAT ARE BEFORE US.

WE CAN, BOTH OF THESE THINGS I CONSIDER JUMPING OFF POINTS FOR THE DISCUSSION.

AND I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST WE TAKE A STEP BACK AND THINK ABOUT WHAT OUR GOAL IS.

IT'S BEEN YEARS YOU KNOW, WE'VE HAD SO MANY PROPOSALS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM WE'RE TRYING TO SOLVE.

AND BOTH PROPOSALS BEFORE US ARE PRETTY COMPLEX.

I'M NOT SURE THAT LEVEL OF COMPLEXITY IS NECESSARY.

I THINK IT WAS COUNCIL HUMBERT WHO BROUGHT UP THE IDEA OF
LIMITING THE NUMBER OF ITEMS.

ORIGINALLY, YOU KNOW, I REMEMBER THE CITY MANAGER COMING TO US
AND BASICALLY BEGGING US TO STOP DOING MAJOR ITEMS BECAUSE STAFF
WAS SO OVERWHELMED.

AND I THINK THERE IS STILL A BACKLOG.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT IT IS.

BUT MAYBE 90 ITEMS OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

YOU KNOW, GIVEN THE STAFFING SITUATION MAYBE WHAT WE DECIDE TO
DO WILL BE TEMPORARY.

MAYBE WE CAN LINK IT TO STAFFING.

BUT I THINK THERE IS AN URGENCY IN US DOING SOMETHING RIGHT NOW
TO ALLEVIATE THE PROBLEM THAT STAFF IS FACING, WHICH IS THAT
THEY JUST CAN'T DEAL WITH EVERYTHING WE'RE GIVING THEM.

SO I WOULD LIKE TO AT OUR NEXT, WHEN WE DISCUSS THIS AGAIN, I
DON'T THINK WE'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO MAKE A DECISION TONIGHT,
ARE WE MAYOR?

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: WE'RE NOT MAKING A DECISION TONIGHT.

>> S. WENGRAF: YEAH, OKAY.

SO I WOULD LIKE TO REVISIT THE GOAL.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND REVISIT THE PROBLEM THAT WE'RE TRYING TO SOLVE.

BECAUSE I CERTAINLY DON'T WANT TO REPLACE A NEW BUNCH OF BUREAUCRATIC AND VERY COMPLICATED PROCEDURES WITH WHAT WE HAVE NOW.

I'M NOT SURE THAT IS GOING TO FIX ANYTHING.

SO THAT'S MY SUGGESTION FOR TONIGHT.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

VICE MAYOR BARTLETT.

>> B. BARTLETT: THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.

I WANT TO THANK COUNCILMEMBER HAHN FOR YOUR DILIGENT WORK.

DEEP, DEEP WORK HERE.

SCHEMATICS OF A MICROCHIP.

[LAUGHTER]

>> B. BARTLETT: AND THANK YOU, AS WELL, COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON FOR YOUR APPROACH, COUNCILMEMBER ROBINSON, COAUTHORING.

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS THROUGH THERE YEARS.

AND YOU KNOW, A COUPLE OF THINGS COME TO MIND.

ONE, YOU KNOW, I THINK JUST A KNEE JERK I HAVE A KNEE JERK

RESPONSE WHEN I FUNDAMENTALLY TEND NOT TO SUPPORT LIMITATIONS ON DEMOCRACY AND REPRESENTATION.

BUT YOU HAVE ANSWERS SOME OF THE ISSUES WITH THE EXCEPTIONS YOU PROVIDE TO TIME CRITICAL MEASURES.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BUT I GUESS THE REAL QUESTION IS, AND IT'S THIS KIND OF HARKENS TO WHAT COUNCILMEMBER WENGRAF JUST MENTIONED.

DOES ANYONE KNOW HOW MANY MAJOR ITEMS THE COUNCIL PRODUCED IN THE LAST YEAR?

I CAN'T THINK OF TOO MANY.

THERE ANY DATA ON THAT?

>> I'LL SAY I THINK JUST GOING OFF OF THE FLOW THROUGH THE AGENDA COMMITTEE, OBVIOUSLY NOTHING SCIENTIFIC, BUT I THINK DURING THE PANDEMIC WE SORT OF HAD A UNSPOKEN AGREEMENT.

THAT WE WERE GOING TO LEAVE THE

>> S. HAHN: CITY MANAGER TO ADDRESS THE PANDEMIC.

SO THE FLOW WENT DOWN.

AND SINCE THAT IS LIFTED I WOULD SAY THE FLOW OF MAJOR ITEMS IS LOWER THAN IT WAS BEFORE THE PANDEMIC.

MAYOR, WOULD THAT?

I MEAN, IF YOU LOOK AT FOR EXAMPLE OUR AGENDA TONIGHT, I THINK IT'S THE FIRST TIME IN MY TIME ON THE AGENDA COMMITTEE THAT WE ACTUALLY DON'T HAVE AN ACTION ITEM EITHER FROM STAFF OR FROM THE COUNCIL --

I THINK PEOPLE ARE BEING MORE I DON'T KNOW, RESTRAINED.

>> B. BARTLETT: THAT WAS MY ANECDOTAL OBSERVATION AS WELL.

IT SEEMS WE UNDERSTAND THE STAFF IS OVERWHELMED.

WE LOST MANY MEMBERS OF OUR TRANSPORTATION DIVISION.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I SEE US WITHHOLDING AND WAITING FOR THINGS TO NORMALIZE.

I FOR ONE HAVE TAKEN MUCH TIME TO WORK WITH CITY STAFF ON MAJOR ITEMS THAT ARE IN DEVELOPMENT.

AND MAYBE DO ONE THIS YEAR.

WHICH SHOULD BE AMAZING TOO.

I CAN'T WAIT TO SHARE WITH YOU ALL.

[LAUGHTER]

>> B. BARTLETT: YOU KNOW, BUT THE YOU KNOW, THE LEANING INTO LEGISLATION THAT IS, AND THIS IS WHAT WE DO THROUGH THE PROCESS, THROUGH THE COMMITTEE PROCESS, WHICH I'M A FAN OF, IT HELPS YOU THINK IT THROUGH.

WE HELP OTHERS COME WITH THEIR -- WE LEND OUR EXPERTISE AND GROUP KNOWLEDGE AND HELP AUTHOR REFINE THEIR WORK.

WE HELP THEM SIMPLIFY THEIR WORK.

AND SO I THINK THIS MEASURE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT TO UNDERSTAND IS PRIORITIZATIONS, THEY KIND OF NEED THE SAME PROCESS, THEY NEED TO BECOME SIMPLIFIED.

THIS IS TOO COMPLEX.

THERE IS A MORE ELEGANT WAY.

PARTICULARLY IN THE LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE COUNCIL APPEARS TO BE RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF THE BUREAUCRACY.

BUT NOT GIVING THEM ANYTHING TO DO.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

IT SEEMS LIKE WE MAY NOT NEED TO OVERLAY THIS MUCH BUREAUCRATIC TO SOMETHING THAT IS NOT EXISTING RIGHT NOW.

WITH ALSO ANOTHER QUESTION, DOES THIS KEEP THE R.V. V. PROCESS AS WELL OR SUPPLANT IT?

>> S. HAHN: I THINK THE IDEA WAS THAT WHEN YOU DON'T HAVE A BIG BACK LOG OF OLD ITEMS THAT HAVEN'T BEEN IMPLEMENTED AND YOU HAVE A RESTRICTED FLOW BASICALLY MORE BASED ON QUALITY THEN ON QUOTAS, BY RAISING OUR STANDARDS, THE IDEA WOULD BE THAT LESS WOULD BE GOING FORWARD.

THEN THE PRIORITIZATION BECOMES MUCH EASIER.

YOU ARE NOT PRIORITIZING 100 ITEMS, MAYBE 15 OR 20.

AND MAYBE YOU USE R.R.V. OR MAYBE THERE IS ANOTHER PROCESS.

IT DEFINITELY DID NOT RECOMMEND GETTING RID OF IT.

BUT THE IDEA WAS THAT IT WOULD ESSENTIALLY BECOME LARGELY MOOT.

>> B. BARTLETT: IF UNDER THIS PROPOSAL YOU HAVE TO WAIT 16 MONTHS TO SUBMIT SOMETHING OR THEN YOU GET R.R.V.ED TO THE BOTTOM OF THE LIST, YOU EFFECTIVELY DENIED THE RESIDENTS WHO PAY EXORBITANT PROPERTY TAXES AND RENTED, THE OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE SOMETHING THEY CARE ABOUT SEEN BY THE COUNCIL.

FOR NEXT, THAT PERSON IS OUT OF OFFICE.

IT'S OVER.

YOU ARE TALKING SEVEN YEARS LATER.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND TRUST ME, I LIVED HERE SEVEN YEARS CYCLES OF LEGISLATION AND IT TAKES DILIGENCE TO SEE IT THROUGH.

AGAIN, I DON'T THINK -- I DON'T SEE THE NEED TO KEEP ADDING SO MUCH TIME AND DISTANCE BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THEIR ASPIRATIONS.

AND THEN, THE CO-SPONSOR'S MEASURE, COUNCILMEMBER ROBINSON BROUGHT IT UP.

I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT FOR COLLEAGUES AND COUNCILMEMBERS TO THINK THROUGH THE STRATEGIES AND YOU KNOW, IT'S PART OF THE KEY TO SUCCESS.

YOU KNOW, NEWER COUNCILMEMBERS COME ON AND TEAM UP WITH OTHERS AND FIGURE OUT HOW TO WIN THE RIGHT COMBINATIONS, I THINK IT'S A GOOD PROVING GROUND FOR LEGISLATION BECAUSE IN THE DAY THE AUTHORS GOAL IS TO GET IT PASSED ON BEHALF OF THE CONSTITUENTS WHO REQUESTED IT OR BENEFIT FROM THEM.

SO I THINK WE NEED TO BAN THEIR ABILITY TO STRATEGIZE ESSENTIALLY.

RIGHT?

AND GET HELP TOO. RIGHT?

AND THEN, LASTLY, I DO SUPPORT ATTACKING THE BACKLOG QUEUE.

SPECIAL TOPIC NUMBER FOUR.

I THINK THAT'S IMPORTANT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

SITTING ON THIS DEEP BENCH OF MATERIALS THAT IS RAPIDLY TURNING FROM COAL INTO DIAMONDS AS IT SITS THE TECTONIC PRESSURE OF BUREAUCRATIC TIME, RIGHT?

YES, ABSOLUTELY, I THINK THAT'S IMPORTANT.

WE SHOULD GO THROUGH THIS AND GET THESE THINGS DEALT WITH.

THOSE ARE MY POINTS.

THAT'S ALL.

I THINK ULTIMATELY, I DON'T THINK ANY OF THIS IS NECESSARY.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON, AGAIN.

>> K HARRISON: I WANT TO ANSWER COUNCILMEMBER BARTLETT'S

QUESTION ABOUT MY PROPOSAL DOES NOT GET RID OF R.R.V.

IT'S STILL THERE.

I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD DO IT AT THE COMMITTEE LEVEL.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: OKAY.

THANK YOU.

ARE THERE ANY OTHER CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS THAT HAVE COMMENTS?

COUNCILMEMBER WENGRAF?

>> S. WENGRAF: YES.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: OKAY.

>> S. WENGRAF: YEAH, I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT YOU KNOW, THE STAFF ISN'T JUST WORKING ON OUR ITEMS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I MEAN, THEY HAVE TO WORK ON ALL KINDS OF OTHER STUFF AS WELL.
AND THEY HAVE PARTNERS, THE SCHOOL BOARD, THE RENT BOARD, YOU
KNOW, ALL OF THESE STATE AGENCIES THAT THEY HAVE TO WORK WITH.
SO I THINK WE'RE BEING A LITTLE NEAR SIGHTED WHEN WE THINK THAT
STAFF ONLY WORKS WITH OUR ITEMS.

I THINK THEIR WORKLOAD IS HUGE.

AND WE'RE ONLY THINKING OF A LITTLE PART OF IT.

SO MAYBE IT WOULD BE ACTUALLY HELPFUL FOR US TO KNOW MORE ABOUT
WHAT THE DEMANDS ARE ON THE DEPARTMENTS FROM ALL OF OUR
PARTNERING AGENCIES.

SO THAT WE WOULD HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING AND A BETTER
PERSPECTIVE ON THE WORKLOAD.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: THANK YOU.

SO FOLLOWING UP ON THAT POINT, I RECALL I THINK IT WAS THE LAST
BIENNIAL BUDGET PROCESS, WE GOT A COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF
OUTSTANDING COUNCIL REFERRALS THAT HAD NOT BEEN PRIORITIZED I
BELIEVE.

AND WE DO GET STATUS UPDATES FROM THE CITY MANAGER ON THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNCIL REFERRALS, SHORT TERM AND LONG TERM.
AND WE HAD THAT DATABASE.

BUT I DO THINK, YOU KNOW, AT SOME POINT YOU KNOW PROBABLY
LEADING UP TO THE NEXT BUDGET DEVELOPMENT, I THINK GOING OVER

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THAT LIST AGAIN WOULD BE HELPFUL BECAUSE THINGS MAYBE OBSOLETE OR REDUNDANT.

I SEEM TO RECALL MULTIPLE REFERRALS ABOUT ADU POLICY OR HOUSING POLICY, MULTIPLE FIRE SAFETY RECOMMENDATIONS.

AND YOU KNOW, WE MAY BE ABLE TO FIND A WAY TO CONSOLIDATE OR ELIMINATE REDUNDANT OR OBSOLETE COUNCIL REFERS SO WE CAN FOCUS ON THE THINGS WE THINK ARE RELEVANT AND WE WANT TO HAVE STAFF DEDICATE TIME TO ADDRESS.

SO I HEAR THAT AS AN OVERARCHING AGREEMENT AMONGST COUNCIL WE NEED TO LOOK AT DEALING WITH THE QUOTE, BACK LOG.

I HOPE WE CAN WHETHER IT'S THROUGH NEW PROCESS OR JUST LEADING UP TO THE BUDGET ADOPTION, WE CAN DO THAT.

I THOUGHT THAT WAS VERY HELPFUL.

SO MAYBE IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE R.R.V. PROCESS THAT MAYBE ONE WAY TO DO IT BEFORE THE R.R.V. PROCESS.

I'M SURE ASSOCIATION WITH THE APPRECIATE IF WE CAN CLARIFY AND REDUCE THE OUTSTANDING NUMBER OF ITEMS.

SO WITH THAT, WHY DON'T WE PROCEED TO PUBLIC COMMENT.

ANY MEMBER HERE THAT WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO THE ITEM ON OUR 4:00 P.M. SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA, THE CITY COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE SYSTEMS REDESIGN?

YES, MISS MOROSOVIC.

>> THANK YOU.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I ATTENDED THE JUNE 29TH RETREAT.

AND I HEARD THE CITY MANAGER'S FRUSTRATION, AND TOTALLY UNDERSTOOD IT.

HOW THERE WERE TOO MANY ITEMS THAT WERE POSSIBLE FOR STAFF TO POSSIBLY IMPLEMENT PROPERLY.

AND IT SEEMED AS IF SOME ITEMS COULD BE CONSOLIDATED AS THE MAYOR JUST MENTIONED AND SOME COULD BE FOLDED INTO ONE ANOTHER.

I UNDERSTAND THAT'S CHANGED THAT THERE AROUND AS MANY ITEMS COMING BEFORE COUNCIL BUT THERE ARE STILL OUTSTANDING ITEMS THAT ARE OUT THERE.

THERE IS A NEED FOR TIME CRITICAL ITEMS FOR OBVIOUS REASONS, STATE LAWS CHANGE, FEDERAL LAWS CHANGE, AND FUNDING CHANGES THAT COMES IN.

AND SO YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO HAVE TIME CRITICAL ITEMS THAT CANNOT BE LIMITED IN NUMBER IF THEY ARE GENERALLY TIME CRITICAL ITEMS.

THERE IS A NEED TO WORK WITH COMMISSIONS.

NOT ONLY HAS TO REFERRALS TO THEM, BUT ALSO REFERRALS FROM THEM.

NOW, THIS IS PERHAPS A SEPARATE ITEM.

BUT I BELIEVE IT'S IMPORTANT TO HAVE TRANSPARENCY TO THE PUBLIC SO THE PUBLIC NEEDS TO SEE WHAT STAFF IS DOING.

OR RATHER WHAT COUNCIL IS DOING, BUT ALSO WHAT STAFF IS DOING IN TERMS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ITEMS THAT PASSED BEFORE YOU.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I'M GOING TO RAISE THAT THE AGENDA, HOMELESS COMMISSION BROUGHT AN ITEM BEFORE THE AGENDA COMMITTEE THAT WAS PASSED IN EARLY 2020.

AND IT SOMEHOW STAYED AT THE AGENDA COMMITTEE LEVEL.

AND THAT WAS THAT ALL THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS FROM

VARIOUS COMMISSIONS BECOME COMPILED ONLINE AND IN A BINDER SO THEY COULD BE TRACKED HOW THEY GO TO COUNCIL.

AND ALSO, IN TERMS OF IMPLEMENTATION.

AND THIS IS IMPORTANT, NOT ONLY FOR INFORMATION SHARING BETWEEN COMMISSIONS BUT ALSO FOR COUNCIL TO KNOW WHAT COMMISSIONS IS DOING, FOR STAFF TO FOLLOW IT, AND ALSO FOR TRANSPARENCY TO THE PUBLIC.

AND I HOPE THAT THIS IS ACTED ON.

EDIS GOING TO GIVE ME HIS TWO MINUTES, RIGHT?

THANK YOU. SO LET ME GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE HOW DIFFICULT IT IS TO RESEARCH AN ITEM.

AND I THINK THE SAME THING HAPPENS WITH COUNCIL ITEMS THAT, AGAIN, THERE HAS TO BE THIS TRANSPARENCY TO THE PUBLIC.

ON THE COMMISSION OF STATUS OF WOMEN, I WANTED TO RESEARCH WHAT IS HAPPENING WITH PREVIOUS ITEMS THAT I WOULD NOT HAVE EVEN KNOWN THESE ITEMS EXISTED EXCEPT I'VE BEEN ATTENDING COUNCIL MEETINGS GENERALLY FOR THE LAST 17 YEARS.

SO I RECALLED SOMETHING ABOUT SMALL BUSINESSES AND WOMEN.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I RECALLED IT PASSED BEFORE COUNCIL SEVERAL YEARS AGO.

I RECALLED OVER 10 YEARS AGO, THIS WAS SOMETHING ON SEX

TRAFFICKING THAT CAME FROM THE STATUS OF WOMEN.

I WOULDN'T HAVE KNOWN HAD I NOT ATTENDED THOSE ITEMS.

I WENT TO THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE, WHO IS EXCELLENT AT DOING THE RESEARCH.

BUT I AM VERY RESPONSIVE.

HAD TO KEEP GOING BACK AND SAY WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT AFTER THAT.

WHERE IS SETTING, DID IT JUST DIE?

AND IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT WE HAVE THIS INFORMATION, AGAIN, FOR COMMISSIONS, FOR COUNCIL, FOR STAFF, AND FOR THE PUBLIC.

WE HAVE TO BE TRANSPARENT ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: OKAY.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

ARE THERE ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC HERE IN THE BOARDROOM AT 1231 ADDISON THAT WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO ITEM ONE, THE COUNCIL'S REDESIGN.

I'LL ASK ARE THERE SPEAKERS ON ZOOM, PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND.

MONI LAW.

>> GOOD EVENING, MAYOR AND COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I AM JUST VERY THANKFUL FOR EVERYONE'S HARD WORK AND MY COUNCILMEMBER, KATE HARRISON AND OTHERS WHO MAY HAVE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

I UNDERSTAND THIS IS GOING BACK TO AGENDA COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW. I WANTED TO MAKE A QUICK REFLECTION AND IMPORTANCE OF THE OPENNESS OF CONTINUED DEMOCRACY.

AND I APPRECIATE COUNCILMEMBER BARTLETT'S COMMENT ABOUT NOT DISTANCING THE PEOPLE FROM THE PROCESS.

AND TO ENSURE THIS OPEN SPACE FOR OUR ASPIRATIONS TO GROW.

WITH THAT IN MIND, I'M THINKING OF THE MAYOR'S FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING WORK GROUP THAT I'M THANKFUL FOR THE MAYOR HAVE APPOINTED ME TO THAT.

AND ALL THE WORK THAT PEOPLE ON THE REIMAGINING TASK FORCE FOR CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS TO PREVENT VIOLENCE AND KEEP US SAFE IN ALL WAYS FROM EDUCATION, ECONOMIC SECURITY, AND POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY.

THOSE PROPOSALS ARE IMPORTANT AND TIME SENSITIVE AND SHOULDN'T BE CONSTRAINED OR PUSHED OUT TO A YEAR LATER.

OR YEAR AND A HALF LATER.

SO TIME LOST IS -- JUSTICE AND GOOD POLICY AND BASIC GOVERNANCE AS DELAYED.

AND SO WE REALLY HAVE A BEAUTIFUL COMMUNITY IN BERKELEY.

I DON'T WANT IT PUT TO THE SIDE AND TOO MANY BITS AND PIECES.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

WE SHOULD HAVE A HOLISTIC CONSTRUCTIVE PROCESS THAT IS OPEN AND OTHERS SAID, TRANSPARENT AND AVAILABLE.

FINALLY, I WANT TO KIND OF SAY THAT WITH REGARD TO BUDGETS AND ALL THE OTHER THINGS THAT WAS SAID, SHE WOULD POINT OUT TO THE BUDGET AND FINANCING ISSUES THAT COME UP.

AND FINALLY, THERE ARE SO MANY THINGS WE HAD AN EXHIBIT "D" WAS CALLED, PART OF THE CITY MANAGER'S ATTACHMENT, AS I RECALL OF THE THINGS THAT HAD NOT BEEN COMPLETED.

I THINK WE COULD HAVE CONTINUED TO CHISEL ON THAT.

I BELIEVE IT'S WORKED ON I HOPE BECAUSE THERE ARE A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT PARTS OF GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES THAT NEED TO BE COMPLETED IN THAT EXHIBIT "D" AS I BELIEVE IT WAS REFERENCED FOR ALL OF THE BACK UP WORK THAT NEEDED TO BE DONE STILL.

I HOPE AS A CITY WORKER MYSELF, WE DO WORK HARD BUT WE ALSO WANTED TO MAKE THE BEST CITY WE CAN.

THANK YOU SO MUCH.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

ARE THERE ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ZOOM WHO WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO ITEM ONE, THE CITY COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE SYSTEMS REDESIGN?

ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?

THIS IS THE LAST CALL.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

OKAY.

THANK YOU.

WE'LL CLOSE PUBLIC COMMENT.

AND COLLEAGUES, I'LL ASK ARE THERE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

COUNCILMEMBER KESARWANI.

>> R. KESARWANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR.

AND THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER HAHN, FOR YOUR PROPOSAL.

AND COUNCILMEMBERS HARRISON, ROBINSON, AND TAPLIN, FOR YOUR PROPOSAL AS WELL.

I DID WANT TO JUST TURN TO THE CITY MANAGER.

BECAUSE I WAS LOOKING BACK AT THE AUDITOR'S RECORD REPORT ON THE STAFFING.

SHE DID NOTE WORKLOAD ISSUES.

DRIVEN IN PART BY COUNCIL ITEMS BUT ALSO BY UNDERSTAFFING AND VACANCIES AS WELL.

AND SO I WANTED TO ASK THE CITY MANAGER FROM WHERE YOU SIT TODAY, COULD YOU HELP US JUST HONE IN ON WHAT YOU SEE AS THE MAJOR PROBLEMS IN TERMS OF MANAGING WORKLOAD IN TERMS OF WHAT IS RECEIVED BY COUNCIL.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMEMBER KESARWANI.

THERE ARE A NUMBER OF THE THINGS THAT INFLUENCE HOW QUICKLY WE CAN IMPLEMENT TURN AROUND LEGISLATION AND PRODUCT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THERE ARE LOTS OF THINGS.

BUT I THINK HALL MARK TO WHAT WE DO HERE AT THE CITY IS THE MATH WE WANT TO BE THOUGHTFUL ABOUT THE WORK WE'RE DOING FOR YOU ALL AND FOR THE COMMUNITY.

SO THERE IS A BIG COMMUNITY PIECE THAT IS THERE FOR US AS WELL.

I THINK THAT DRIVES US LOTS OF WHAT WE DO AS IN TERMS OF STAFF AND HOW WE PROCESS INFORMATION AND GATHER INFORMATION.

STAFFING, WE ARE IN A STAFFING CRISIS.

WE'VE KNOWN THAT FOR QUITE SOME TIME.

WE'RE CHIPPING AWAY AT IT AND DOING WELL AT CHIPPING AWAY AT GETTING NEW HIRES ONBOARD.

ADDRESSING ISSUES WHERE WE HAVE DIFFICULT TO FILL POSITIONS.

WE'RE DOING A GREAT JOB IN THAT REGARD.

WHEN IT COMES TO THE NUMBER, THIS IS ABOUT VOLUME FOR US TRULY.

WE MAKE OUR OWN WORK TOO.

SO LET'S TALK ABOUT THAT A LITTLE BIT.

BECAUSE WE DEVELOP A STRATEGIC PLAN.

WHERE DEPARTMENTS PUT IN 30 OR 40 TYPES OF PROGRAMS THEY WANTED TO DO TO IMPROVE COMMUNITY SERVICE, AND TO WORK HARDER, WHETHER THAT IS ABOUT HOW WE DEVELOP ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS, TO HIRE THE BEST EMPLOYEES, TO TRAINING, TO WHATEVER IT IS, WE HAD OUR OWN SET OF INITIATIVES COMING THROUGH THE STRATEGIC PLAN AS WELL.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

ON TOP OF THAT WE HAD REFERRALS.

SO WE AT ONE POINT WE HAD OVER 300 REFERRALS.

AND I WOULD PROBABLY REDUCE THAT TO ABOUT 250.

NOW WE'RE DOWN TO 80 TO 90 REFERRALS.

I THINK THE OTHER THING THAT KIND OF CHALLENGED US IS THAT THESE THINGS WOULD COME IN AT VARIOUS TIMES THROUGH THE YEAR AND IT WILL BE A START STOP FOR US.

WE WOULD START THE WORK ON A PROJECT.

AND THEN WE WOULD GET TWO OR THREE NEW PROJECTS THAT WOULD REQUIRE US TO STOP AND RESTART.

SO THAT CREATED BACK LOG FOR THOSE PRIOR AS WE START LIFTING UP NEW.

WE WERE UNABLE TO SHIFT AND BE AS FLEXIBILITY AS WE WOULD LIKE TO BE IN TERMS OF ADDRESSING AND IMPLEMENTING THAT POLICY.

WHOLE STAFFING HAS BEEN AN ISSUE FOR US, I THINK PRIORITIES KNOWING WHAT THEY ARE FOR THE CITY HAS BEEN SOMETHING I'VE BEEN CHALLENGED WITH IN TRYING TO ADDRESS WHAT ARE OUR TRUE PRIORITIES ACROSS-THE-BOARD AND HOW DO I GET TO WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO THIS COUNCIL FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD SO I HAVE THAT IN MY QUEUE.

SO WE'VE USED R.R.V. TO TRY AND GATHER THAT AS A PRIORITY BASE FOR US TO LAUNCH AND COMPLETE INITIATIVES AND WORK.

I THINK WE'VE DONE WELL WITH THAT.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

WE'VE NOT ALWAYS BEEN ABLE TO ADDRESS THE NUMBER-ONE PRIORITY BECAUSE BEEN, REMEMBER THE YEAR PRIOR WE WORKED ON NEW INITIATIVE SAID.

THOSE ARE EITHER UNDERWAY OR NOT STARTED. ESPECIALLY IF YOU ARE A DEPARTMENT WITH FIVE OR 10 REFERRALS THAT COME TO YOU.

SO IT'S NOT ONLY THE AMOUNT AND NUMBERS.

WE ALSO GET LOTS OF PROJECTS FROM STATE AGENCIES, OUR LOCAL PARTNERS, OUR COMMISSIONS, AND OF COURSER, WITH POLICY COMMITTEES WE'RE DOING WORK WITH THEM AS WELL.

OUR PLATES ARE EXTREMELY FULL GENERALLY.

BUT WHAT I THINK IS HELPFUL FOR US IS NOT GOING TO BE THE A CONVOLUTED OR COMPLEX PROCESS.

I AGREE.

I THINK WE DON'T WANT TO PUT IN SOME COMPLICATED OR YOU KNOW, PROCESS THAT IS GOING TO RENDER US PARALLELIZED IN TERMS OF INITIATIVES I'M NOT SAYING THESE ARE DOING THAT.

MY POINT IS WE DON'T WANT TO PUT TOO MUCH IN THERE.

WHAT IS HELPFUL FOR ME AS THE CITY MANAGER WHICH I SHARED BEFORE IS HAVING CORE PRIORITIES.

EVERYTHING CAN'T BE AN EMERGENCY OR AT THE SAME LEVEL OF PRIORITY AS -- THEY ALL CAN'T HAVE EQUAL PRIORITY FOR US.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

BECAUSE AND WE DON'T WANT TO SHIFT EVERY TIME THERE IS A NEW THING.

BUT WE'RE SHIFTING AND WE PUT SOMETHING ON THE BACK BURNER, WE START ANEW.

WHAT IS HELP IF ME, IF WE TRULY HAVE A PROCESS, WE CAN LEAN IN AND SAY, YOU GOT THESE 30 MAJOR INITIATIVES OR THINGS YOU ARE WORKING ON, THESE 20 WE WANT YOU TO PUT ON HOLD SO YOU CAN GET THEM DONE AND COME BACK TO THESE.

WE KNOW WHAT WE'RE PUTTING ON HOLD, WE KNOW WHAT IS STOPPED OR YIELDED.

RIGHT NOW WE TRY TO PECK AT ALL OF THEM AND NEVER GET ALL YOU HAVE THEM DONE.

IT WOULD BE GOOD TO KNOW IF WE HAVE A PROCESS TO ALLOW US TO COME TO YOU AND SAY, WE'VE GOT THIS SIX YOU HAVE GIVEN US TO WORK ON, WE NEED TO MOVE THESE FIVE TO THE BACK BURNER.

THAT IS HELPFUL SO EXPECTATIONS FOR THE COMMUNITY AND COUNCIL AND STAFF ARE CLEAR.

SO WHENEVER WE HAVE NEW THINGS THAT ARE GOING TO IMPACT OLD THINGS, WE NEED TO PUT SOMETHING ON HOLD.

AND I THINK A CLEAR PROCESS TO DO SO WOULD BE HELPFUL.

I THINK THE COMPLEXITY OF THE WORK THAT WE DO IS SOMETIMES NOT SEEN.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

THE WORK THAT COMES FROM NOT ONLY THE COUNCIL BUT OUR DEPARTMENTS AS WELL, OUR COMMISSIONS AND PARTNERS OUT THERE, STATE AGENCIES, THAT WORK IS COMPLICATED, DETAILED AND IT'S HARD.

SO AS WE'RE TRYING TO CHALLENGE OUR WAY THROUGH ALL OF THAT IT TAKES TIME.

TO ME THOSE ARE THE THINGS THAT KIND OF IMPACT THIS WORK. AND THE WORKLOAD FOR ME AS CITY MANAGER.

THANK YOU FOR GIVING ME A MOMENT TO SAY ALL OF THAT.

I APPRECIATE IT.

>> R. KESARWANI: THANK YOU, MADAM CITY MANAGER.

I APPRECIATE HEARING THAT.

I THINK IT'S NOT ALWAYS CLEAR TO ME AND PERHAPS NOT TO MY COLLEAGUES WHAT EXACTLY IS ON YOUR PLATE.

AND I DO KNOW SOME OF THE MY COLLEAGUES TALKED ABOUT EXAMPLES, THINKING ABOUT THE ACCESSORY DWELLING ORDINANCE THE OTHER NIGHT. WE DID ADD TWO REFERRAL SAID AND PART OF WHAT I UNDERSTOOD FROM THE PLANNING DIRECTOR WAS DOING THAT SURVEY YOU KNOW THAT'S ADDITIONAL STAFF TIME POTENTIALLY, MAYBE NOT SO MUCH IF WE USE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATA.

I WAS THINKING ABOUT STATE MANDATES AS IT RELATES TO THE HOUSING ELEMENT AND DEADLINES WE HAVE TO ATTEMPT TO LIVE UP TO.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

AND SO I THINK THAT'S AN EXAMPLE WHERE WE HAVE GIVEN MORE REFERRALS NOW TO THAT DEPARTMENT BUT THAT DOESN'T TAKE AWAY THE STATE MANDATES AND THINGS THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN PROCESS THAT HAVE TO BE COMPLETED.

SO I KNOW OUR AGENDAS IS GOING TO TAKE THIS BACK.

AND SOLVE IT ALL IN THE NEXT MEETING PROBABLY IN SHORT ORDER.

SO IN ANY CASE, I WANT TO THANK THOSE WHO THOUGHT ABOUT THIS AND YEAH, I DO, I JUST WANT TO SAY GENERALLY AM A LITTLE BIT CONCERNED ABOUT A LENGTHY BUREAUCRATIC PROCESS.

BUT I DO THINK WE HAVE TO GIVE OUR CITY STAFF CLEAR PRIORITIES THAT ARE ACHIEVABLE SO THAT MEANS THERE DOES HAVE TO BE SOME KIND OF LIMIT TO IT THAT WE DO HAVE THINK ABOUT.

AND I THINK THE BIGGEST CONCERN THAT I HAVE AS A MEMBER OF THIS BODY IS WHEN WE GET A LARGE NEW PROGRAM THAT THE CITY HAS NEVER DONE BEFORE THAT WOULD REQUIRE YOU KNOW NEW STAFF, NEW SIGNIFICANT BUDGET ON AN ONGOING BASIS.

THOSE ARE THE THINGS THAT YOU KNOW, I JUST WANT US TO BE AWARE OF THOSE COMMITMENTS WHEN WE MAKE THEM.

BECAUSE THOSE ARE THINGS WE HAVE TO PLAN FOR ON AN ONGOING BASIS.

SO THERE IS SOME WAY, YOU KNOW, IF WE'RE GOING TO TAKE THOSE THINGS ON, WE HAVE TO THINK ABOUT WHAT ARE WE NOT GOING TO DO. IN SOME CASES I THINK ABOUT DEPARTMENTS LIKE H.H.C.S.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

HOUSING HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES, A LOT OF WHAT THEY DO IS MANDATED.

THESE ARE REQUIRED PROGRAMS THAT WE'RE ADMINISTERING, WE RUN A PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT, WE HAVE A MENTAL HEALTH DIVISION, WE HAVE TO RUN THESE PROGRAMS.

AND SO, YOU KNOW, WE HAVE TO FIGURE OUT WHAT DOES IT MEAN WHEN WE GIVE THAT DEPARTMENT A WHOLE NEW PROGRAM TO LIFT UP AND HOW IS THAT GOING TO HAPPEN WITH A STAFFING SITUATION WE'RE IN.

AND YOU KNOW, I THINK IT MAY BE A NEW NORMAL BECAUSE I'M HEARING A LOT ABOUT GOVERNMENT AGENCIES THAT HAVE HIGH VACANCY AND YOU KNOW, IT'S A CHALLENGE BECAUSE ALL OF THESE ENTITIES ARE RECRUITING AND IT'S A CHALLENGING LABOR SITUATION RIGHT NOW.

SO IN ANY CASE, I WILL LEAVE IT AT THAT AND THANK EVERYONE FOR THE THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THIS ITEM.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: COUNCILMEMBER HARRISON, THEN WRAP IT UP.

>> K HARRISON: MADAM CITY MANAGER, THAT WAS HELPFUL.

I THINK WE INSTITUTE THE R. R.V. TO DO WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT.

I WOULD LOVE FOR YOU TO DISCUSS WITH THE AGENDA COMMITTEE WHY THAT DOESN'T FUNCTION THAT WAY.

I THOUGHT THAT'S WHY WE HAD IT.

THERE IS SOMETHING MISSING WE NEED TO DEAL WITH.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

I WANTED TO MAKE SURE ALL OF US RECOGNIZE THERE IS SOMETHING NOT
QUITE RIGHT ABOUT THE R.R.V. AND IT'S NOT GETTING THE CITY
MANAGER WHAT SHE NEEDS.

HOWEVER WE CAN GET THAT RESOLVED WOULD BE GREAT.
THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: OKAY.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

I THINK THIS WAS A GOOD DISCUSSION.

I APPRECIATE WE HAD THIS FORUM TO HEAR EVERYONE'S INPUT.

SO WE'LL TAKE ALL THIS FEEDBACK BACK TO THE COMMITTEE.

AND TRY TO IDENTIFY THE AREAS WHERE THERE IS CONSENSUS.

FIRST AND FOREMOST, I HEARD CONSENSUS THAT STAFF INPUT INTO THE
PROCESS OF DRAFTING LEGISLATION IS IMPORTANT EARLIER IN THE
PROCESS.

I THINK EVERYONE IS IN AGREEMENT ON THAT.

THAT WE NEED TO DEVELOP SOME CLEAR CRITERION FOR DETERMINING
WHAT IS A MAJOR ITEM.

I THINK- AND THE CITY MANAGER ACTUALLY PROVIDED SOME SUGGESTED
LANGUAGE FOR DEFINITION CANNOT BE OPERATIONALIZED OVER TIME, NOT
IMPLEMENTABLE WITH EXISTING RESOURCES.

ADDITIONAL AND NEW FTE NEEDED.

ADDITIONAL COSTS.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

SOME METRIC BY WHICH THIS CAN'T BE ABSORBED BY EXISTING RESOURCES WE NEED TO DEDICATE NEW RESOURCES AND THAT IS NOT A PROBLEM.

AND I HAVE TO SAY THAT, YOU KNOW, WE'RE BERKELEY. YOU KNOW, WE'RE ALWAYS AT THE CUTTING EDGE.

YES WE HAVE TO PROVIDE BASELINE SERVICES BUT WE ALSO ARE REALLY AT THE FOREFRONT OF INNOVATIVE PUBLIC POLICY.

AND RESPONDING TO A LARGE MACRO ISSUES.

THAT ARE FACING THIS COUNTRY AND THIS REGION.

AND THAT WE'RE RESPONDING TO AND PROGRESS WE'RE MAKING IN BERKELEY TO ADDRESS THE HOUSING CRISIS, HOMELESSNESS, PUBLIC SAFETY.

AND MODELING BEST PRACTICES THAT OTHER CITIES CAN FOLLOW IN THE STATE.

AND THAT DOES MEAN WE HAVE TO THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX AND DO NEW THINGS.

AND TAKE ON NEW LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND ADAPT AND EVOLVE IN THE WAY WE SERVE THE COMMUNITY.

THERE IS ONLY SO MUCH STAFF AND BUDGET.

HAVING A CLEAR PROCESS AND WAY TO PRIORITIZE, AND MAKING SURE WE HAVE FLEXIBILITY TO BE RESPONSIVE TO WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE COMMUNITY AND WHAT THE COMMUNITY WANTS.

THAT'S WHAT THE PEOPLE OF BERKELEY WANT FROM US.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

GOING BACK TO A FEW OTHER THINGS.

WE NEED TO DEAL WITH THE BACKLOG.

I THINK AS WE GO BACK TO THE AGENDA COMMITTEE, DEFINITELY LOVE TO HEAR MORE FROM THE CITY MANAGER, CITY CLERK AND OTHER STAFF ABOUT YOUR THOUGHTS TOXIC THIS INPUT INTO CONSIDERATION.

WE'LL TRYING TO SUMMARIZE THE FEEDBACK AND NOTES TO THE COMMITTEE THAT WILL BE IN THE PACKET.

SO I THINK THERE IS AREAS OF AGREEMENT.

LOOKING AT USING A TEMPLATE WITH MORE REQUIRING MORE SPECIFIC INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT SHOULD BE IN AN ITEM TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE THE RELEVANT INFORMATION AND MAKE A DECISION THAT WE SHOULD TRY TO ALIGN IT WITH THE BUDGET PROCESS.

WE NEED TO FIGURE OUT THE TIMING OF THAT.

IS IT ONE TIME LINE, IS IT A ROLLING TIMELINE, WHAT IS THE TIMELINE FOR WHERE THE INPUTS ARE COMING IN AND OUTPUTS ARE COMING OUT.

AND REALLY SORT OF HELPING STRENGTHEN THE ROLE OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE TO REVIEW ITEMS IS ONE THING I HEARD AS WELL AND MAKING SURE WE HAVE CITY ATTORNEY REVIEW AND WE'RE ABLE TO HAVE THINGS OUT OF THE PROCESS IN ORDER FOR US TO BUDGET FOR THEM AND IMPLEMENT THEM.

This information provided by a Certified Realtime Reporter. The City of Berkeley cannot certify the following text since we did not create it.

SO I THINK WE HAVE SOME COMMONALITY FROM THE FEEDBACK WE'VE
GOTTEN AND WE'LL TRY TO CONSOLIDATE THIS INPUT AND COME BACK
WITH A FRAMEWORK FOR THE COUNCIL TO CONSIDER.

WE DO NEED TO MOVE ON.

WE'RE PAST DUE FOR OUR 6:00 MEETING.

UNLESS IT IS CRITICAL, I WOULD LIKE TO WRAP UP THE DISCUSSION.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS.

I MAKE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE 4:00 P.M. MEETING.

>> SECOND.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: IF WE CAN PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

[ROLL CALL]

>> R. KESARWANI: YES.

>> T. TAPLIN: YES.

>> B. BARTLETT: YES.

>> K HARRISON: YES.

>> S. HAHN: YES.

>> S. WENGRAF: YES.

>> R. ROBINSON: YES.

>> M. HUMBERT: YES.

>> MAYOR J. ARREGUIN: YES.



No Material
Available for
this Item

There is no material for this item.

City Clerk Department
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-6900

City of Berkeley City Council Agenda Index Webpage:
<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/city-council/city-council-agendas>



No Material
Available for
this Item

There is no material for this item.

City Clerk Department
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-6900

City of Berkeley City Council Agenda Index Webpage:
<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/city-council/city-council-agendas>



No Material
Available for
this Item

There is no material for this item.

City Clerk Department
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-6900

City of Berkeley City Council Agenda Index Webpage:
<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/city-council/city-council-agendas>



No Material
Available for
this Item

There is no material for this item.

City Clerk Department
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-6900

City of Berkeley City Council Agenda Index Webpage:
<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/city-council/city-council-agendas>

