



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

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 2021

2:30 P.M.

Committee Members:

Mayor Jesse Arreguin, Councilmembers Sophie Hahn and Susan Wengraf

Alternate: Councilmember Lori Droste

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

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

To access the meeting remotely using the internet: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Use URL <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84992094173>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon on the screen.

To join by phone: Dial **1-669-900-9128 or 1-877-853-5257 (Toll Free)** and Enter Meeting ID: **849 9209 4173**. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

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

AGENDA

Roll Call

Public Comment

Review of Agendas

1. **Approval of Minutes: January 11, 2021**
2. **Review and Approve Draft Agenda:**
 - a. 2/9/21 – 6:00 p.m. 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 Regarding Impact of COVID-19 (novel coronavirus) on Meetings of Legislative Bodies**
9. **Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12 *(Item contains supplemental material)***
From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Referred: July 28, 2020
Due: January 29, 2021
Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt first reading of an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act, Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts (See Section 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts, Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission).
Financial Implications: None
Contact: Sam Harvey, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6950

Referred Items for Review

10. Relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers' office budgets

From: Open Government Commission

Referred: August 31, 2020

Due: February 15, 2021

Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution creating a temporary advisory committee consisting of three (3) members each of the City Council and the Open Government Commission ("OGC") to enable discussion between the Council and the OGC to make recommendations governing relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers' office budgets.

Financial Implications: None

Contact: Sam Harvey, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6950

11. Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) to Regulate Officeholder Accounts and Proposed Changes to City Council Office Budget Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.)

From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission

Referred: January 11, 2021

Due: June 1, 2021

Recommendation: Form a joint subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to (1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

Financial Implications: None

Contact: Sam Harvey, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6950

Unscheduled Items

These items are not scheduled for discussion or action at this meeting. The Committee may schedule these items to the Action Calendar of a future Committee meeting.

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

Referred: June 15, 2020

Due: March 1, 2021

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

Financial Implications: See report

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

Items for Future Agendas

- **Discussion of items to be added to future agendas**

Adjournment – Next Meeting Monday, February 8, 2021

~~~~~

### **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 prior to the meeting.*

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



**COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:**

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

\* \* \*

I hereby certify that the agenda for this special meeting of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City's website, on January 21, 2020.

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

Mark Numainville, City Clerk

**Communications**

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



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

**MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2021**

**2:30 P.M.**

Committee Members:

Mayor Jesse Arreguin, Councilmembers Sophie Hahn and Susan Wengraf

Alternate: Councilmember Lori Droste

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

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

To access the meeting remotely using the internet: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Use URL <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88332004696>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon on the screen.

To join by phone: Dial **1-669-900-9128 or 1-877-853-5257 (Toll Free)** and Enter Meeting ID: **883 3200 4696**. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, press \*9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

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

**Roll Call:** 2:33 p.m. All present.

**Public Comment** – 1 speaker.

## **Review of Agendas**

**1. Approval of Minutes: January 4, 2021**

**Action:** M/S/C (Wengraf/Hahn) to approve the minutes of 1/4/21.

**Vote:** All Ayes.

**2. Review and Approve Draft Agenda:**

a. 1/26/21 – 6:00 p.m. Regular City Council Meeting

**Action:** M/S/C (Wengraf/Arreguin) to recommend to Councilmember Kesarwani that the author edit the recommendation of Item 10 to be a referral to the FY 2022 Budget Process.

**Vote:** All Ayes.

**Action:** M/S/C (Arreguin/Wengraf) to approve the agenda of 1/26/21 with the changes noted below.

- *Item Added: ADU Regulations (Wengraf) – Scheduled for 1/26 Consent Calendar*
- *Item 8 U.S. Base Construction (Commission Item) – Scheduled for 2/23/21 agenda*
- *Item 9 Paving Plan (Commission Item) – Moved to Action Calendar*
- *Item 10 Gun Buyback (Kesarwani) – Recommendation revisions from Agenda & Rules Committee*
- *Item 15 BERA Amendment and District Budgets (Commission Item) – Referred to the Agenda & Rules Committee*
- *Item 16a/b Sanctuary Encampment (Commission Item) – Moved to 1/26 Consent Calendar with Policy Committee recommendation*
- *Item 18 Reimagining Public Safety (Arreguin) – Scheduled for 1/26 Consent Calendar*

Order of Items on the Action Calendar

Item 11

Item 14

Item 9

Item 12

Item 13

Item 17

**Vote:** All Ayes.

**3. Selection of Item for the Berkeley Considers Online Engagement Portal**

- None Selected

**4. Adjournments In Memory - None**



## Scheduling

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

## Referred Items for Review

8. **Discussion Regarding Impact of COVID-19 (novel coronavirus) on Meetings of Legislative Bodies**

**Action:** 1 speaker. Discussion held. No action taken.

9. **Support Affirming the Right to Boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change**

**From:** Councilmember Davila (Author)

**Referred:** November 30, 2020

**Due:** May 23, 2021

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution with the following actions: 1. Support Affirming the Right to Boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change, and celebrate the People of Berkeley for their commitment to Peace, Justice and Equity; 2. The City of Berkeley affirms the right of all people to participate in boycotts of any entity when they have conscientious concerns with the entity's policies or actions; 3. The City of Berkeley condemns attempts by governments to infringe upon the right to peaceful boycotts by criminalizing that participation, denying participants state contracts, or otherwise impeding the freedom of advocacy for all; 4. The City Council encourages City Commissions to recommend boycott policies to the City Council when appropriate, so that the City Council may be well informed in its oversight of City resources 5. Send a copy of this resolution to Governor Gavin Newsom, Attorney General Xavier Becerra, State Assemblymember Buffy Wicks, State Senator Nancy Skinner, United States Senators Bernie Sanders, Kamala Harris, Dianne Feinstein, and United States Congressional Representatives Barbara Lee, Ro Khanna, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Ilhan Omar, Ayanna Pressley, Rashida Harbi Tlaib, and Pramila Jayapal.

**Financial Implications:** None

Contact: Cheryl Davila, Councilmember, District 2, (510) 981-7120

**Action:** 2 speakers. M/S/C (Hahn/Wengraf) to move the item to the full Council with a Negative Recommendation and recommend that the Council take no action on the item (scheduled for the 2/9/21 agenda).

**Vote:** All Ayes.

## Unscheduled Items

*These items are not scheduled for discussion or action at this meeting. The Committee may schedule these items to the Action Calendar of a future Committee meeting.*

- 10. Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12 (Item contains supplemental material)**  
**From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission**  
**Referred: July 28, 2020**  
**Due: January 29, 2021**

**Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt first reading of an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act, Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts (See Section 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts, Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission).

**Financial Implications:** None

Contact: Sam Harvey, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6950

**Action:** Scheduled for the 1/25/21 meeting for discussion.

- 11. Relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers' office budgets**  
**From: Open Government Commission**  
**Referred: August 31, 2020**  
**Due: February 15, 2021**

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution creating a temporary advisory committee consisting of three (3) members each of the City Council and the Open Government Commission ("OGC") to enable discussion between the Council and the OGC to make recommendations governing relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers' office budgets.

**Financial Implications:** None

Contact: Sam Harvey, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6950

**Action:** Scheduled for the 1/25/21 meeting for discussion.

## Unscheduled Items

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

**Referred: June 15, 2020**

**Due: March 1, 2021**

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

**Financial Implications:** See report

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

**Action:** Pending scheduling of a special meeting for this topic.

## Items for Future Agendas

- None

## Adjournment

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

**Vote:** All Ayes.

Adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct record of the Agenda & Rules Committee meeting held on January 11, 2021.

---

Mark Numainville  
City Clerk

## **Communications**

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

## DRAFT AGENDA



## BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, February 9, 2021  
6:00 PM

JESSE ARREGUIN, MAYOR

Councilmembers:

DISTRICT 1 – RASHI KESARWANI  
DISTRICT 2 – TERRY TAPLIN  
DISTRICT 3 – BEN BARTLETT  
DISTRICT 4 – KATE HARRISON

DISTRICT 5 – SOPHIE HAHN  
DISTRICT 6 – SUSAN WENGRAF  
DISTRICT 7 – RIGEL ROBINSON  
DISTRICT 8 – LORI DROSTE

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

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

*Live audio is available on KPFB Radio 89.3. Live captioned broadcasts of Council Meetings are available on Cable B-TV (Channel 33) and via internet accessible video stream at <http://www.cityofberkeley.info/CalendarEventWebcastMain.aspx>.*

*To access the meeting remotely: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Please use this URL <<INSERT URL HERE>>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon by rolling over the bottom of the screen.*

*To join by phone: Dial 1-669-900-9128 or 1-877-853-5257 (Toll Free) and enter Meeting ID: <<INSERT MEETING ID HERE>>. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, Press \*9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.*

*To submit an e-mail comment during the meeting to be read aloud during public comment, email [clerk@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:clerk@cityofberkeley.info) with the Subject Line in this format: "PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM ##." Please observe a 150 word limit. Time limits on public comments will apply. Written comments will be entered into the public record.*

*Please be mindful that the teleconference will be recorded as any Council meeting is recorded, and all other rules of procedure and decorum will apply for Council meetings conducted by teleconference or videoconference.*

*This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953. Any member of the public may attend this meeting. Questions regarding this matter may be addressed to Mark Numainville, City Clerk, (510) 981-6900. The City Council may take action related to any subject listed on the Agenda. Meetings will adjourn at 11:00 p.m. - any items outstanding at that time will be carried over to a date/time to be specified.*

## Preliminary Matters

### Roll Call:

**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. The remainder of the speakers wishing to address the Council on non-agenda items will be heard at the end of the agenda.*

## 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 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.*

## Consent Calendar

- 1. Amendment: FY 2021 Annual Appropriations Ordinance**  
**From: City Manager**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt second reading of Ordinance No. 7,748-N.S. amending the FY 2021 Annual Appropriations Ordinance No. 7,724–N.S. for fiscal year 2021 based upon recommended re-appropriation of committed FY 2020 funding and other adjustments authorized since July 1, 2020, in the amount of \$197,890,469 (gross) and \$193,471,132 (net).  
**First Reading Vote:** All Ayes.  
**Financial Implications:** See report  
Contact: Teresa Berkeley-Simmons, Budget Manager, (510) 981-7000
- 2. Amendments to the Berkeley Lobbyist Registration Act; Amending Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.09**  
**From: Open Government Commission**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt second reading of Ordinance No. 7,749-N.S. amending the Berkeley Lobbyist Registration Act (BMC Chapter 2.09) to incorporate the recommendations of the Open Government Commission (OGC).  
**First Reading Vote:** All Ayes.  
**Financial Implications:** None  
Contact: Sam Harvey, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6950
- 3. Extending Time for Temporary Parklets and Sidewalk Seating Post-COVID-19; Amending Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 16.18 and Section 14.48.150**  
**From: Councilmember Hahn (Author), Councilmember Harrison (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Bartlett (Co-Sponsor)**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt second reading of Ordinance No. 7,750-N.S. revising BMC Chapter 16.18 Right-of-Way Encroachments and Encroachment Permits and BMC Section 14.48.150 Sidewalk Seating, Benches, and Planters to extend the period of time that Parklets and Sidewalk Seating established under the COVID-19 declared City emergency can remain in place to 365 days after the termination of the declared City emergency rather than the current 90 days.  
**First Reading Vote:** All Ayes.  
**Financial Implications:** See report  
Contact: Sophie Hahn, Councilmember, District 5, (510) 981-7150

## Consent Calendar

- 4. Resolution Reviewing and Ratifying the Proclamation of Local Emergency Due to the Spread of a Severe Acute Respiratory Illness Caused by a Novel (New) Coronavirus (COVID-19)**  
**From: City Manager**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution reviewing the need for continuing the local emergency due to the spread of a severe acute respiratory illness caused by a novel (new) coronavirus (COVID-19) and ratifying the Proclamation of Local Emergency issued by the Director of Emergency Services on March 3, 2020, initially ratified by the City Council on March 10, 2020, and subsequently reviewed and ratified by the Council on April 21, 2020, June 16, 2020, July 28, 2020, September 22, 2020, November 17, 2020 and December 15, 2020.  
**Financial Implications:** To be determined  
Contact: Farimah Brown, City Attorney, (510) 981-6950
- 5. Donation to the Animal Shelter from the Stephen and Mary Birch Foundation**  
**From: City Manager**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution accepting a donation from the estate of Stephen and Mary Birch in the sum of \$10,000.  
**Financial Implications:** Animal Services Donation Fund - \$10,000 (donation)  
Contact: Paul Buddenhagen, City Manager's Office, (510) 981-7000
- 6. Contract No. 8287B Amendment: Claremont Behavioral Services for Employee Assistance Program Services**  
**From: City Manager**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to amend Contract No. 8287 with Claremont Behavioral Services (Claremont) in order to provide continued services for the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) by increasing expenditure authority in an amount not to exceed \$500,000, for a total contract amount of \$1,635,000, through December 31, 2025.  
**Financial Implications:** Payroll Deduction Trust Fund - \$500,000  
Contact: LaTanya Bellow, Human Resources, (510) 981-6800

## Council Consent Items

- 7. Installation of Banners Marking “Kala Bagai Way”: Relinquishment of Council Office Budget Fund to General Fund and Grant of Such Funds**  
**From: Mayor Arreguin (Author), Councilmember Droste (Author)**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt a resolution approving the expenditure of an amount not to exceed \$500 per council member, including \$500 from Mayor Arreguin, to the Downtown Berkeley Association with funds relinquished to the City’s general fund for this purpose from the discretionary council office budget of Mayor Arreguin and any other council members who would like to contribute.  
**Financial Implications:** Mayor's Discretionary Funds - \$500  
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Mayor, (510) 981-7100



## Action Calendar

*The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up. 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.*

*The Presiding Officer will request that persons wishing to speak use the "raise hand" function 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. 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 – Public Hearings

*Staff shall introduce the public hearing item and present their comments. This is followed by five-minute presentations each by the appellant and applicant. The Presiding Officer will request that persons wishing to speak use the "raise hand" function to be recognized and 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. 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.*

*Each member of the City Council shall verbally disclose all ex parte contacts concerning the subject of the hearing. Councilmembers shall also submit a report of such contacts in writing prior to the commencement of the hearing. Written reports shall be available for public review in the office of the City Clerk.*

### 8. **Second Substantial Amendments to 1) the 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan including the PY20 (FY21) Annual Action Plan in Response to the Addition of Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Funds, and 2) the PY19 (FY20) Annual Action Plan**

**From: City Manager**

**Recommendation:** Conduct a Public Hearing on: 1. The proposed Substantial Amendment to the 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan including the PY20 (FY21) Annual Action Plan in response to the addition of Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds; and 2. A proposed substantial amendment to the PY19 (FY20) Annual Action Plan;

And upon conclusion adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager, or her designee, to:

A. Accept CARES Act Community Development Block Grant-CV3 funding totaling \$891,121 and allocate the full amount allowable under the HUD waiver to public services (\$712,897), and up to 20% to Planning and Administration (\$178,224);

B. Allocate all CDBG-CV3 public services funding (\$712,897) to support the Berkeley Housing Retention program;

C. Reallocate up to \$1.2M of CDBG-CV1 funds previously allocated to COVID-19 Testing to support the Berkeley Housing Retention Program, leaving up to \$200,000 in CDBG-CV1 funding available for COVID-19 testing or vaccinations if needed;

D. Execute resultant agreements and amendments with the Eviction Defense Center for the COVID-19 Housing Retention Program, using \$1,801,541 in CDBG-CV1 & 3, plus any unused CDBG-CV1 funds allocated to the Targeted Equity Testing program

## Action Calendar – Public Hearings

(up to \$200,000) for a total possible not-to-exceed contract amount of \$2,001,541;  
E. Allocate up to 25% of the PY20 HOME allocation for program administration, up to 10% of the PY20 HOME funds for Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) operating funds, and the remaining funds to the Housing Trust Fund;  
F. Reallocate \$535,633 in PY20 CDBG Housing Services funds, \$1,049,370 PY19 CDBG Community Facility Improvement funds, and \$378,230 in available uncommitted funds to the South Berkeley Neighborhood Development Corporation for housing rehabilitation at Rosewood Manor and Lorin Station Apartments and execute resultant agreements, as contained in Exhibits A and B;  
G. Update the PY20 CDBG and HOME entitlement allocations to reflect the revised HUD PY20 entitlement awards; and  
H. Submit the approved Second Substantial Amendments to the 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan/PY20 Annual Action Plan and the PY19 Annual Action Plan, including public comments, to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and accept any resulting agreements with HUD.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Lisa Warhuus, Health, Housing, and Community Services, (510) 981-5400

**9. Referral Response: Amendments to the Home Occupations Ordinance; Amending BMC Sub-Titles 23C, 23D, 23E, and 23F** *(Continued from December 15, 2020)*

**From: City Manager**

**Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing and, upon conclusion, adopt the first reading of an Ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance to streamline the permitting process for Home Occupations and amending Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 23C.16 Home Occupations, Chapter 23E.84 MU-R Mixed Use-Residential District Provisions, Chapter 23F.04 Definitions, and Use Tables in Applicable Zoning Districts.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Jordan Klein, Planning and Development, (510) 981-7400

## Action Calendar – Old Business

**10. Vote of No Confidence in the Police Chief** *(Continued from November 10, 2020)*

**From: Councilmember Davila (Author)**

**Recommendation:** Adopt a resolution taking a Vote of No Confidence in the Police Chief.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Cheryl Davila, Councilmember, District 2, (510) 981-7120

## Council Action Items

**11. Support Affirming the Right to Boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change** *(Reviewed by the Agenda & Rules Committee)*

**From: Councilmember Davila (Author)**

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution with the following actions: 1. Support Affirming the Right to Boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change, and celebrate the People of Berkeley for their commitment to Peace, Justice and Equity; 2. The City of Berkeley affirms the right of all people to participate in boycotts of any entity when they have conscientious concerns with the entity's policies or actions; 3. The City of Berkeley condemns attempts by governments to infringe upon the right to peaceful boycotts by criminalizing that participation, denying participants state contracts, or otherwise impeding the freedom of advocacy for all; 4. The City Council encourages City Commissions to recommend boycott policies to the City Council when appropriate, so that the City Council may be well informed in its oversight of City resources 5. Send a copy of this resolution to Governor Gavin Newsom, Attorney General Xavier Becerra, State Assemblymember Buffy Wicks, State Senator Nancy Skinner, United States Senators Bernie Sanders, Kamala Harris, Dianne Feinstein, and United States Congressional Representatives Barbara Lee, Ro Khanna, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Ilhan Omar, Ayanna Pressley, Rashida Harbi Tlaib, and Pramila Jayapal.

*(On January 11, 2021, the Agenda and Rules Committee moved the item to the full Council with a Negative Recommendation and recommend that the Council take no action on the item.)*

**Financial Implications:** None

Contact: Cheryl Davila, Councilmember, District 2, (510) 981-7120

## Action Calendar – Policy Committee Track Items

**12. Right to Choose Communications Services Provider**

**From: Councilmember Droste (Author), Mayor Arreguin (Author), Councilmember Taplin (Author), Councilmember Robinson (Author)**

**Recommendation:** Refer to the City Manager and City Attorney to explore, and if deemed feasible, draft ordinance language to clarify that property owners of multi-unit properties cannot interfere with tenants' choice of communications services providers.

The City of San Francisco has implemented such an ordinance, which has since been challenged. This recommendation requests the City Attorney to review the San Francisco law and Federal Communications Commission rulings pertaining to this topic to determine if Berkeley could effectively adopt a similar ordinance.

**Financial Implications:** See report

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

## Action Calendar – Policy Committee Track Items

### 13. Potential Measure P FY2022 Allocations

**From: Councilmember Droste (Author)**

**Recommendation:** Refer the Measure P funding discussion to the City Manager, Measure P Homeless Panel of Experts, and the Health and Life Enrichment policy committee to determine next steps to ensure that the Measure P fund stays solvent. Specifically, these bodies should prioritize preferred programs and services within the various categories that the Measure P panel previously outlined according to updated projected revenues. During the course of these deliberations, the Panel of Experts should hear presentations from staff on which homeless services (e.g. permanent supportive housing exits, shelters, emergency interventions, multi-departmental staffing, and supportive services) are funded outside of Measure P so that the bodies can make recommendations after understanding the entirety of services and programs.

To the extent possible, the committees and commissions should attempt to find a non-volatile source of funding for permanent supportive housing, using the 1,000 person plan as a framework for best addressing the homelessness crisis on our streets.

The Panel of Experts and Health and Life Enrichment policy committee should finalize their priorities in time for the budget committee's consideration in June of 2021.

**Financial Implications:** See report

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

## Information Reports

### 14. LPO NOD: 1 Orchard Lane/#LMIN2020-0006

**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.*

Live captioned broadcasts of Council Meetings are available on Cable B-TV (Channel 33), via internet accessible video stream at <http://www.cityofberkeley.info/CalendarEventWebcastMain.aspx> and KPFB Radio 89.3.

Archived indexed video streams are available at <http://www.cityofberkeley.info/citycouncil>. 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 posted on the City's website at <http://www.cityofberkeley.info>.

Agendas and agenda reports may be accessed via the Internet at <http://www.cityofberkeley.info/citycouncil>

COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:

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



Captioning services are provided at the meeting, on B-TV, and on the Internet.

~~~~~




TO: Honorable Members of the City Council

FROM: Mayor Jesse Arreguín
Vice Mayor Lori Droste

SUBJECT: Installation of Banners Marking “Kala Bagai Way”: Relinquishment of Council Office Budget Fund to General Fund and Grant of Such Funds

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a resolution approving the expenditure of an amount not to exceed \$500.00 per council member, including \$500.00 from Mayor Arreguín, to the Downtown Berkeley Association with funds relinquished to the City’s general fund for this purpose from the discretionary council office budget of Mayor Arreguín and any other council members who would like to contribute.

BACKGROUND

In 2020, the City Council approved the renaming of a two-block portion of Shattuck Avenue ‘East’ from Center Street to University Avenue to “Kala Bagai Way.”

The City’s decision to honor Kala Bagai—an Asian American, a woman, an immigrant, and a survivor of local racism—has attracted significant positive attention. There have been over two dozen media mentions to date, ranging from KQED to the Times of India.

Community members are working with the Office of Economic Development and the Downtown Berkeley Association to install banners to mark this historic moment, honor Kala Bagai, and celebrate the City’s Asian American history. Funds will go towards the printing and installation of banners. We expect the banners to be installed prior to the ribbon cutting for the Shattuck Reconfiguration project.

The placemaking banner was designed pro-bono by the Design Action Collective in Oakland, with input from the Bagai family and community members. One side honors Kala Bagai and features

a photo of her, while the other honors Berkeley's Asian American history, and features a group photo of early local South Asian families.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

\$500.00 from Mayor Arreguín's discretionary council office budget.

CONTACT

Mayor Jesse Arreguín

mayor@cityofberkeley.info | 510-981-7100

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

AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF SURPLUS FUNDS FROM THE OFFICE EXPENSE ACCOUNTS OF THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS FOR A GRANT TO PROVIDE PUBLIC SERVICES FOR A MUNICIPAL PUBLIC PURPOSE

WHEREAS, in 2020, the City Council approved the renaming of a two-block portion of Shattuck Avenue 'East' from Center Street to University Avenue to "Kala Bagai Way"; and

WHEREAS, the City's decision to honor Kala Bagai—an Asian American, a woman, an immigrant, and a survivor of local racism—has attracted significant positive attention; and

WHEREAS, the placemaking banner was designed with input from the Bagai family and community members; and

WHEREAS, one side of the banner honors Kala Bagai and features a photo of her, while the other honors Berkeley's Asian American history, and features a group photo of early local South Asian families; and

WHEREAS, Mayor Arreguín has surplus funds in his office expenditure account; and

WHEREAS, a California non-profit tax-exempt corporation – the Downtown Berkeley Association – will receive funds in the amount of \$500.00; and

WHEREAS, the provision of such services would fulfill the following municipal public purpose: the Downtown Berkeley Association is a 501(c)(6) non-profit program, in the San Francisco Bay Area, working with community members and the City's Office of Economic Development to mark this historic moment, honor Kala Bagai, and celebrate the City's Asian American history.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that funds relinquished by the Mayor and council members from their council office budget of up to \$500.00 per office shall be granted to the Downtown Berkeley Association.



Cheryl Davila
Councilmember
District 2

ACTION CALENDAR

February 9, 2021

(Continued from November 10, 2020)

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Cheryl Davila

Subject: Vote of No Confidence in the Police Chief

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a resolution taking a Vote of No Confidence in the Police Chief.

BACKGROUND

On June 9, 2020, Berkeley Police Chief Andrew Greenwood made comments to the Berkeley City Council advocating for shooting protestors of police violence, saying, “We can shoot people”, when asked about an alternative to tear gas.

During this time of national recognition of the reckoning of police violence and racial justice, the Chief’s comments were not merely a gaffe but an inexcusable declaration of police violence and the violation of the most basic rights guaranteed in the United States Constitution, which he is sworn to protect.

Berkeley is considered one of the most progressive cities in the country and should be leading the nation in police transformation. We must be working to find ways to respond to harms in our communities that do not put marginalized groups in constant danger. Chief Greenwood’s comments directly contradict this objective.

A Center for Policing Equity report in 2018 demonstrated the disparate treatment to African American and people of color. Unfortunately, during the pandemic, disparities have only increased. Analysis of the Berkeley Police Department’s Open Data Portal shows that disparities between the number of Black and White civilians the department stops *doubled during the COVID-19 pandemic*.

According to the police department’s data conducted by independent analysis report “Racial Disparities in Berkeley Policing Update on Pandemic Period, March 15 to June 2020” released on June 19, 2020, the following conclusions can be drawn from the data representing the first 13 weeks of the pandemic shutdown, from March 15 through June 12:

1. Predictably, the number of police stops for all racial groups is down due to the stay-home order. The total number of stops, 608, is about a fourth of an average 13-week quarter in 2008.
2. *The disparity between stops of African American and White civilians has skyrocketed*, as is evident from the raw numbers: African American stops are exactly 50% of total 608 stops at **304**, with White stops at **143** for 23.52% of all stops. This compares to percentages of 3,083 and 2,706, or 28% and 32% respectively in the year 2018.
3. Taking into account the *low number of African Americans* residing in Berkeley, the *disparities come into sharp relief*. African American stops are about 42.7 per 1,000 of their population, where White stops are about 2.9 per 1,000, a disparity of **14.5 to 1**. This compares to a disparity of 7.6 to 1 in 2018, meaning that **the racial disparity in stops has almost doubled** between 2018 and the pandemic period.

The citations per stop are down by about two-thirds compared to that of 2018. While that might sound like good news, that is not necessarily the case. A reduced rate of writing citations likely means that civilians of all races are being stopped without the required reasonable suspicion of criminal activity. What's more, **the citation rate for African American civilian stops is 7.57% and for Whites, 15.38%, a disparity of over two to one**. That disparity indicates that only half as many African American stops as White stops are conducted with valid suspicion of a criminal act. The citation rate of 7.5% for African Americans raises questions about why the other 92.5% were stopped.

The BPD did not report the stop data for a period of August 2019 through early June 2020 with the excuse that "For a period we had someone who was part of the processing of the data, and that position was eliminated due to staffing shortages." Competent leadership should ensure a prioritized process should always have repeatability, and an automation built into it. That means the system will not fall due to the departure of an individual.

BPD continues to demonstrate disparate treatment of people of color, Chief Greenwood's comments and actions are cause for a Vote of No Confidence. The community is demanding change. For example, at the July 14, 2020 City Council meeting with over three hundred attendees, the majority stating they had no confidence in the Chief of Police as well as demanding defunding the police. Now is the time to step up and listen to the demands of our beloved community.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

To be determined, there could be cost savings and efficiencies in policies, procedures, processes, by eliminating the disparate treatment of African Americans and People of Color in our community.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Protecting our communities during this climate and health crisis is an act of environmental sustainability.

CONTACT PERSONS

Cheryl Davila
Councilmember District 2
510.981.7120
cdavila@cityofberkeley.info

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution
2. Racial Disparities in Berkeley Policing Update on Pandemic Period, March 15 to June 2020

REFERENCES:

Article: Marchers in Berkeley demand resignation of police chief
<https://www.berkeleyside.com/2020/06/13/marchers-in-berkeley-demand-resignation-of-police-chief>

Center for Policing Equity Report on the Berkeley Police Department (05/09/18)
https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Police_Review_Commission/Commissions/2018/Berkeley%20Report%20-%20May%202018.pdf

City Auditor's Office Dispatcher Audit (04/25/19): <http://bit.ly/2DvbCpv>
https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Auditor/Level_3_-_General/Dispatch%20Workload_Fiscal%20Year%202018.pdf

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

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA,
TAKING A VOTE OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE POLICE CHIEF

WHEREAS, On June 9, 2020, Berkeley Police Chief Andrew Greenwood made comments to the Berkeley City Council advocating for shooting protestors of police violence, saying, “We can shoot people”, when asked about an alternative to tear gas; and

WHEREAS, During this time of national recognition of the reckoning of police violence and racial justice, the Chief’s comments were not merely a gaffe but an inexcusable declaration of police violence and the violation of the most basic rights guaranteed in the United States Constitution, which he is sworn to protect; and

WHEREAS, Berkeley is considered one of the most progressive cities in the country and should be leading the nation in police transformation. We must be working to find ways to respond to harms in our communities that do not put marginalized groups in constant danger. Chief Greenwood’s comments directly contradict this objective; and

WHEREAS, A Center for Policing Equity report in 2018 demonstrated the disparate treatment to African American and people of color. Unfortunately, during the pandemic, disparities have only increased. Analysis of the Berkeley Police Department’s Open Data Portal shows that disparities between the number of Black and White civilians the department stops *doubled during the COVID-19 pandemic; and*

WHEREAS, According to the police department’s data conducted by independent analysis titled “Racial Disparities in Berkeley Policing Update on Pandemic Period, March 15 to June 2020” released on June 19, 2020, the following conclusions can be drawn from the data representing the first 13 weeks of the pandemic shutdown, from March 15 through June 12:

4. Predictably, the number of police stops for all racial groups is down due to the stay-home order. The total number of stops, 608, is about a fourth of an average 13-week quarter in 2008.
5. *The disparity between stops of African American and White civilians has skyrocketed*, as is evident from the raw numbers: African American stops are exactly 50% of total 608 stops at **304**, with White stops at **143** for 23.52% of all stops. This compares to percentages of 3,083 and 2,706, or 28% and 32% respectively in the year 2018.
6. Taking into account the *low number of African Americans* residing in Berkeley, the *disparities come into sharp relief*. African American stops are about 42.7 per 1,000 of their population, where White stops are about 2.9 per 1,000, a disparity of **14.5 to 1**. This compares to a disparity of 7.6 to 1 in 2018, meaning that **the racial disparity in stops has almost doubled** between 2018 and the pandemic period.

WHEREAS, The citations per stop are down by about two-thirds compared to that of 2018. While that might sound like good news, that is not necessarily the case. A reduced rate of

writing citations likely means that civilians of all races are being stopped without the required reasonable suspicion of criminal activity. What's more, **the citation rate for African American civilian stops is 7.57% and for Whites, 15.38%, a disparity of over two to one.** That disparity indicates that only half as many African American stops as White stops are conducted with valid suspicion of a criminal act. The citation rate of 7.5% for African Americans raises questions about why the other 92.5% were stopped; and

WHEREAS, The BPD did not report the stop data for a period of August 2019 through early June 2020 with the excuse that "For a period we had someone who was part of the processing of the data, and that position was eliminated due to staffing shortages." Competent leadership should ensure a prioritized process should always have repeatability, and an automation built into it. That means the system will not fall due to the departure of an individual; and

WHEREAS, BPD continues to demonstrate disparate treatment of people of color, Chief Greenwood's comments and actions are cause for a Vote of No Confidence. The community is demanding change. For example, at the July 14, 2020 City Council meeting with over three hundred attendees, the majority stating they had no confidence in the Chief of Police as well as demanding defunding the police. Now is the time to step up and listen to the demands of our beloved community.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Berkeley hereby take a Vote of No Confidence in the Police Chief.

Racial Disparities in Berkeley Policing
Update on Pandemic Period, March 15 to June 12, 2020
George Lippman
June 19, 2020

As of June 12, the BPD resumed publication of demographic stop data to the online open portal, after a break since July 31, 2019. See: <https://data.cityofberkeley.info/Public-Safety/Berkeley-PD-Stop-Data-NEW-/4tbf-3yt8>

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data representing the first 13 weeks of the pandemic shutdown, from March 15 through June 12.

1. Predictably, the number of police stops for all racial groups is down due to the stay-home order. The total number of stops, 608, is about a fourth of an average 13-week quarter in 2008.
2. *The disparity between stops of African American and White civilians has skyrocketed*, as is evident from the raw numbers: African American stops are exactly 50% of total 608 stops at **304**, with White stops at **143** for 23.52% of all stops. This compares to percentages of 3,083 and 2,706, or 28% and 32% respectively in the year 2018.
3. Taking into account the *low number of African Americans* residing in Berkeley, the *disparities come into sharp relief*. African American stops are about 42.7 per 1,000 of their population, where White stops are about 2.9 per 1,000, a disparity of **14.5 to 1**. This compares to a disparity of 7.6 to 1 in 2018, meaning that **the racial disparity in stops has almost doubled** between 2018 and the pandemic period.
4. The citations per stop are down by about two-thirds compared to that of 2018. While that might sound like good news, that is not necessarily the case. A reduced rate of writing citations likely means that civilians of all races are being stopped without the required reasonable suspicion of criminal activity. What's more, **the citation rate for African American civilian stops is 7.57% and for Whites, 15.38%, a disparity of over two to one**. That disparity indicates that only half as many African American stops as White stops are conducted with valid suspicion of a criminal act. The citation rate of 7.5% for African Americans raises questions about why the other 92.5% were stopped.

An overall risk in this pandemic is that the social and legal emergency undermines democratic norms such as transparency, civilian oversight, and adherence to constitutional principle and established process. The doubling of the already high disparity of Black and White stop rates is an indicator that equal treatment under the law (Fourteenth Amendment) has been shelved in practice.

Suspension of oversight bodies such as the PRC and the Fair and Impartial Policing Working Group--and proposals to permanently defund city commissions--and the failure to publish the required stop data, all while residents are not allowed to freely travel outdoors in the city, are also troubling; they bar the community from utilizing the "disinfectant effects of sunshine."

In the attached spreadsheet, see the first tab, or sheet (“BPD Raw Data_3-16 to 6-12-20”) for the full listing of police encounters in that period. At the bottom of this tab please find a chart summarizing the calculations on numbers and percentages of stops, and numbers, percentages, and racial disparities in enforcement outcomes (citations and arrests). Contact me directly for calculations used to quantify disparities in stops based on the population by race in Berkeley.

Ethnicity	Stopped	% of total	Cited	% of stops resulting in citation	Arrest	% of stops resulting in arrest
Asian	29	4.77%	6	20.69%	0	0.00%
Black	304	50.00%	23	7.57%	8	2.63%
Hispanic/Latino	88	14.47%	9	10.23%	4	4.55%
White	143	23.52%	22	15.38%	7	4.90%
Bad data	1	0.16%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	43	7.07%	11	25.58%	0	0.00%
TOTALS:	608	100.00%	71	11.68%	19	3.13%

George Lippman
 geolippman.pjc@earthlink.net

For context on the citation rate disparities, I refer to my presentation to the Mayor’s Fair and Impartial Policing Working Group from January 2020, “Key things to understand about the BPD stop data.” That presentation refers to data from the year 2012-2018.

The citation rate discrepancies are stable over the years studied. They are critical because they show the chances of civilians of different ethnic groups to be stopped by police in Berkeley with no ensuing need for enforcement action. The citation rate metric removes the need for consideration of residency. It also removes any need for consideration of the demographics of crime. Those who argue for allowing police officers to put more weight on a civilian’s race in their decision to stop them, contend that people of color commit crime at higher rates than White people. But this disparity in post-stop enforcement shows that Black people are twice more likely than Whites to be stopped where there either was no reasonable suspicion, or that suspicion was unfounded.

These numbers are not the end of the discussion, but the beginning. Particularly the stop and the citation rate disparities require us to delve deeper. The City government should investigate how the decision to make a stop is made. Are the disparate stops being made by a subset of the street officers or across the board? Do stops that are officer-initiated versus dispatched result in different levels of disparity? Are there certain officers who make proportionately more stops of African Americans and Latinos than other officers do? How can those outlier officers be identified?

Answers to these questions will give the Working Group and the department the tools to ensure that policing is conducted fairly and impartially.

*

In conclusion, the data described above compel the Working Group to develop an action plan that will achieve the following goals:

- Identify officers that are outliers in their practice of stopping, searching, and citation-writing, and appropriately train and manage them.
- We cannot make poorly performing officers take the entire responsibility for the disparities. We have to also look at who their commanders are, what direction the officers are getting from those commanders, and what action these commanders are taking to address the performance of these officers.
- Adopt programs such as precision-based policing and intelligence-led stops to heavily reduce stops, particularly of African Americans and Latinos.
- Reduce racial disparities in citation rates as defined in this paper as close to zero as possible.
- Ensure that all use of force is reported.



Cheryl Davila
Councilmember
District 2

ACTION CALENDAR
February 9, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Cheryl Davila

Subject: Support Affirming the Right to Boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution with the following actions:

1. Support Affirming the Right to Boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change, and celebrate the People of Berkeley for their commitment to Peace, Justice and Equity;
2. The City of Berkeley affirms the right of all people to participate in boycotts of any entity when they have conscientious concerns with the entity’s policies or actions;
3. The City of Berkeley condemns attempts by governments to infringe upon the right to peaceful boycotts by criminalizing that participation, denying participants state contracts, or otherwise impeding the freedom of advocacy for all;
4. The City Council encourages City Commissions to recommend boycott policies to the City Council when appropriate, so that the City Council may be well informed in its oversight of City resources
5. Send a copy of this resolution to Governor Gavin Newsom, Attorney General Xavier Becerra, State Assemblymember Buffy Wicks, State Senator Nancy Skinner, United States Senators Bernie Sanders, Kamala Harris, Dianne Feinstein, and United States Congressional Representatives Barbara Lee, Ro Khanna, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Ilhan Omar, Ayanna Pressley, Rashida Harbi Tlaib, and Pramila Jayapal.

POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

On January 11, 2021, the Agenda and Rules Committee adopted the following action: M/S/C (Hahn/Wengraf) to move the item to the full Council with a Negative Recommendation and recommend that the Council take no action on the item. Vote: All Ayes.

BACKGROUND

Berkeley’s municipal code defines “Peace and Justice” as “the goal of creating a world community in which the relations between people are based on equality, respect for human rights, and the abhorrence of exploitation and all forms of oppression” and the city has found that “the residents of Berkeley have continually demonstrated their concern for peace and justice based on equality among all peoples”¹.

¹ Ord. 5705-NS § 3, 1986

Boycotts have been effectively used in the United States by advocates for equal rights since the Boston Tea Party and include boycotts led by civil rights activists during the 1950s and 1960s in order to advocate for racial equality, such as the Montgomery bus boycott², and promote workers' rights, such as the United Farm Workers-led boycott of table grapes.

Berkeley has a long history of enacting and supporting boycotts on various issues of importance to the People of Berkeley, including boycotts against corporations including Motorola, Kaiser Aluminum, Shell, Honda, IBM, Coca-Cola, Hewlett-Packard, and others, sometimes targeting all companies doing business in a country or area (Burma, Occupied Tibet, Nigeria), or companies supplying weapons technology (a violation of the Nuclear-Free ordinance).

All forms of bigotry, including racism, classism, sexism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, homophobia, ableism, and all forms of hatred that target people based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, disability, gender or sexual orientation, are unacceptable and inconsistent with Berkeley's commitment to equity and justice.

Criticism of the actions of corporations and nations is critical to healthy public discourse and must be protected in a democracy, and criticism of a nation, including by means of a non-violent citizens' boycott, does not constitute bigotry against the citizens of that nation. Rather, boycott is often a strategic and necessary means by which to encourage a government to abandon policies that are inconsistent with the ideals of peace and justice.

Boycotts and their importance are written into the Berkeley Municipal Code, including in the mandate of the Labor commission which reads "...encouraging support for officially sanctioned boycotts".

The right to boycott has repeatedly been reaffirmed as protected free speech by the first amendment of the United States' Constitution³, a protection that is of particular pride and importance to the City of Berkeley⁴, as the birthplace of the Free Speech Movement.

Despite its important history in social movements and its constitutional protections, governments and non-governmental organizations alike have sought to criminalize⁵, stigmatize, and delegitimize⁶ the use of boycotts in an attempt to stifle constitutionally protected political expression.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None.

² Anne Brice, B., & Brice, A. (2020, February 18). The Montgomery bus boycott and the women who made it possible. Retrieved November 23, 2020, from <https://news.berkeley.edu/2020/02/11/podcast-montgomery-bus-boycott-womens-political-council/>

³ The Supreme Court, in the 1966 case *Rosenblatt v. Baer*, held that the First Amendment to the Constitution ensures that "criticism of government is at the very center of the constitutionally protected area of free discussion". Then, in 1982, in *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware* they held that "the right of the States to regulate economic activity could not justify a complete prohibition against a nonviolent, politically motivated boycott".

⁴ UC Berkeley Library. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2020, from <https://www.lib.berkeley.edu/libraries/bancroft-library/oral-history-center/projects/fsm>

⁵ Greenwald, G., & Grim, R. (2017, July 19). U.S. Lawmakers Seek to Criminally Outlaw Support for Boycott Campaign Against Israel. Retrieved November 23, 2020, from <https://theintercept.com/2017/07/19/u-s-lawmakers-seek-to-criminally-outlaw-support-for-boycott-campaign-against-israel/>

⁶ Carol Morello, S. (2020, November 19). Pompeo sets off debate on boycott of Israel, calling it an anti-Semitic 'cancer'. Retrieved November 23, 2020, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/pompeo-israel-bds-movement-boycott/2020/11/19/79fe4cba-2a7d-11eb-b847-66c66ace1afb_story.html

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Protecting the community's right to boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change is an act of environmental sustainability.

CONTACT PERSONS

Cheryl Davila
Councilmember District 2
510.981.7120
cdavila@cityofberkeley.info

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution

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

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA
SUPPORT AFFIRMING THE RIGHT TO BOYCOTT AS A TACTIC FOR SOCIAL AND
POLITICAL CHANGE

WHEREAS, Berkeley's municipal code defines "Peace and Justice" as "the goal of creating a world community in which the relations between people are based on equality, respect for human rights, and the abhorrence of exploitation and all forms of oppression" and the city has found that "the residents of Berkeley have continually demonstrated their concern for peace and justice based on equality among all peoples"⁷; and

WHEREAS, boycotts have been effectively used in the United States by advocates for equal rights since the Boston Tea Party and include boycotts led by civil rights activists during the 1950s and 1960s in order to advocate for racial equality, such as the Montgomery bus boycott⁸, and promote workers' rights, such as the United Farm Workers-led boycott of table grapes; and

WHEREAS, Berkeley has a long history of enacting and supporting boycotts on various issues of importance to the People of Berkeley, including boycotts against corporations including Motorola, Kaiser Aluminum, Shell, Honda, IBM, Coca-Cola, Hewlett-Packard, and others, sometimes targeting all companies doing business in a country or area (Burma, Occupied Tibet, Nigeria), or companies supplying weapons technology (a violation of the Nuclear-Free ordinance); and

WHEREAS, all forms of bigotry, including racism, sexism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, homophobia, ableism, and all forms of hatred that target people based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, disability, gender or sexual orientation, are unacceptable and inconsistent with Berkeley's commitment to equity and justice; and

WHEREAS, criticism of the actions of corporations and nations is critical to healthy public discourse and must be protected in a democracy, and criticism of a nation, including by means of a non-violent citizens' boycott, does not constitute bigotry against the citizens of that nation. Rather, boycott is often a strategic and necessary means by which to encourage a government to abandon policies that are inconsistent with the ideals of peace and justice; and

WHEREAS, boycotts and their importance are written into the Berkeley Municipal Code, including in the mandate of the Labor commission which reads "...encouraging support for officially sanctioned boycotts"; and

WHEREAS, the right to boycott has repeatedly been reaffirmed as protected free speech by the first amendment of the United States' Constitution⁹, a protection that is of particular pride and importance to the City of Berkeley¹⁰, as the birthplace of the Free Speech Movement; and

⁷ Ord. 5705-NS § 3, 1986

⁸ Anne Brice, B., & Brice, A. (2020, February 18). The Montgomery bus boycott and the women who made it possible. Retrieved November 23, 2020, from <https://news.berkeley.edu/2020/02/11/podcast-montgomery-bus-boycott-womens-political-council/>

⁹ The Supreme Court, in the 1966 case *Rosenblatt v. Baer*, held that the First Amendment to the Constitution ensures that "criticism of government is at the very center of the constitutionally protected area of free discussion". Then, in 1982, in *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware* they held that "the right of the States to regulate economic activity could not justify a complete prohibition against a nonviolent, politically motivated boycott".

¹⁰ UC Berkeley Library. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2020, from <https://www.lib.berkeley.edu/libraries/bancroft-library/oral-history-center/projects/fsm>

WHEREAS, despite its important history in social movements and its constitutional protections, governments and non-governmental organizations alike have sought to criminalize¹¹, stigmatize, and delegitimize¹² the use of boycotts in an attempt to stifle constitutionally protected political expression.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Berkeley hereby support Affirming the Right to Boycott as a Tactic for Social and Political Change, and celebrate the People of Berkeley for their commitment to Peace, Justice and Equity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The City of Berkeley affirms the right of all people to participate in boycotts of any entity when they have conscientious concerns with the entity's policies or actions;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The City of Berkeley condemns attempts by governments to infringe upon the right to peaceful boycotts by criminalizing that participation, denying participants state contracts, or otherwise impeding the freedom of advocacy for all;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The City Council encourages City Commissions to recommend boycott policies to the City Council when appropriate, so that the City Council may be well informed in its oversight of City resources

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Send a copy of this resolution to Governor Gavin Newsom, Attorney General Xavier Becerra, State Assemblymember Buffy Wicks, State Senator Nancy Skinner, United States Senators Bernie Sanders, Kamala Harris, Dianne Feinstein, and United States Congressional Representatives Barbara Lee, Ro Khanna, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Ilhan Omar, Ayanna Pressley, Rashida Harbi Tlaib, and Pramila Jayapal.

¹¹ Greenwald, G., & Grim, R. (2017, July 19). U.S. Lawmakers Seek to Criminally Outlaw Support for Boycott Campaign Against Israel. Retrieved November 23, 2020, from <https://theintercept.com/2017/07/19/u-s-lawmakers-seek-to-criminally-outlaw-support-for-boycott-campaign-against-israel/>

¹² Carol Morello, S. (2020, November 19). Pompeo sets off debate on boycott of Israel, calling it an anti-Semitic 'cancer'. Retrieved November 23, 2020, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/pompeo-israel-bds-movement-boycott/2020/11/19/79fe4cba-2a7d-11eb-b847-66c66ace1afb_story.html



Lori Droste
Vice Mayor District 8

Consent Calendar
February 9, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
 From: Vice Mayor Lori Droste, Mayor Jesse Arreguín, Councilmember Terry Taplin,
 Councilmember Rigel Robinson
 Subject: Right to Choose Communications Services Provider

Recommendation: Refer to the City Manager and City Attorney to explore, and if deemed feasible, draft ordinance language to clarify that property owners of multi-unit properties cannot interfere with tenants' choice of communications services providers.

The City of San Francisco has implemented such an ordinance, which has since been challenged. This recommendation requests the City Attorney to review the San Francisco law and Federal Communications Commission rulings pertaining to this topic to determine if Berkeley could effectively adopt a similar ordinance.

Background:

Problem Statement

At a time when many more people are working remotely because of COVID-19, tenants are unable to access the communications provider of their choice no matter where they live. Some property owners only allow specific communications services providers, or just one provider, to install necessary equipment and provide services, leaving tenants with no ability to choose a provider of their choice.

Consultation and Outreach to Stakeholders

This came to our attention through a local resident who is unable to access the wireless technology they need to work remotely.

Alternative Actions Considered:

Current situation

If no action is taken, some tenants will have limited access to communications services. Given the current COVID-19 pandemic, more people are working from home and are reliant on various telecommunications.

Alternatives Considered

In 2016, the City of San Francisco passed an [ordinance, Article 52](#) or the “Occupant’s Right to Choose a Communications Services Provider,” to ensure tenants in multi-unit buildings can choose their preferred utility provider. The ordinance mandated that property owners must allow tenants, if they so choose, to utilize any utility company of their choice.

Specifically, property owners cannot:

- enforce exclusivity agreements
- prevent a communications services provider from entering the property (under tenants request for service)
- Prevent a communications services provider from installing necessary equipment to serve tenant or use existing equipment to provide essential services

Two years after San Francisco’s law passed, small internet providers indicated that they were able to gain access to buildings to which they were previously denied access. The CEO of Sonic, the internet service provider, also indicated having greater ability to provide its services.¹

Despite the success of the law, it was challenged by trade groups. In 2019, the Federal Communications Commission adopted a [Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Declaratory Ruling](#) pertaining to the San Francisco law to which Mayor Breed [responded](#). Interpretation of that ruling is still unclear.

Criteria Considered

Effectiveness

Pursuing an ordinance similar to that of San Francisco’s maximizes public interest by providing tenants with more choices for communications services providers and allowing them to select the one that best suits their needs.

Environmental Impacts

None

Fiscal Impacts and Operational Considerations

Staff time. Since this is a new concept, there is no current budget allocation for developing ordinance language. This ordinance is unlikely to generate funds or savings for the City.

Strategic Plan Alignment (?)

This referral will further the City’s Strategic Plan goal to provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities. It will expand residents’ ability to utilize the most up to date telecommunications that meet their needs.

Equity

¹ <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-07-11/fcc-s-san-francisco-decision-causes-confusion>

This referral seeks to ensure that regardless of living situation, residents can obtain the communications services provider of their choice. Since this is particularly focused on protecting tenants in multi-unit buildings, it will be most beneficial to those who rent units (students, low-income residents, etc.).

Rationale for Recommendation

Tenants should be able to choose their preferred communication services provider. Though this may be a legally complicated task (as demonstrated by San Francisco's experience), there are few other alternatives that can assist tenants in accessing providers of their choice if their landlord refuses entry or does not allow installation from other providers.

Contact info

Councilmember Lori Droste ldroste@cityofberkeley.info

Attachment 1: [San Francisco Article 52](#)

ARTICLE 52:

OCCUPANT'S RIGHT TO CHOOSE A COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES PROVIDER

- Sec. 5200. Definitions.
- Sec. 5201. No Interference by Property Owner.
- Sec. 5202. No Discrimination by Property Owner Against Occupant.
- Sec. 5203. Applicability.
- Sec. 5204. Request to Inspect a Multiple Occupancy Building.
- Sec. 5205. Notice of Intent to Provide Service.
- Sec. 5206. Permitted Refusal of Access.
- Sec. 5207. Permitted Limitations on Access.
- Sec. 5208. Just and Reasonable Compensation.
- Sec. 5209. Notice of Violation.
- Sec. 5210. Enforcement by the City Attorney.
- Sec. 5211. Enforcement by Communications Services Providers and Occupants.
- Sec. 5212. Attorneys' Fees and Costs.
- Sec. 5213. Civil Penalties.
- Sec. 5214. Statute of Limitations.
- Sec. 5215. Extensions of Time.
- Sec. 5216. Undertaking for General Welfare.
- Sec. 5217. Severability.
- Sec. 5218. No Conflict with Federal or State Law.

***Editor's Note:**

Ord. 250-16, which added Sections 5200 through 5218, set forth this Article heading but did not mark it as an addition to the Code. The heading was subsequently added by Ord. [250-18](#), File No. 180002, approved 11/2/2018, effective 12/3/2018.

SEC. 5200. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Article 52:

“City” means the City and County of San Francisco.

“Communications services” means: (a) video service as that term is defined in California Public Utilities Code § 5830(s); (b) telecommunications services certificated by the California Public Utilities Commission under California Public Utilities Code § 1001; or (c) services provided by a telephone corporation as that term is defined in California Public Utilities Code § 234. Nothing in this definition is intended to limit the types of services that a communications services provider accessing a multiple occupancy building pursuant to this Article 52 may provide to occupants.

“Communications services provider” means a person that: (a) has obtained a franchise to provide video service from the California Public Utilities Commission under California Public Utilities Code § 5840; (b) has obtained a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the California Public Utilities Commission under California Public Utilities Code § 1001 to provide telecommunications services; or (c) is a telephone corporation as that term is defined in California Public Utilities Code § 234. In addition, a communications services provider must have obtained a Utility Conditions Permit from the City under Administrative Code Section 11.9.

“Existing wiring” means both home run wiring and cable home wiring, as those terms are defined by the Federal Communications Commission in 47 C.F.R. § 76.800(d) and 47 C.F.R. § 76.5(II) respectively, except that those terms as used herein shall apply only to the home run wiring or cable home wiring owned by a property owner.

“Just and reasonable compensation” means the “fair market value” of the impact on the multiple occupancy building as that term is defined in California Code of Civil Procedure § 1263.320.

“Multiple occupancy building” means: (a) an apartment building, apartment complex, or any other group of residential units located upon a single premises or lot, provided that such multiple dwelling unit contains at least four separate units; and (b) a multi-tenant building used for business purposes that has separate units occupied by at least four different persons. Hotels, guesthouses, and motels, consisting primarily of guest rooms and/or transient accommodations, are not multiple occupancy buildings. Multiple occupancy buildings include properties that are rented to tenants, owned and occupied by individual owners, or occupied by shareholders/tenants of a cooperative.

“Occupant” means a person occupying a unit in a multiple occupancy building.

“Person” means any natural person or an entity including but not limited to a corporation or partnership.

“Property owner” means a person that owns a multiple occupancy building or controls or manages a multiple occupancy building on behalf of other persons.

“Request for service” means an expression of interest from an occupant received by a communications service provider either by mail, telephone or electronic mail. A contact between an occupant and a communications services provider through a sign-up list contained on the provider’s website will be deemed a request for service once the communications services provider confirms the request either by telephone or electronic mail.

– (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5201. NO INTERFERENCE BY PROPERTY OWNER.

(a) No property owner shall interfere with the right of an occupant to obtain communications services from the communications services provider of the occupant’s choice.

(b) A property owner interferes with the occupant’s choice of communications services provider by, among other things, refusing to allow a communications services provider to install the facilities and equipment necessary to provide communications services or use any existing wiring to provide communications services as required by this Article 52.

– (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5202. NO DISCRIMINATION BY PROPERTY OWNER AGAINST OCCUPANT.

No property owner shall discriminate in any manner against an occupant on account of the occupant’s requesting or obtaining communications services from the communications services provider of the occupant’s choice.

– (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5203. APPLICABILITY.

All property owners as defined in Section 5200 are covered by this Article 52. A property owner that, as of the effective date of this Article, has an agreement with a communication services provider that purports to grant the communications services provider exclusive access to a multiple occupancy building and/or the existing wiring to provide services is not exempt from the requirements of this Article.

– (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5204. REQUEST TO INSPECT A MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY BUILDING.

(a) Prior to issuing a notice of intent to provide service under Section 5205 of this Article 52, a communications services provider shall inspect a multiple occupancy building to determine the feasibility of providing services to one or more occupants.

(b) A communications services provider shall request in writing that the property owner allow it to inspect the property for the purpose of providing service. Such request shall be sent to the property owner by registered mail at least 14 days before the proposed date for the inspection. The request may be sent by electronic mail instead, but the 14-day period shall not commence until the communications services provider is able to confirm that the property owner actually received the electronic mail communication.

(c) A request for an inspection shall include, but need not be limited to, the following:

(1) A statement that the communications services provider: (A) is authorized to provide communications services in the City; (B) has received a request for service from one or more occupants; (C) when inspecting the property, will conform to such reasonable conditions as the property owner deems necessary to protect the safety, functioning, and appearance of the property and the convenience and well-being of the occupants; and (D) will indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the property owner for any damage caused by the inspection.

(2) A description of: (A) the communications services to be offered to occupants; (B) the facilities and equipment the communications services provider anticipates installing on the property; (C) the square footage generally required for the provider’s facilities and equipment; and (D) the estimated electrical demand of the provider’s facilities and equipment.

(3) The date and time the communications services provider proposes to inspect the property.

(4) A statement that the property owner has until three days before the proposed inspection date to notify the communications services provider in writing either that:

(A) The property owner will not allow the communications services provider to provide services on the property. In this case, the property owner shall set forth the reasons for its refusal and whether any of those reasons are permitted by Section 5206 of this Article 52; or

(B) The property owner will allow the communications services provider to inspect the property. In this case, the property owner shall identify any reasonable conditions that the communications services provider must follow during the inspection in order to protect the safety, functioning, and appearance of the property and the convenience and well-being of the occupants.

(5) A reference to and a copy of this Article 52.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5205. NOTICE OF INTENT TO PROVIDE SERVICE.

(a) A communications services provider that intends to provide communications services to one or more occupants shall send a notice of intent to the property owner at least 30 days before the proposed installation date. The notice of intent shall be sent by registered mail or electronic mail. If the notice of intent is sent by electronic mail, the 30-day period shall not commence until the communications service provider is able to confirm that the property owner actually received the electronic mail communication.

(b) A notice of intent to provide communications services shall include, but need not be limited to, the following information:

(1) A statement that the communications services provider: (A) is authorized to provide communications services in the City; (B) has received a request for service from one or more occupants, including the unit number of each such occupant; (C) when installing, operating, maintaining or removing its facilities and equipment from the property, will conform to such reasonable conditions as the property owner deems necessary to protect the safety, functioning, and appearance of the property and the convenience and well-being of the occupants; (D) will pay the property owner just and reasonable compensation for its use of the property, and the proposed amount of such just and reasonable compensation to be paid as required by Article 52 of the Police Code; and (E) will indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the property owner for any damage caused by the installation, operation, maintenance, or removal of its facilities from the property.

(2) (A) A description of the communications services to be offered to occupants; and (B) a full set of the communications services provider's detailed plans and specifications for any work to be performed and facilities and equipment to be installed in or on the property, including any required utility connections and the electrical demand of any facilities and equipment to be installed.

(3) The dates and times the communications services provider proposes to start and complete the installation.

(4) A statement that the property owner has until five days before the proposed installation start date to notify the communications services provider in writing either that:

(A) The property owner will not allow the communications services provider to provide services on the property. In this case, the property owner shall set forth the reasons for its refusal and whether any of those reasons are permitted by Section 5206 of this Article 52; or

(B) The property owner will allow the communications services provider to provide services on the property, but disagrees with the amount of the just and reasonable compensation the communications services provider has proposed. In this case, the property owner shall state the amount of just and reasonable compensation the property owner will require; and, in either the case of (A) or (B), the property owner shall state:

(C) Such reasonable conditions the communications services provider must follow during the installation to protect the safety, functioning, and appearance of the property and the convenience and well-being of the occupants.

(5) A reference to and a copy of this Article 52.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5206. PERMITTED REFUSAL OF ACCESS.

(a) Nothing in this Article 52 shall be construed to require a property owner to allow a communications services provider to access its property to inspect the property where the communications services provider has failed or refused to agree to the property owner's request that the provider comply with any conditions on accessing the property contained in a notice pursuant to Section 5207 of this Article.

(b) Nothing in this Article 52 shall be construed to require a property owner to allow a communications services provider to access its property to install the facilities and equipment that are necessary to offer services to occupants where:

(1) The communications services provider is not authorized to provide communications services in the City;

(2) The communications services provider cannot verify that one or more occupants of the multiple occupancy building have made a request for services;

(3) The property owner can show that physical limitations at the property prohibit the communications services provider from installing the facilities and equipment in existing space that are necessary to provide communications services and/or from using existing wiring to provide such services;

(4) The communications services provider has not agreed to the property owner's request that the provider comply with any conditions on accessing the property contained in a notice from the property owner issued pursuant to Section 5207 of this Article 52;

(5) The communications services provider's proposed installation of facilities and equipment in or on the property would: (A) have a significant, adverse effect on any historically or architecturally significant elements of the property; (B) disturb any existing asbestos or lead-paint in or on the property; (C) have a significant, adverse effect on the continued ability of existing communications services providers to provide services on the property; (D) cause undue damage to the property; or (E) impair the use of the property for the continued provision of any existing essential services; or

(6) The property owner and communications services provider have not reached an agreement concerning any just and reasonable compensation to the property owner for allowing the communications services provider to install, operate, and maintain facilities and equipment on its property as required by Section 5208 of this Article 52.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5207. PERMITTED LIMITATIONS ON ACCESS.

(a) A property owner that grants a communications services provider access to its property to inspect the property may require the communications services provider to conform to such reasonable conditions as the property owner deems necessary to protect the safety, functioning, and appearance of the property and the convenience and well-being of the occupants during the inspection.

(b) A property owner that grants a communications services provider access to its property to install facilities and equipment on the property to be used to offer communications services to occupants may require the communications services provider, when installing, operating, maintaining, or removing its facilities and equipment from the property to:

(1) Conform to such reasonable conditions as the property owner deems necessary to protect the safety, functioning, and appearance of the property and the convenience and well-being of the occupants;

(2) Provide a certificate of insurance evidencing coverages generally required by the property owner for contractors performing comparable work at the property;

(3) Demonstrate that any contractors installing facilities and equipment on the property are licensed;

(4) Obtain any permits that might be required to install facilities and equipment on the property;

(5) Accept responsibility for the cost: (A) to install any electrical facilities needed to serve the facilities and equipment installed by the provider; and (B) of any electricity to be used by those facilities and equipment;

(6) Allow the property owner to inspect the communication services provider's installation and construction of any facilities and equipment for compliance with the San Francisco Building Code and generally acceptable construction standards; and

(7) Remove its facilities and equipment and restore any area of the property occupied by the communications services provider to its prior condition when: (A) those facilities and equipment are no longer being used to provide communications services to any occupant; or (B) any access agreement between the property owner and the communication services provider has expired or been terminated.

(c) A property owner that has received an inspection request under Section 5204(a) of this Article 52 or an installation notice under Section 5205(b) of this Article shall notify the communications services provider in writing at least five days before the inspection or installation of any conditions authorized under subsections (a) or (b) that the communications services provider must comply with while inspecting the property or installing facilities or equipment on the property.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5208. JUST AND REASONABLE COMPENSATION.

A property owner is entitled to just and reasonable compensation from a communications services provider that obtains access to a multiple occupancy building from a property owner pursuant to this Article 52 to provide communications services to occupants.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5209. NOTICE OF VIOLATION.

(a) A communications services provider or occupant that believes that a property owner has failed to comply with the requirements of this Article 52 shall notify the property owner in writing that: (1) the property owner is in violation of this Article; and (2) unless the property owner agrees to come into compliance with this Article within 10 days the communications services provider or occupant may take action against the property owner pursuant to Section 5211 of this Article.

(b) The notice required by subsection (a) shall: (1) describe the manner in which the property owner is in violation of this Article 52; and (2) identify any actions the property owner is required to take to come into compliance with this Article.

(c) No communications services provider or occupant may enforce the requirements of this Article 52, as permitted under Section 5211, unless and until the communications services provider or occupant has complied with subsection (a).

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5210. ENFORCEMENT BY THE CITY ATTORNEY.

The City Attorney may institute a civil proceeding in the San Francisco Superior Court on behalf of the City for injunctive and monetary relief, including civil penalties as specified more fully in Section 5213 of this Article 52, to enforce this Article against a property owner that has violated this Article.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5211. ENFORCEMENT BY COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES PROVIDERS AND OCCUPANTS.

(a) A communications services provider or occupant of a multiple occupancy building where the property owner has refused to allow the communications services provider to provide service may institute a civil proceeding to enforce this Article 52 in San Francisco Superior Court against such property owner for injunctive and monetary relief.

(b) Prior to filing a civil proceeding in accordance with subsection (a), the communications services provider or occupant shall: (1) comply with the notice requirements contained in Section 5209 of this Article 52, and (2) notify the City Attorney in writing of its intent to proceed against a property owner.

(c) Subject to subsection (d), a communications services provider or occupant that has complied with subsection (b) may commence such a proceeding 30 days after notice was sent to the City Attorney.

(d) If the City Attorney institutes a civil proceeding against the property owner before or during the 30-day notice period, then no communications services provider or occupant may file a proceeding under subsection (a). If the City Attorney institutes a civil proceeding after the 30-day notice period has elapsed, any communications services provider or occupant that provides the notice required under subsection (b) may file a separate civil proceeding.

(e) The City Attorney shall notify any person submitting a notice under subsection (b) that the City Attorney has instituted a civil proceeding or decided not to institute a civil proceeding.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5212. ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS.

(a) A court may award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to the City if it obtains injunctive relief under Section 5210 of this Article 52 or to any person who obtains injunctive and monetary relief under Section 5211 of this Article.

(b) If a court finds that any action brought under this Article 52 is frivolous, the court may award the property owner reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

(c) If a proceeding brought against a property owner under this Article 52 concerns a multiple occupancy building that contains fewer than 25,000 square feet of space available for occupants to rent or own, the attorneys' fees and costs recoverable against the property owner pursuant to subsection (a), or recoverable against a person commencing the action pursuant to subsection (b), shall be limited to \$5,000.

■ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5213. CIVIL PENALTIES.

(a) Any property owner that violates this Article 52 may be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed \$500 for each day such violation is committed or continues. Such penalty shall be assessed and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the City by the City Attorney.

(b) In assessing the amount of a civil penalty, a court may consider any of the relevant circumstances, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (1) The number of occupants affected by the violation;
 - (2) The number of communications services providers affected by the violation;
 - (3) Whether the property owner has violated this Article 52 at other properties;
 - (4) The amount of revenues the property owner receives from any existing communications services providers serving the property;
 - (5) Whether the property owner has a legitimate reason for refusing access to its property by the communications services provider;
- and
- (6) The net assets and liabilities of the property owner, whether corporate or individual.

(c) Any civil penalty under subsection (a) will start to accrue following the completion of the notice required by Section 5209 of this Article 52.

▫ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5214. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

(a) Any court proceeding by a communications services provider or occupant to enforce this Article 52 against a property owner must be brought within 180 days of the communications services provider or occupant completing the notice requirements contained in Sections 5209 and 5211 of this Article.

(b) The City Attorney may institute a court proceeding to enforce this Article 52 within 180 days of the City Attorney receiving written notice that a property owner has violated this Article.

▫ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5215. EXTENSIONS OF TIME.

Any of the deadlines set forth in Sections 5204, 5205, 5207, or 5209 of this Article 52 may be extended by agreement between a communications services provider or occupant and property owner, as applicable.

▫ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5216. UNDERTAKING FOR GENERAL WELFARE.

In enacting or implementing this Article 52, the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. It is not assuming, nor is it imposing on its officers and employees, an obligation for breach of which it is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused injury.

▫ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5217. SEVERABILITY.

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Article 52, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this Article, and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional, without regard to whether any other portion of this Article or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

▫ (Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)

SEC. 5218. NO CONFLICT WITH FEDERAL OR STATE LAW.

Nothing in this Article 52 shall be interpreted or applied so as to create any requirement, power, or duty in conflict with any federal or state law.

(Added by Ord. [250-16](#), File No. 161110, App. 12/22/2016, Eff. 1/21/2017)



Lori Droste
Vice Mayor District 8

Consent Calendar
February 9, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Vice Mayor Lori Droste
Subject: Potential Measure P FY2022 Allocations

Recommendation

Refer the Measure P funding discussion to the City Manager, Measure P Homeless Panel of Experts, and the Health and Life Enrichment policy committee to determine next steps to ensure that the Measure P fund stays solvent. Specifically, these bodies should prioritize preferred programs and services within the various categories that the Measure P panel previously outlined according to updated projected revenues. During the course of these deliberations, the Panel of Experts should hear presentations from staff on which homeless services (e.g. permanent supportive housing exits, shelters, emergency interventions, multi-departmental staffing, and supportive services) are funded outside of Measure P so that the bodies can make recommendations after understanding the entirety of services and programs.

To the extent possible, the committees and commissions should attempt to find a non-volatile source of funding for permanent supportive housing, using the [1,000 person plan](#) as a framework for best addressing the homelessness crisis on our streets.

The Panel of Experts and Health and Life Enrichment policy committee should finalize their priorities in time for the budget committee's consideration in June of 2021.

Background

Current Measure P revenues projections for the upcoming fiscal years are currently estimated at \$3 million dollars while total annual expenses hover around \$11.5 (Attachment A). While the beginning fund balance is healthy for FY21 and FY22, if current allocations are sustained, the fiscal year shortfalls begin this year and extend to \$8 million dollar annual fiscal year deficits in the following fiscal years.¹

¹ <https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/2020-11-12%20Budget%20Item%203a.pdf>

In 2019, the Measure P Panel of Experts recommended that Council allocate its Measure P revenues accordingly:

- 30% permanent supportive housing
- 30% temporary accommodations and shelter
- 14% street conditions and hygiene
- 14% supportive services
- 10% flexible housing funds
- 2% infrastructure.

If Council chooses to strictly follow the recommended percentage allocations, this means that Council has the following revenue to allocate to the aforementioned categories:

- \$900,000 to permanent supportive housing
- \$900,000 to temporary accommodations and shelter
- \$420,000 to street conditions and hygiene
- \$420,000 to supportive services
- \$300,000 to flexible housing funds
- \$60,000 to infrastructure

For example, Council allocated approximately \$2.6 million for temporary shelters (STAIR, Dorothy Day, YSA, outdoor shelter) in FY2021. If Council wants to maintain these existing and new shelter programs *and* if overall revenues are anticipated to be only \$3 million, Council will exhaust all Measure P revenue and have no money to allocate to permanent supportive housing, street conditions and hygiene, supportive services, flexible housing funds, and infrastructure. (Additionally, in October of 2020, City Council also approved a \$900,000 yearly [permanent supportive housing Measure P allocation](#) for homeless housing.)

Fiscal Impacts

By addressing future funding shortfalls, this item will guide discussions to ensure that the Measure P fund remains financially solvent.

Contact

Lori Droste, Vice Mayor, ldroste@cityofberkeley.info

Attachment 1. Measure P Program Projection

**EXHIBIT 1
TRANSFER TAX -- MEASURE P PROGRAM PROJECTION**

1/13/21 2:56 PM

	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actual	FY 2021 Estimate	FY 2022 Estimate	FY 2023 Estimate	FY 2024 Estimate
Revenues						
<i>Beginning Fund Balance</i>		\$2,932,313	\$9,859,779	\$5,008,436	(\$3,514,040)	(\$12,100,474)
<i>Measure P Revenues (1)</i>	2,932,313	9,512,603	4,747,414	3,000,000	3,060,000	3,121,200
<i>Permanent Local Housing Allocation (FY 21)</i>	0	0	1,000,000	0	0	0
Total Revenues and Balance of Funds	2,932,313	12,444,916	15,607,193	8,008,436	(454,040)	(8,979,274)
LESS: Total Expenses						
<u><i>Personnel Costs</i></u>	0	118,521	279,927	336,951	460,909	477,041
Finance: Accountant II (2)		0	152,965	158,319	163,860	169,595
Finance: Contract Staffing		38,266	11,734	0	0	0
HHCS: Community Services Specialist II (Filled) (3)		80,255	115,228	178,633	184,885	191,356
HHCS: 50% Senior Management Analyst (Requested) (4)		0	0	0	112,164	116,090
<u><i>Non-Personnel Costs/ Program Expenses</i></u>	0	2,466,616	10,318,830	11,185,524	11,185,524	11,185,524
Fire: 5150 Response & Transport (2) (5)	0	846,616	2,753,384	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Dorothy Day House Shelter (6)	0	0	300,000	566,000	566,000	566,000
Dorothy Day House Drop In (6)	0	0	21,340	182,000	182,000	182,000
Pathways STAIR Center	0	0	2,200,000	2,499,525	2,499,525	2,499,525
Coordinated Entry System	0	0	0	1,442,426	1,442,426	1,442,426
BDIC Locker Program	0	0	25,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
LifeLong Medical - Street Medicine	0	0	454,239	454,239	454,239	454,239
YSA Tiny Home	0	0	117,000	78,000	78,000	78,000
DBA- Homeless Outreach Worker	0	20,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Downtown Streets Team	0	0	225,000	225,000	225,000	225,000
Outdoor Shelter	0	0	615,000	615,000	615,000	615,000
COVID-19 Housing Solutions (7)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Permanent Housing Subsidies	0	0	2,434,053	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
HHCS: Square One Hotel Vouchers	0	0	65,947	0	0	0
Training and Evaluation	0	0	133,334	133,334	133,334	133,334
Homeless Response Team	0	0	934,533	0	0	0
Berkeley Relief Fund	0	1,600,000	0	0	0	0
Fiscal Year Surplus (Shortfall)	2,932,313	6,927,466	(5,851,343)	(8,522,476)	(8,586,433)	(8,541,365)
Ending Fund Balance	\$2,932,313	\$9,859,779	\$5,008,436	(\$3,514,040)	(\$12,100,474)	(\$20,641,839)

Notes:

Measure P: General Fund (Fund 011)/ Program Code 5002

(1). Revenues revised to reflect FY 20 actuals and revised projections part of FY 21 adopted budget.

(2). Approved as part of FY 20 budget.

(3). This position supports the Measure P Panel of Experts, monitors contracts with BACS, tracks and reports on outcomes of homeless programs and represents Berkeley at county-wide homeless coordinating meetings

(4). Responsibilities include processing contracts and payments for homeless contracts, tracks expenditures and assists in reporting to funders. Funding to be shared with Measure U1 as proposed and discussed at Land Use Policy Committee.

(5). Assumes 1,200 calls per year and a cost per call of \$2,000. Reimbursement levels will vary and may impact this estimated cost.

(6). Existing program. FY 20 represents partial year funding. FY 21 and thereafter represents full year funding.

(7). [Per Mayor's Recommended Adopted Budget for FY 21, STAIR Center Expansion \(\\$705,000\) and Safe RV Parking \(\\$100,000\) were combined for COVID-19 Homeless Solutions.](#) On December 15, 2020, City Council adopted FY 21 AAO#1 and reallocated these funds to the Homeless Response Team.

EXHIBIT 2
Homeless Response Team

	FY 2021 Estimate	FY 2022 Estimate	FY 2023 Estimate	FY 2024 Estimate
<i>Personnel Costs</i>	\$257,016	\$1,000,673	\$1,000,673	\$1,000,673
CMO: Community Services Specialist II (Existing, Not Filled)	47,750	191,000	191,000	191,000
CMO: Community Services Specialist III (New)	53,487	213,949	213,949	213,949
CMO: Health Services Program Specialist (Existing, Filled)	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
CMO: Social Services Specialist (New)	75,362	150,724	150,724	150,724
PRW: Landscape Gardener	69,417	119,000	119,000	119,000
PW: Helper and Driver	0	315,000	315,000	315,000
PD: Community Services Officer	0	0	0	0
PD: Staff Support Overtime	57,920	57,920	57,920	57,920
<i>Non-Personnel Costs/ Program Expenses</i>	\$677,517	\$414,300	\$414,300	\$414,300
CMO: Neighborhood Services Outreach Fund	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
CMO: Neighborhood Services Mitigation Flex Fund	29,167	50,000	50,000	50,000
CMO: Staff Operating Costs	43,600	21,600	21,600	21,600
CMO: Outreach Vehicle	32,000	0	0	0
CMO: Outreach Vehicle - Replacement and Maintenance Fees	1,000	6,700	6,700	6,700
Public Works: Downtown Streets Handsweep	50,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Public Works: Tipping Fees	43,750	75,000	75,000	75,000
Public Works: Rear Loader and Stake Bed Truck	380,000	0	0	0
Public Works: Truck - Replacement and Maintenance Fees	83,000	146,000	146,000	146,000
Total Expenses	\$934,533	\$1,414,973	\$1,414,973	\$1,414,973

Upcoming Worksessions – <i>start time is 6:00 p.m. unless otherwise noted</i>	
Scheduled Dates	
Feb. 16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BMASP/Berkeley Pier-WETA Ferry 2. Systems Realignment 3. Presentation: Report on Homeless Outreach during COVID 19 Pandemic
March 16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capital Improvement Plan (Parks & Public Works) 2. Digital Strategic Plan/FUND\$ Replacement/Website Update 3. FY 2021 Mid-Year Report and the Unfunded Liabilities Report (tentative)
May 18	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bayer Development Agreement (tentative) 2. Affordable Housing Policy Reform (tentative)


Unscheduled Workshops
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cannabis Health Considerations 2. Berkeley Police Department Hiring Practices (referred by the Public Safety Committee)

Unscheduled Presentations (City Manager)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update: Zero Waste Priorities 2. Civic Arts Grantmaking Process & Capital Grant Program

	City Council Referrals to the Agenda & Rules Committee and Unfinished Business for Scheduling
1.	<p>47. Amending Chapter 19.32 of the Berkeley Municipal Code to Require Kitchen Exhaust Hood Ventilation in Residential and Condominium Units Prior to Execution of a Contract for Sale or Close of Escrow <i>(Reviewed by Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment, and Sustainability Committee) (Referred from the January 21, 2020 agenda)</i></p> <p>From: Councilmember Harrison</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt an ordinance amending Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) 19.32 to require kitchen exhaust ventilation in residential and condominium units prior to execution of a contract for sale or close of escrow. 2. Refer to the City Manager to develop a process for informing owners and tenants of the proper use of exhaust hoods. <p>Financial Implications: See report Contact: Kate Harrison, Councilmember, District 4, (510) 981-7140 <i>Note: Referred to Agenda & Rules for future scheduling.</i></p>
2.	<p>25. Surveillance Technology Report, Surveillance Acquisition Report, and Surveillance Use Policy for Automatic License Plate Readers <i>(Continued from February 25, 2020. Item contains revised and supplemental materials) (Referred from the May 12, 2020 agenda.)</i></p> <p>From: City Manager</p> <p>Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution accepting the Surveillance Technology Report, Surveillance Acquisition Report, and Surveillance Use Policy for Automatic License Plate Readers submitted pursuant to Chapter 2.99 of the Berkeley Municipal Code.</p> <p>Financial Implications: None Contact: Andrew Greenwood, Police, (510) 981-5900; Dave White, City Manager's Office, (510) 981-7000 <i>Note: Referred to Agenda & Rules for future scheduling.</i></p>

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT				
WORKING CALENDAR FOR SCHEDULING LAND USE MATTERS BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL				
Address	Board/ Commission	Appeal Period Ends	Determination on Appeal Submitted	Public Hearing
NOD – Notices of Decision				
1 Orchard Ln (The Steilberg House and Cottages)	LPC	2/9/2021		
2300 College Ave (add service of beer and wine)	ZAB	2/2/2021		
2980 College Ave "Elmwood Village" (increase dwelling units)	ZAB	2/2/2021		
1549 Shattuck Ave (add service of distilled spirits)	ZAB	2/2/2021		
Public Hearings Scheduled				
0 (2435) San Pablo Ave (construct mixed-use building)	ZAB			1/21/2021
1915 Berryman St (Payson House)	LPC			1/21/2021
1850 Arch St (add bedrooms to multi-family residential building)	ZAB			2/23/2021
1862 Arch St (add bedrooms to multi-family residential building)	ZAB			2/23/2021
1200-1214 San Pablo Ave (construct mixed-use building)	ZAB			3/23/2021
Remanded to ZAB or LPC				
Notes				

1/19/2021



Office of the City Manager

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 2

Meeting Date: November 10, 2020

Item Number: 20

Item Description: Annual Commission Attendance and Meeting Frequency Report

Submitted by: Mark Numainville, City Clerk

The attached memo responds to issues and questions raised at the October 26 Agenda & Rules Committee Meeting and the October 27 City Council Meeting regarding the ability of city boards and commissions to resume regular meeting schedules.



Office of the City Manager

November 9, 2020, 2020

To: Mayor and Council
From: Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager
Subject: Commission Meetings Under COVID-19 Emergency (Item 20)

This memo provides supplemental information for the discussion on Item 20 on the November 10, 2020 Council agenda. Below is a summary and update of the status of meetings of Berkeley Boards and Commissions during the COVID-19 emergency declaration and the data collected by the City Manager on the ability of commissions to resume meetings in 2021.

On March 10, 2020 the City Council ratified the proclamation of the Director of Emergency Services for a state of local emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The emergency proclamation has been renewed twice by the Council and remains in effect.

On March 17, 2020 the City Council adopted Resolution No. 69,331-N.S. which placed limitations of the meetings of City legislative bodies, including all boards and commissions. The resolution allows for commissions to meet to conduct time-sensitive, legally mandated business with the authorization of the City Manager. Since that time, several commissions have obtained this approval and held meetings; many other commissions have not met at all since March.

The City Manager has periodically reviewed the status of commission meetings with the City Council Agenda & Rules Committee. Recently, at the October 12, 2020 Agenda & Rules Committee meeting, the City Manager presented a proposal to allow all commissions to meet under limited circumstances. The Committee voted to endorse the City Manager's recommendation.

Effective October 12, 2020, all City boards and commissions may meet once to develop and finalize their work plan for 2021 and to complete any Council referrals directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic response. A second meeting may be held to

complete this work with specific authorization by the City Manager. It is recommended that the meeting(s) occur by the end of February 2021.

Commissions that have been granted permission to meet under Resolution No. 69,331-N.S. may continue to meet pursuant to their existing authorization, and may also meet to develop their 2021 work plan.

Commissions that have not requested meetings pursuant to the Resolution No. 69,331-N.S. may meet pursuant to the limitations listed above.

In response to questions from the Agenda & Rules Committee and the Council, the City Manager polled all departments that support commissions to obtain information on their capacity to support the resumption of regular commission meetings. The information in Attachment 1 shows the information received from the departments and notes each commission's ability to resume a regular, or semi-regular, meeting schedule in 2021.

In summary, there are 24 commissions that have staff resources available to support a regular meeting schedule in 2021. Seven of these 24 commissions have been meeting regularly during the pandemic. There are five commissions that have staff resources available to support a limited meeting schedule in 2021. There are seven commissions that currently do not have staff resources available to start meeting regularly at the beginning of 2021. Some of these seven commissions will have staff resources available later in 2021 to support regular meetings. Please see Attachment 1 for the full list of commissions and their status.

With regards to commission subcommittees, there has been significant discussion regarding the ability of staff to support these meetings in a virtual environment. Under normal circumstances, the secretary's responsibilities regarding subcommittees is limited to posting the agenda and reserving the meeting space (if in a city building). With the necessity to hold the meetings in a virtual environment and be open to the public, it is likely that subcommittee meetings will require significantly more staff resources to schedule, train, manage, and support the work of subcommittees on Zoom or a similar platform. This additional demand on staff resources to support commission subcommittees is not feasible for any commission at this time.

One possible option for subcommittees is to temporarily suspend the requirement for ad hoc subcommittees of city commissions to notice their meetings and require public participation. Ad hoc subcommittees are not legislative bodies under the Brown Act and are not required to post agendas or allow for public participation. These requirements are specific to Berkeley and are adopted by resolution in the Commissioners' Manual. If it is the will of the Council, staff could introduce an item to temporarily suspend these

requirements which will allow subcommittees of all commissions to meet as needed to develop recommendations that will be presented to the full commission.

The limitations on the meetings of certain commissions are due to the need to direct staff resources and the resources of city legislative bodies to the pandemic response. Some of the staff assigned as commission secretaries are engaged in work with the City Emergency Operations Center or have been assigned new duties specifically related to the impacts of the pandemic.

Meeting frequency for boards and commissions will continue to be evaluated on a regular basis by the City Manager and the Health Officer in consultation with Department Heads and the City Council.

Attachments:

1. List of Commissions with Meeting Status
2. Resolution 69,331-N.S.

**November 10, 2020 - Item 20
Supplemental Information**

<u>Boards and Commissions</u>	<u>Meetings Held Under COVID March - Oct</u>	<u>Regular Mtg. Date</u>	<u>Secretary</u>	<u>Dept.</u>	<u>Resume Regular Schedule in January 2021?</u>	<u>Note</u>
Fair Campaign Practices Commission	9	3rd Thur.	Sam Harvey	CA	YES	Have been meeting regularly under COVID Emergency
Open Government Commission	6	3rd Thur.	Sam Harvey	CA	YES	Have been meeting regularly under COVID Emergency
Animal Care Commission	0	3rd Wed.	Amelia Funghi	CM	YES	
Police Review Commission	10	2nd & 4th Wed.	Katherine Lee	CM	YES	Have been meeting regularly under COVID Emergency
Disaster and Fire Safety Commission	4	4th Wed.	Keith May	FES	YES	
Community Health Commission	0	4th Thur.	Roberto Terrones	HHCS	YES	
Homeless Commission	0	2nd Wed.	Josh Jacobs	HHCS	YES	
Homeless Services Panel of Experts	5	1st Wed	Josh Jacobs	HHCS	YES	
Human Welfare & Community Action Commission	0	3rd Wed.	Mary-Claire Katz	HHCS	YES	
Mental Health Commission	1	4th Thur.	Jamie Works-Wright	HHCS	YES	
Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts	0	3rd Thur.	Dechen Tsering	HHCS	YES	
Civic Arts Commission	2	4th Wed.	Jennifer Lovvorn	OED	YES	
Elmwood BID Advisory Board	1	Contact Secretary	Kieron Slaughter	OED	YES	
Loan Administration Board	0	Contact Secretary	Kieron Slaughter	OED	YES	
Solano Avenue BID Advisory Board	2	Contact Secretary	Eleanor Hollander	OED	YES	
Design Review Committee	6	3rd Thur.	Anne Burns	PLD	YES	Have been meeting regularly under COVID Emergency
Energy Commission	0	4th Wed.	Billi Romain	PLD	YES	
Landmarks Preservation Commission	6	1st Thur.	Fatema Crane	PLD	YES	Have been meeting regularly under COVID Emergency
Planning Commission	3	1st Wed.	Alene Pearson	PLD	YES	Have been meeting regularly under COVID Emergency
Zoning Adjustments Board	11	2nd & 4th Thur.	Shannon Allen	PLD	YES	Have been meeting regularly under COVID Emergency
Parks and Waterfront Commission	4	2nd Wed.	Roger Miller	PRW	YES	
Commission on Disability	0	1st Wed.	Dominika Bednarska	PW	YES	
Public Works Commission	4	1st Thur.	Joe Enke	PW	YES	
Zero Waste Commission	0	4th Mon.	Heidi Obermeit	PW	YES	
Commission on the Status of Women	0	4th Wed.	Shallon Allen	CM	YES - LIMITED	Secretary has intermittent COVID assignments

November 10, 2020 - Item 20
Supplemental Information

<u>Boards and Commissions</u>	<u>Meetings Held Under COVID March - Oct</u>	<u>Regular Mtg. Date</u>	<u>Secretary</u>	<u>Dept.</u>	<u>Resume Regular Schedule in January 2021?</u>	<u>Note</u>
Commission on Aging	0	3rd Wed.	Richard Castrillon	HHCS	REDUCED FREQUENCY	Significant Dept. resources assigned to COVID response
Housing Advisory Commission	0	1st Thur.	Mike Uberti	HHCS	REDUCED FREQUENCY	Significant Dept. resources assigned to COVID response
Measure O Bond Oversight Committee	0	3rd Monday	Amy Davidson	HHCS	REDUCED FREQUENCY	Significant Dept. resources assigned to COVID response
Transportation Commission	2	3rd Thur.	Farid Javandel	PW	REDUCED FREQUENCY	Staff assigned to COVID response
Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission	0	4th Monday	Stephanie Chu	PRW	NO - SEPT 2021	Staff assigned to COVID response
Youth Commission	0	2nd Mon.	Ginsi Bryant	PRW	NO - SEPT 2021	Staff assigned to COVID response
Community Environmental Advisory Commission	0	2nd Thur.	Viviana Garcia	PLD	NO - JUNE 2021	Staff assigned to COVID response
Cannabis Commission	0	1st Thur.	VACANT	PLD	NO - JAN. 2022	Staff vacancy
Peace and Justice Commission	0	1st Mon.	VACANT	CM	NO	Staff vacancy
Commission on Labor	0	3rd Wed., alternate mon	Kristen Lee	HHCS	NO	Staff assigned to COVID response
Personnel Board	1	1st Mon.	La Tanya Bellow	HR	NO	Staff assigned to COVID response

RESOLUTION NO. 69,331-N.S.

RATIFYING THE RECOMMENDATIONS ISSUED BY THE DIRECTOR OF EMERGENCY SERVICES AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER REGARDING MEETINGS OF BERKELEY LEGISLATIVE BODIES IN RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 (NOVEL CORONAVIRUS) PANDEMIC

WHEREAS, on March 3, 2020, pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.88.040, the City Manager, serving as the Director of Emergency Services, proclaimed the existence of a local emergency; and

WHEREAS, the proclamation was warranted by virtue of the extreme peril to the safety of persons and property in the City caused by pandemic in the form of the global spread of a severe acute respiratory illness caused by a novel (new) coronavirus ("COVID-19"), including confirmed cases in California and the San Francisco Bay Area, and presumed cases in Alameda County prompting the County to declare a local health emergency; and

WHEREAS, the proclamation of the Director of Emergency Services was ratified by the City Council on March 10, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the continued spread of COVID-19 and increase in community transmission cases in surrounding counties warrant further measures be taken by the City to protect the community; and

WHEREAS, the Public Health Officer has issued guidelines for limiting mass gatherings; and

WHEREAS, certain limitations on the meetings of legislative bodies in the City of Berkeley is warranted; and

WHEREAS, the continued essential functions of the City and certain legislative bodies must continue for time-sensitive, legally mandated actions; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Emergency Services presented recommendations to the Agenda & Rules Committee on March 12, 2020 regarding the meetings of legislative bodies; and

WHEREAS, the Agenda & Rules Committee recommended that said recommendations be forwarded to the City Council for acknowledgement and ratification.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the following recommendations issued by the Director of Emergency Services and the Public Health Officer regarding limitations and practices for legislative bodies of the City of Berkeley are hereby acknowledged and ratified:

Section 1. Boards and Commissions

Commissions listed below may continue to meet only if they have time-sensitive, legally mandated business to complete, as determined by the Director of Emergency Services. The City may consider teleconferencing for these commissions, if feasible.

Design Review Committee
Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Housing Advisory Commission (limited to quasi-judicial activities)
Joint Subcommittee on the Implementation of State Housing Laws
Landmarks Preservation Commission
Open Government Commission
Personnel Board
Planning Commission
Police Review Commission
Zoning Adjustments Board

Commissions in Category B shall not meet for a period of 60 days. This will be re-evaluated at the Agenda & Rules Committee meeting on April 13, 2020. A Commission in Category B may convene a meeting if it has time-sensitive, legally-mandated business to complete, as determined by the Director of Emergency Services.

Category B

Animal Care Commission
Cannabis Commission
Civic Arts Commission
Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission
Commission on Aging
Commission on Disability
Commission on Labor
Commission on the Status of Women
Community Environmental Advisory Commission
Community Health Commission
Disaster and Fire Safety Commission
Elmwood Business Improvement District Advisory Board
Energy Commission
Homeless Commission
Homeless Services Panel of Experts
Housing Advisory Commission
Human Welfare and Community Action Commission
Measure O Bond Oversight Committee
Mental Health Commission
Parks and Waterfront Commission
Peace and Justice Commission
Public Works Commission
Solano Avenue Business Improvement District Advisory Board
Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts

Transportation Commission
Youth Commission
Zero Waste Commission
Loan Administration Board

Section 2. City Council Policy Committees

The Agenda & Rules Committee and the Budget & Finance Committee may continue to meet to fulfill their legislative and advisory responsibilities. All other Policy Committees (Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability, Public Safety, Land Use, Housing & Economic Development, and Health, Life Enrichment Equity & Community) are suspended indefinitely. The 120-day deadline to consider an item will be tolled during the suspension of business.

Section 3. City Council


For City Council meetings, the City will continue to advise and implement social distancing by limiting the capacity of the Council Chambers, providing an overflow room, attempting to limit the duration of the meeting, only conducting essential business, and limiting or suspending ceremonial items. The City will adhere to and implement the provisions of the Governor's Executive Order #N-25-20 related to the Brown Act and the utilization of technology to facilitate participation.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on March 17, 2020 by the following vote:

Ayes: Bartlett, Davila, Droste, Hahn, Harrison, Kesarwani, Robinson, Wengraf, and Arreguin.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.



Jesse Arreguin, Mayor

Attest: 

Mark Numalville, City Clerk



Office of the City Manager

October 22, 2020

To: Berkeley Boards and Commissions

From: *DWR* Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager

Subject: Commission Meetings During COVID-19 Emergency

This memo serves to provide a summary and update of the status of meetings of Berkeley Boards and Commissions during the COVID-19 emergency declaration.

On March 10, 2020, the City Council ratified the proclamation of the Director of Emergency Services for a state of local emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The emergency proclamation has been renewed twice by the Council and remains in effect.

On March 17, 2020, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 69,331-N.S. which placed limitations of the meetings of City legislative bodies, including all boards and commissions. The resolution allows for commissions to meet to conduct time-sensitive, legally mandated business with the authorization of the City Manager. Since that time, several commissions have obtained this approval and held meetings; many other commissions have not met at all since March.

The City Manager has periodically reviewed the status of commission meetings with the City Council Agenda & Rules Committee. Recently, at the October 12, 2020, Agenda & Rules Committee meeting, the City Manager presented a proposal to allow all commissions to meet under limited circumstances. The Committee voted to endorse the City Manager's recommendation.

Effective October 12, 2020, all City boards and commissions may meet once to develop and finalize their work plan for 2021 and to complete any Council referrals directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic response. A second meeting may be held to complete this work with specific authorization by the City Manager. It is recommended that the meeting(s) occur by the end of February 2021.

Commissions that have been granted permission to meet under Resolution No. 69,331-N.S. may continue to meet pursuant to their existing authorization, and may also meet to develop their 2021 work plan.

Commissions that have not requested meetings pursuant to the Resolution No. 69,331-N.S. may meet pursuant to the limitations listed above.

To assist commissions with the development of their work plan and to provide the City Council with a consistent framework to review the work plans, the City Manager has developed the following items to consider in developing the work plan that is submitted to the City Council agenda.

Prompts for Commissions to use in work plan:

- What commission items for 2021 have a direct nexus with the COVID-19 response or are the result of a City Council referral pertaining to COVID-19?
- What commission items for 2021 are required for statutory reasons?
- What commission items for 2021 are required for budgetary or fund allocation reasons?
- What commission items for 2021 support council-adopted or voter-adopted mission critical projects or programs?
- What are the anticipated staff demands (above and beyond baseline) for analysis, data, etc., to support commission work in 2021 (baseline duties = posting agendas, creating packets, attend meetings, minutes, etc.)?

The limitations on commission meetings are due to the need to direct staff resources and the resources of city legislative bodies to the pandemic response. Many of the staff assigned as commission secretaries are engaged in work with the City Emergency Operations Center or have been assigned new specific duties related to the impacts of the pandemic.

Meeting frequency for boards and commissions will continue to be evaluated on a regular basis by the City Manager in consultation with Department Heads and the City Council. More frequent meetings by commissions will be permitted as the conditions under COVID-19 dictate.

Thank you for your service on our boards and commissions. The City values the work of our commissions and we appreciate your partnership and understanding as we address this pandemic as a resilient and vibrant community.

Attachments:

1. Resolution 69,331-N.S.
2. List of Commissions with Meeting Data

cc: Mayor and City Councilmembers
Senior Leadership Team

RESOLUTION NO. 69,331-N.S.

RATIFYING THE RECOMMENDATIONS ISSUED BY THE DIRECTOR OF EMERGENCY SERVICES AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER REGARDING MEETINGS OF BERKELEY LEGISLATIVE BODIES IN RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 (NOVEL CORONAVIRUS) PANDEMIC

WHEREAS, on March 3, 2020, pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.88.040, the City Manager, serving as the Director of Emergency Services, proclaimed the existence of a local emergency; and

WHEREAS, the proclamation was warranted by virtue of the extreme peril to the safety of persons and property in the City caused by pandemic in the form of the global spread of a severe acute respiratory illness caused by a novel (new) coronavirus ("COVID-19"), including confirmed cases in California and the San Francisco Bay Area, and presumed cases in Alameda County prompting the County to declare a local health emergency; and

WHEREAS, the proclamation of the Director of Emergency Services was ratified by the City Council on March 10, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the continued spread of COVID-19 and increase in community transmission cases in surrounding counties warrant further measures be taken by the City to protect the community; and

WHEREAS, the Public Health Officer has issued guidelines for limiting mass gatherings; and

WHEREAS, certain limitations on the meetings of legislative bodies in the City of Berkeley is warranted; and

WHEREAS, the continued essential functions of the City and certain legislative bodies must continue for time-sensitive, legally mandated actions; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Emergency Services presented recommendations to the Agenda & Rules Committee on March 12, 2020 regarding the meetings of legislative bodies; and

WHEREAS, the Agenda & Rules Committee recommended that said recommendations be forwarded to the City Council for acknowledgement and ratification.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the following recommendations issued by the Director of Emergency Services and the Public Health Officer regarding limitations and practices for legislative bodies of the City of Berkeley are hereby acknowledged and ratified:

Section 1. Boards and Commissions

Commissions listed below may continue to meet only if they have time-sensitive, legally mandated business to complete, as determined by the Director of Emergency Services. The City may consider teleconferencing for these commissions, if feasible.

Design Review Committee
Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Housing Advisory Commission (limited to quasi-judicial activities)
Joint Subcommittee on the Implementation of State Housing Laws
Landmarks Preservation Commission
Open Government Commission
Personnel Board
Planning Commission
Police Review Commission
Zoning Adjustments Board

Commissions in Category B shall not meet for a period of 60 days. This will be re-evaluated at the Agenda & Rules Committee meeting on April 13, 2020. A Commission in Category B may convene a meeting if it has time-sensitive, legally-mandated business to complete, as determined by the Director of Emergency Services.

Category B

Animal Care Commission
Cannabis Commission
Civic Arts Commission
Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission
Commission on Aging
Commission on Disability
Commission on Labor
Commission on the Status of Women
Community Environmental Advisory Commission
Community Health Commission
Disaster and Fire Safety Commission
Elmwood Business Improvement District Advisory Board
Energy Commission
Homeless Commission
Homeless Services Panel of Experts
Housing Advisory Commission
Human Welfare and Community Action Commission
Measure O Bond Oversight Committee
Mental Health Commission
Parks and Waterfront Commission
Peace and Justice Commission
Public Works Commission
Solano Avenue Business Improvement District Advisory Board
Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts

Transportation Commission
Youth Commission
Zero Waste Commission
Loan Administration Board

Section 2. City Council Policy Committees

The Agenda & Rules Committee and the Budget & Finance Committee may continue to meet to fulfill their legislative and advisory responsibilities. All other Policy Committees (Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability, Public Safety, Land Use, Housing & Economic Development, and Health, Life Enrichment Equity & Community) are suspended indefinitely. The 120-day deadline to consider an item will be tolled during the suspension of business.

Section 3. City Council


For City Council meetings, the City will continue to advise and implement social distancing by limiting the capacity of the Council Chambers, providing an overflow room, attempting to limit the duration of the meeting, only conducting essential business, and limiting or suspending ceremonial items. The City will adhere to and implement the provisions of the Governor's Executive Order #N-25-20 related to the Brown Act and the utilization of technology to facilitate participation.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on March 17, 2020 by the following vote:

Ayes: Bartlett, Davila, Droste, Hahn, Harrison, Kesarwani, Robinson, Wengraf, and Arreguin.

Noes: None.


Absent: None.



Jesse Arreguin, Mayor

Attest: 

Mark Numalville, City Clerk



[First Last name]
Councilmember District [District No.]

SUPPLEMENTAL REVISED AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 2

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Item Number: 2

Item Description: Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

Submitted by: Councilmember Hahn

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.



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

ACTION CALENDAR
February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Vice Mayor Sophie Hahn
Subject: Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

Officeholder accounts are accounts an elected official can open, and raise funds for, to pay for expenses related to the office they hold.¹ They are not campaign accounts, and cannot be used for campaign purposes. The types of expenses Officeholder Accounts can be used for include research, conferences, events attended in the performance of government duties, printed newsletters, office supplies, travel related to official duties, etc. Cities can place limits on Officeholder Accounts, as Oakland has done.² Officeholder Accounts must be registered as official "Committees" and adhere to strict public reporting requirements, like campaign accounts. They provide full transparency to the public about sources and uses of funds.

The FCPC bases its recommendation to prohibit Officeholder Accounts on arguments about "equity" and potential "corruption" in elections. The report refers repeatedly to "challengers" and "incumbents," suggesting that Officeholder Accounts are vehicles for unfairness in the election context.

I believe that the FCPC's recommendations reflect a misunderstanding of the purpose and uses of Officeholder Accounts, equating them with campaign accounts and suggesting that they create an imbalance between community members who apparently have already decided to run against an incumbent (so-called "challengers") and elected officials who are presumed to be

¹ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS-Documents/LegalDiv/Regulations/Index/Chapter5/18531.62.pdf>

² <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>

always running for office. The recommendations do not take into account some important framing: the question of what funds are otherwise available to pay for Officeholder-type expenses for Officeholders or members of the public. Contrary to the conclusions of the FCPC, I believe Officeholder accounts are an important vehicle to redress a significant disadvantage for elected officials, whose ability to exercise free speech in the community and participate in conferences and events related to their profession is constrained by virtue of holding public office, as compared to community members, whose speech rights are unrestricted in any manner whatsoever, and who can raise money to use for whatever purposes they desire.

Outlawing Officeholder Accounts is also posited as a means to create equity between more and less wealthy Officeholders, on the theory that less affluent Officeholders will have less access to fundraising for Officeholder Accounts than more affluent Officeholders. Because there are no prohibition on using personal funds for many of the purposes for which Officeholder Account funds can be used, prohibiting Officeholder Accounts I believe has the opposite effect; it leaves more affluent Officeholders with the ability to pay for Officeholder expenses from personal funds, without providing an avenue for less affluent Officeholders, who may not have available personal funds, to raise money from their supporters to pay for such Officeholder expenses.

The question of whether Officeholder Accounts should be allowed in Berkeley plays out in the context of a number of rules and realities that are important to framing any analysis.

First, by State Law, elected officials are prohibited from using public funds for a variety of communications that many constituents nevertheless expect. For example, an elected official may not use public funds to send a mailing announcing municipal information to constituents, “such as a newsletter or brochure, [...] delivered, by any means [...] to a person’s residence, place of employment or business, or post office box.”³ Nor may an elected official mail an item using public funds that features a reference to the elected official affiliated with their public position.⁴ Note that Electronic newsletters are not covered by these rules, and can and do include all of these features, even if the newsletter service is paid for by the public entity. That said, while technically not required, many elected officials prefer to use email newsletter distribution services (Constant Contact, MailChimp, Nationbuilder, etc.) paid for with personal (or “Officeholder”) funds, to operate in the spirit of the original rules against using public funds for communications that include a photo of, or references to, the elected official.

Without the ability to raise funds for an Officeholder Account, for an elected official to send a paper newsletter to constituents or to use an email newsletter service that is not paid for with public funds, they must use personal funds. A printed newsletter mailed to 5-6,000 households (a typical number of households in a Berkeley City Council District) can easily cost \$5,000+, and an electronic mail service subscription typically costs \$10 (for the most basic service) to \$45 per month, a cost of \$120.00 to over \$500 per year - in personal funds.

³ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

⁴ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

Second, Berkeley City Councilmembers and the Mayor of Berkeley are not paid enough for there to be any reasonable expectation that personal funds should be used for these types of expenses.⁵ For many Councilmembers and/or the Mayor, work hours are full time - or more - and there is no other source of income.

Finally, and most importantly, local elected officials are restricted from accepting money or gifts. An elected official cannot under any circumstances raise money to pay for Officeholder expenses such as printed communications, email newsletter services, travel and admission to industry conferences for which the elected official is not an official delegate (e.g., conferences on City Planning, Green Cities, Municipal Finance, etc.), and other expenses related to holding office that are not covered by public funds. Again, without the possibility of an Officeholder Account, an elected official generally must use personal funds for these expenses, allowing more affluent elected officials to participate while placing a hardship or in some cases a prohibition on the ability of less affluent elected officials to undertake these Officeholder-type activities - which support expected communications with constituents and participation in industry activities that improve the elected official's effectiveness.

The elected official's inability to raise funds from others must be contrasted with the ability of a community member - a potential "challenger" who has not yet declared themselves to be an actual candidate - or perhaps a neighborhood association, business or corporation (Chevron, for example) - to engage in similar activities. Nothing restricts any community member or organization from using their own funds - or funds obtained from anyone - a wealthy friend, a corporation, a local business, a community organization or their neighbors - for any purpose whatsoever.

Someone who doesn't like the job an elected official is doing could raise money from family or connections anywhere in the community - or the world - and mail a letter to every person in the District or City criticizing the elected official, or buy up every billboard or banner ad on Facebook or Berkeleyside to broadcast their point of view. By contrast, the elected official, without access to an Officeholder Account, could only use personal funds to "speak" with their own printed letter, billboard or advertisement. Community members (including future "challengers") can also attend any and all conferences they want, engage in travel to visit interesting cities and projects that might inform their thoughts on how a city should be run, and pay for those things with money raised from friends, colleagues, businesses, corporations, foreign governments - *anyone*. They are private citizens with full first amendment rights and have no limitations, no reporting requirements, no requirements of transparency or accountability whatsoever.

The imbalance is significant. Outside of the campaign setting, where all declared candidates can raise funds and must abide by the same rules of spending and communications, *elected officials cannot raise money for any expenses whatsoever, from any source, while community*

⁵ Councilmembers receive annual compensation of approximately \$36,000, while the Mayor receives annual compensation of approximately \$55,000.⁵

members, including organizations and private companies, can raise as much money as they want from any sources, and use that money for anything they choose.


Without the ability to establish and fund an Officeholder Account, the only option an elected official has is to use personal funds, which exacerbates the potential imbalance between elected officials with more and less personal funds to spend. Elected officials work within a highly regulated system, which can limit their ability to “speak” and engage in other activities members of the public are able to undertake without restriction. Officeholder Accounts restore some flexibility by allowing elected officials to raise money for expenses related to holding office, so long as the sources and uses of those funds is made transparent.

By allowing Officeholder Accounts and regulating them, Berkeley can place limits on amounts that can be raised, and on the individuals/entities from whom funds can be accepted, similar (or identical) to the limits Berkeley places on sources of campaign funds. Similarly, Berkeley can restrict uses of funds beyond the State’s restrictions, to ensure funds are not used for things like family members’ travel, as is currently allowed by the State. Oakland has taken this approach, and has a set of Officeholder Account regulations that provide a good starting point for Berkeley to consider.⁶

I respectfully ask for a vote to send the question of potential allowance for, and regulation of, Officeholder Accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

CONTACT: Sophie Hahn, District 5: (510) 981-7150

⁶ <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 2

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Item Number: 2

Item Description: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

Submitted by: Samuel Harvey; Deputy City Attorney / Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices Commission

Attachment 4 to the report (“Memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque”) included an attachment which was erroneously omitted from the Council item. Attached is Attachment 4 (for context) along with the additional pages which should be included to appear as pages 16 -17 of the item.



Office of the
City Attorney

DATE: December 28, 1999

TO: BARBARA GILBERT,
Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean

FROM: MANUELA ALBUQUERQUE, City Attorney *MA*
By: CAMILLE COUREY, Deputy City Attorney

SUBJECT: APPLICATION OF BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

ISSUE:

Does the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) govern officeholder accounts?

CONCLUSION:

No. The BERA does not govern true officeholder accounts per se. However, the mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under the BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable local laws.

ANALYSIS:

Sarah Reynoso, former secretary and staff counsel to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC), issued an opinion to the FCPC dated December 2, 1991, a copy of which is attached, stating that the BERA's contribution limit does not apply to contributions made to an officeholder account. The opinion reasons that the BERA's contribution limit applies only to "contributions" as defined in the BERA, i.e., which are made directly or indirectly in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) § 2.12.100.) Contributions to a true officeholder account are not made for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate to office, but rather for the use of an officeholder in carrying out the duties of his or her office. Therefore, the contribution limit of the BERA is inapplicable to officeholder accounts.¹ For similar reasons, the BERA does not

¹ However, the opinion also provided that contributions to officeholder accounts still had to be reported on campaign statements because the State Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Regulations broadly defined contributions as any contribution for "political purposes." Since officeholder expenses are for political purposes, they must be reported to the State.

Barbara Gilbert

Re: Application of Berkeley Election Reform Act To Officeholder Accounts

December 28, 1999

Page 2

apply to true officeholder accounts.

The BERA requires the filing of statements to report the amounts received and expended in municipal elections. (See BMC §§ 2.12.015, 2.12.030 through 2.12.050) Specifically, a "campaign statement" required to be filed under the BERA is an itemized report which provides the information required by Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 of the BERA. (BMC § 2.12.080.) Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 govern the reporting of contributions and expenditures. "Contributions" and "expenditures" are defined by the BERA as any amounts received or expended, respectively, in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See BMC §§ 2.12.100 and 2.12.130.) Contributions to or expenditures from a true officeholder account are not subject to the BERA's reporting requirements because they are made for the purpose of carrying out the duties of elective office, and not for the purpose of aiding or opposing the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office.² Therefore, the BERA does not apply to true officeholder accounts.

However, the fact that an account may be designated as an officeholder account will not shield it from scrutiny under the BERA if the officeholder account is, in fact, being used for the receipt of contributions or the making of expenditures in aid of the nomination or election of a candidate for local elective office. Nor will BERA requirements, such as the \$250 contribution limit or the prohibition against contributions from businesses to candidates, be held inapplicable if contributions made initially to an officeholder account are transferred subsequently to a campaign account. Where the actions taken with respect to an officeholder account implicate campaign contributions and expenditures in municipal elections, the officeholder account will be scrutinized under the BERA and other applicable local law.

Attachment

cc: Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Sherry Kelly, City Clerk

City Attorney Opinion Index: ILE 1. and IILG.

CCM

PAUSERSUBEL2\offhldr.mem.doc

² Again, however, the State FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to an officeholder account. (See footnote 1.)

CITY OF BERKELEY

DATE: December 9, 1991

Memorandum

TO: FCPC COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Sarah Reynoso,  Secretary & Staff Counsel

SUBJECT: APPLICABILITY OF BERA'S CONTRIBUTION LIMIT TO FUNDS RAISED FOR OFFICEHOLDER EXPENSES

BACKGROUND AND ISSUE

I received the attached letter from Richard N. Lerner, treasurer of Friends of Loni Hancock Committee ("Committee"), regarding the applicability of BERA's (Berkeley Election Reform Act) \$250 contribution limit to funds raised to cover officeholder expenses. The Committee would like to raise money to cover activities by the Mayor for which the City has not allocated funds, for example, distribution of a newsletter and international travel to visit Berkeley Sister Cities.

Thus, the issue presented to the Commission is as follows: Is BERA's \$250 contribution limit applicable to funds raised for officeholder expenses?

CONCLUSION

No. The BERA's contribution limitation is only applicable to money raised "in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election" of a candidate. Since the Committee intends to raise these funds for activities unrelated to the nomination or election of the Mayor, they are not subject to the BERA's \$250 contribution limitation. However, such funds must be reported as contributions under the State Political Reform Act and their expenditure itemized on the disclosure forms.

ANALYSIS

The BERA prohibits candidates for elective office from soliciting or accepting a contribution of more than \$250 from any one contributor. (BERA section 2.12.415.) Thus, funds which fall within BERA's definition of a contribution, are subject to the \$250 limit. In order to determine whether funds raised for officeholder expenses are subject to the contribution limitation, BERA's definition of contribution must be reviewed.

The BERA defines contribution, in part, as follows:

"Contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, made directly or indirectly in aid of or

FCPC COMMISSIONERS
December 9, 1991
Page 2

in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates (Emphasis added.)


Thus, the plain language of the BERA requires that a contribution be solicited for purposes related to the nomination or election of a candidate for office to be subject to its contribution limitation. Since the Committee intends to raise funds for purposes unrelated to the Mayor's nomination or election for elective office, such funds do not fall within the BERA's definition and are therefore not subject to its \$250 limitation.

However, because the state Political Reform Act defines contribution to include any funds raised for political purposes, funds raised for officeholder expenses are considered contributions and must be reported on campaign disclosure forms.^{1/} (Government Code section 82015.) Additionally, since the court's ruling in SEIU v. FPPC invalidated the state's \$1,000 contribution limit, funds raised for officeholder expenses are not subject to any limitation.

As a final precaution, the Committee should be advised that the FPPC has issued regulations concerning officeholder expenses and it should review them with respect to their interaction with the BERA.

Attachment

^{1/}I spoke with the FPPC's legal staff and confirmed that funds raised for officeholder expenses must be reported as contributions on the campaign disclosure forms.



Office of the City Auditor
Ann-Marie Hogan, City Auditor

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 14, 2017
To: Councilmember Harrison
From: Ann-Marie Hogan, City Auditor
Re: Council Expense Reimbursement Guidance

The purpose of this memo is to provide you with forms for, links to, and general guidance on Council expense and reimbursement policies. In some cases, the restrictions on expenses for Council Members are more restrictive and more complex than those for City employees, because of state law. You must contact my office prior to incurring expenses for attendance at a conference, seminar, or training, or making travel arrangements. The purchase of routine office supplies should be made using the City's standard procurement procedures and vendors, using a purchase order, but on those occasions when you must pay for something personally and then request reimbursement, you will also need to submit the request to my office. For information regarding the City's procurement procedures, see Administrative Regulation 3.4¹. Once your City email is active, we'll send this memo to you via email, so you can click on the links to the City's intranet. Please feel free to contact me if you or your staff have questions.

In July 2006, the Berkeley City Council passed Resolution No. 63,412–N.S. to comply with state bill AB1234, which requires all cities to adopt an expense reimbursement policy for legislators in local government, and sets specific requirements for that policy. In September 2013, at the recommendation of the City Attorney, Council rescinded Resolution No. 63,412–N.S. and replaced it with Resolution No. 66,295–N.S. (See attached.) Council adopted the new resolution to incorporate a budget relinquishment and grant policy, and also to clarify the criteria and spending limitations associated with reimbursements for the Mayor and Council Members. Some of the spending limitations include:

- **Mileage and Transit**:- Mileage is reimbursed at the current year's IRS mileage rate and must be accompanied by supporting documentation, such as a Google Maps printout. Use the most economical mode of transportation practical.
- **Meals**: Meals are reimbursed at the per diem rates set forth in City Administrative Regulation 3.9, or the actual cost of the meal, whichever is *lower*.² The per diem rate covers the meal, tax,

¹ Administrative Regulation 3.4: <http://icobweb/AR/PDF/AR3-4.pdf>

² Administrative Regulation 3.9: [http://icobweb/AR/PDF/2016/Administrative Regulation 3.9.pdf](http://icobweb/AR/PDF/2016/Administrative%20Regulation%203.9.pdf)

tip, and nonalcoholic beverages (alcoholic beverages are not reimbursable). The per diem rate also applies when Council Members are requesting reimbursement for meals paid on behalf of individuals who are conducting city related business, such as Legislative Assistants. Council Members must submit original receipts, a list of attendees and the Statement of Municipal Purpose form (explaining how the expense benefits the City), as part of the reimbursement request. Any expense in excess of the individual meal allowance will not be reimbursed. The current per diem rates are:

- Breakfast \$10
 - Lunch \$15
 - Dinner \$26
- **Airfare**: Airfare is reimbursed based on the most economical mode and class of transportation reasonably consistent with scheduling needs. We suggest that you attach a printout of available fares with your request. Please note that the current language in Resolution No. 66,295–N.S. is out of date because it references a program that is no longer available. This will be corrected in Council’s next revision of that resolution.
 - **Lodging**: Lodging for conferences will be reimbursed at the available group rates. If lodging at the conference rate is not available, reimbursement will be based on either the published conference rate or the government rates published by the U.S. General Services Administration, whichever is greater. Where no conference rate is published, the reimbursement rate will be based on the government rate or the median rate listed on discount travel websites, whichever is greater. Trivago, Priceline, Kayak, Orbitz, Travelocity, and Expedia are examples of travel sites that provide discount rates and may be used to identify a reasonable median rate. Include a printout of the published conference rate, government rate, or travel site rates with the reimbursement request as applicable. Council Members can look up rates by using the U.S. General Services Administration’s Per Diem Rates Look-Up tool.³ Council Members should select the specific location they are traveling to in the look-up tool.
 - **Registration**: Generally, Council Members should use a purchase order for conference, seminar, and training registrations as defined by Administrative Regulation 3.9. However, Council Members may use their credit card to register, if that is the vendor’s required form of payment. Council Members may not submit their reimbursement request until after the event has taken place, and must include proof of payment, and should include evidence of attendance with their request. Resolution No. 66,295–N.S. also requires that Council members provide a report to Council on training they attend, but we will be recommending that this requirement be deleted since it is not required by AB1234.

³ Hotel fee tool: <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/category/100120>

When completing a reimbursement request, Council Members must complete and provide the following:

1. FN-024 payment voucher: available in Administration Regulation 3.14⁴, on the City's intranet⁵, or by contacting Accounts Payable at (510) 981-7310. All three sources provide guidance for completing this form.
2. Statement of municipal purpose form: available in City Auditor's Groupware section or by contacting the City Auditor's Office at (510) 981-6750 or auditor@cityofberkeley.info.
3. Supporting documentation: Council member original receipts, proof of payment, official per diem rates, etc.

Council Members must include account codes on the FN-024 payment voucher. The City's standard account codes are *14 digits* long and include both an element and an object code as the last four digits. The most commonly used element and object codes are:

- 4064: mileage/transportation (including taxi or ride-sharing service, such as Uber or Lyft)
- 4063: registration
- 4062: meals and lodging related to conferences, seminars, training, workshops, and similar
- 4061: airfare
- 5550: meals and food for city business, events, functions, and similar business meals

City Administrative Regulation (A.R.) 3.9 establishes the policies and procedures for reimbursing expenses incurred by City staff to attend conferences, meetings, seminars, trainings, and workshops. The regulation complements Resolution No. 66,295–N.S., which establishes the procedures for Council Members. A.R. 3.9 includes the following exceptions for Mayor and Council Members' expenses:

- **Attendance and travel request form:** The Mayor, Council Members, and Legislative Assistants are not required to submit an Attendance and Travel Request form. (A.R. 3.9, page two)
- **Paying for another employee's expenses:** The Mayor, Council Members, and Legislative Assistants may be reimbursed for paying for other legislative staff's or Council Members' expenses incurred for city related business. This is an exception to A.R. 3.9, noted on page three.
- **Business meals:** The Mayor and Council Members may be reimbursed for meals where the primary purpose of the meal is to conduct City-related business (other than simply meeting constituents). City Auditor review and approval is required. Council Members must describe the purpose of their business meal, e.g. issues discussed and how they relate to adopted priorities of Council, on the Statement of Municipal Purpose form and list the attendees. Meals are reimbursed at the per diem rates as listed above, or the actual cost of the meal, whichever is lower. (A.R. 3.9, page four) **Note that AB1234 requires that members of a legislative body shall**

⁴ A.R. 3.14: <http://icobweb/AR/PDF/AR3-14.pdf>

⁵ City Intranet: <http://icobweb/finance/GroupwareAP.FN-024&PettyCash.htm>

provide brief reports on meetings attended at the expense of the local agency at the next regular meeting of the legislative body.

- **Receipts:** The Mayor, Council Members, and Legislative Assistants must submit meal receipts. Meals are reimbursed at the per diem rates as listed above, or the actual cost of the meal, whichever is lower. (A.R. 3.9, page four)

cc: Sheila Soo, Administrative Assistant, Auditor's Office

RESOLUTION NO. 66,295-N.S.

CITY COUNCIL EXPENDITURE AND REIMBURSEMENT POLICIES

WHEREAS, each fiscal year, the City Council appropriates funds in the Mayor and Councilmember's departmental budgets to cover the costs of Mayor and Council staff and non-personnel expenditures which are reasonable and necessary for the performance of the duties of Mayor and Councilmember; and

WHEREAS, the Council needs to ensure that the expenditures are incurred and paid in conformity with the requirements of the City Charter; and

WHEREAS, AB 1234, adopted in 2005 and codified as Government Code Sections 53232, et. seq., requires that all cities adopt an expense reimbursement policy for Mayor and Council expenses; and

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2006, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 63,412-N.S. to establish the expenditure and reimbursement policy required by state law; and

WHEREAS, the Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant Policy generally falls under the purview of the existing City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant Policy enumerated in Exhibit A is incorporated by reference into the policy for City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution No. 63,412-N.S. and any amendments thereto are hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the policy concerning City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council departments is hereby adopted to read as follows:

CITY EXPENDITURES AND EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL DEPARTMENTS

I. City Expenditures for Mayor and Council

The Mayor and Council members shall purchase all office supplies, office equipment, furniture, computers, or any other product, good, or service for the actual and necessary expense of their office in the manner normally applicable to all other purchases of goods and services by the City. Such expenses may include membership in organizations of elected officials and the purchase of newspapers and periodicals that provide information needed for the performance of official duties.

II. Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expense of Office

The Mayor and Council members and their staff may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary expenses for the categories of activities set forth below under "Authorized Activities."

A. Authorized Activities.

Travel, meals and/or other food, incidentals, and lodging incurred in connection with the following types of activities set forth below constitute authorized expenses, as long as the other requirements of this Resolution are fulfilled:

1. Communicating with representatives of local, regional, state and national government on City policy positions;
2. Attending educational seminars designed to improve officials' skill and information levels, provided that a brief report of such seminar shall be made by the Mayor and Council at a subsequent Council meeting;
3. Participating in local, regional, state and national organizations of cities whose activities affect the City's interests;
4. Recognizing service to the City (for example, thanking a longtime employee with a retirement gift or celebration of nominal value and cost);
5. Attending City events; or events sponsored by organizations or entities whose activities affect the City's interests where the primary purpose of the event is to discuss subjects which relate to City business;
6. Implementing City approved policies;
7. Meals where the primary purpose of the meal is to conduct City-related business (other than simply meeting constituents) as long as the amount of such meal does not exceed the daily maximum as set forth in this Resolution and meets applicable federal and state standards as to when meal reimbursement may be allowed; and
8. Expenditures for these purposes approved in advance by a Mayor or Council member and undertaken by that person's staff.

Expenditures for all other activities require prior approval by the City Council and must meet an articulated municipal purpose that must be recited in the report proposing the expenditure and the resolution authorizing the expenditure. The policy for relinquishments and grants from Councilmember office budgets is enumerated in Exhibit A.

B. Unauthorized Expenses

The following personal expenditures incurred by City officials shall not be reimbursed:

1. The personal portion of any trip, such as where the official is on his/her own vacation activities;
2. Political contributions or attendance at political or charitable events;
3. Family expenses, including partner's expenses when accompanying official on agency-related business, as well as children or pet-related expenses;
4. Entertainment expenses, including theater, movies (either in-room or at the theater), sporting events (including gym, massage and/or golf related

- expenses), or other recreational and cultural events;
- 5. Alcoholic beverages;
- 6. Non-mileage personal automobile expenses, including repairs, traffic citations, insurance or gasoline; and
- 7. Personal losses incurred while on City business.

Any questions regarding the propriety of a particular type of expense should be resolved by the City Council before the expense is incurred.

C. Particular Types of Authorized Expenditures Defined

To conserve City resources and keep expenses within community standards for public officials, expenditures should adhere to the following guidelines. In the event that expenses are incurred which exceed these guidelines, the cost borne or reimbursed by the City will be limited to the costs that fall within the guidelines.

1. **Registration.** Registration fee charged for any authorized convention, conference, seminar or meeting is reimbursable.
2. **Transportation.** The most economical mode and class of transportation reasonably consistent with scheduling needs and cargo space requirements must be used, using the most direct and time-efficient route. Charges for rental-vehicles may be reimbursed under this provision if more than one City official is attending an out of town conference, and it is determined that sharing a rental vehicle is more economical than other forms of transportation. In making such determination, the cost of the rental vehicle, parking and gasoline will be compared to the combined cost of such other forms of transportation. Government and group rates must be used when available.
3. **Airfare.** Airfares that are equal to or less than those available through the Enhanced Local Government Airfare Program offered through the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties and the State of California are presumed to be the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy. Reimbursement for travel must not exceed the rates available through the League program as published by the California Department of General Services.
4. **Automobile.** Automobile mileage is reimbursed at Internal Revenue Service rates presently in effect. These rates are designed to compensate the driver for gasoline, insurance, maintenance, and other expenses associated with operating the vehicle. This amount does not include bridge and road tolls, which are also reimbursable. The Internal Revenue Service rates will not be paid for rental vehicles; only receipted fuel expenses will be reimbursed.
5. **Car Rental.** Rental rates that are equal or less than those published by the California Department of General Services shall be considered the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy.
6. **Taxis/Shuttles.** Taxis or shuttles fares may be reimbursed, including a 15 percent gratuity per fare, when the cost of such fares is equal or less than

the cost of car rentals, gasoline and parking combined, or when such transportation is necessary for time-efficiency.

7. **Lodging.** Lodging expenses will be reimbursed or paid for when travel on official City business reasonably requires an overnight stay. If such lodging is in connection with a conference, lodging expenses must not exceed the group rates. If lodging at the conference rate is not available, reimbursement will be based on either the published conference rate or government rates as published by the Federal General Services Agency, whichever is greater. Where no conference rate is published, the reimbursement will be based on the government rate or the median rate listed on priceline.com or similar service, whichever is greater.
8. **Meals.** Meal expenses and associated gratuities will be reimbursed at the rate set forth in Administrative Regulation 3.9.
9. **Telephone/Fax/Cellular.** Council members will be reimbursed for actual telephone and fax expenses incurred on City business. Telephone bills should identify which calls were made on City business. For calls made on an official's personal cell phone, the official may obtain reimbursement for business calls based on the following formula: minutes used on public business divided by the total minutes allowed under a monthly plan, plus long-distances charges for those calls.
10. **Airport Parking.** Airport parking must be used for travel exceeding 24-hours.
11. **Other Travel Related Expenses.** Baggage handling fees of up to \$1 per bag and gratuities of up to 15 percent will be reimbursed. Expenses for which City officials receive reimbursement from another agency are not reimbursable.
12. **Miscellaneous Office Products.** Notwithstanding the requirement in Section I, occasionally an elected officer or officer's staff may need to make an immediate small out of pocket purchase of office supplies that are normally ordered by the City for which payment is paid directly to the vendor. The City in accordance with the applicable City Manager Administrative Regulation concerning petty cash refunds may reimburse such purchases.

D. Cash Advance Policy for Airfare and Hotel Only (per A.R, 3.9)

From time to time, it may be necessary for an official to request a cash advance to cover anticipated expenses while traveling or doing business on the City's behalf. Such request for an advance should be submitted to the City Auditor, and copied to the City Manager, ten (10) working days prior to the need for the advance with the following information:

1. The purpose of the expenditure(s);
2. Whether the expenditure is for an authorized activity
3. The benefit to the residents of the City.
4. The anticipated amount of the expenditure(s) (for example, hotel rates, meal costs, and transportation expenses); and
5. The dates of the expenditure(s).

Any unused advance must be returned to the City within five (5) working days of the official's return, along with an expense report and receipts documenting how the advance was used in compliance with this expense policy.

E. Expense Report Content and Submission Deadline

1. A Statement of Expense must be completed, signed and submitted to the City Auditor for review and forwarding to the Finance Department for payment. The Statement of Expense must document that the expense in question met the requirements of this Resolution. For example, if the meeting is with a legislator, the local agency official should explain whose meals were purchased, what issues were discussed and how those relate to the City's adopted legislative positions and priorities.
2. Officials must submit their Statement of Expense reports to the Auditor's Office within 60 days of an expense being incurred, accompanied by receipts documenting each expense. Restaurant receipts, in addition to any credit card receipts, are also part of the necessary documentation. Receipts for gratuities and tolls under \$5 are not required.
3. Inability to provide such documentation in a timely fashion may result in the expense being borne by the official.

F. Audits of Expense Reports

All expenses are subject to verification by the City Auditor of compliance with this policy.

G. Reports

At the following City Council meeting, each official shall briefly report on meetings attended at City expense. If multiple officials attended, a joint report may be made.

H. Compliance with Laws

City officials should keep in mind that some expenditures may be subject to reporting under the Political Reform Act and other laws. All agency expenditures are public records subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act.

I. Violation of This Policy

Use of public resources or falsifying expense reports in violation of this policy may result in any or all of the following:

1. loss of reimbursement privileges;
2. a demand for restitution to the City;
3. the City's reporting the expenses as income to the elected official to state and federal tax authorities;
4. civil penalties of up to \$1,000 per day and three times the value of the resources used; and
5. prosecution for misuse of public resources.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on September 10, 2013 by the following vote:

Ayes: Anderson, Arreguin, Capitelli, Maio, Moore, Wengraf, Worthington, Wozniak and Bates.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.



Tom Bates, Mayor

Attest: 

Mark Numainville, CMC, City Clerk

Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant Policy

Introduction – Limitations on the Expenditure of Public Funds

The basic purpose of the City as an entity is to exist and function as a *municipality*. This is also reflected in the Charter, which limits the Council's powers only to those "municipal affairs adequate to a complete system of local government". (Section 38.)

Exercises of this power may not be used solely to further the interests of particular individuals, although they may incidentally benefit private interests:

The exercise of the police power is available only for the purpose of promoting the general welfare, the interests of the public as distinguished from those of individuals or persons. It cannot be used to promote private gain or advantage, except so far as the same may also promote the public interest and welfare, and it is the latter, and not the former, effect which forms the basis of the power and warrants its exercise.
(*Binford v. Boyd* (1918) 178 Cal. 458, 461.)

The Council's basic powers circumscribe its ability to spend public funds. In other words, the Council cannot spend public funds for purposes that are beyond its authority in the first place. Thus the City may only use its funds for municipal purposes. In any given case the crucial inquiry is whether an expenditure serves such a purpose.

The determination of what constitutes a public purpose is primarily a matter for the legislature, and its discretion will not be disturbed by the courts so long as that determination has a reasonable basis.
(*County of Alameda v. Carlson* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 730, 745-746.)

If the courts find that there is a valid public purpose, they next examine whether the government's actions are reasonably related to effectuating this purpose. (*Tip Top Foods, Inc. v. Lyng* (1972) 28 Cal.App.3d 533, 541.) Public appropriations granted to private interests will not be considered unlawful diversions of public funds when the transaction serves the public interest, merely granting an incidental benefit to the private individual. (*Cane v. City and County of San Francisco* (1978) 78 Cal.App.3d 654, 660.)

Criteria for Grants of City Funds from Councilmember Office Budgets

Relinquishments and grants for purposes and recipients that fall within the categories listed in Table 1 may be "pre-approved" each fiscal year by Council resolution.

Table 1.

Recipient	Purpose
The City (e.g., the Berkeley Public Library, the Berkeley Animal Shelter)	Any purpose already being undertaken, because it already serves a public purpose. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.
BUSD and other public agencies operating in Berkeley	Any purpose already being undertaken, because it already serves a public purpose, assuming the activity is in Berkeley. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.
Entities with which the City is co-sponsoring a public event in Berkeley (e.g., Earth Day, Solano Stroll).	City co-sponsorship suggests but is not conclusive of public purpose; public purpose would need to be stated, and all such events should be open to the public at no cost. Alternatively, a list of ongoing events that have been determined to serve a public purpose could be developed.
Entities in Berkeley to which the City already contributes funds for municipal purposes (e.g., affordable housing or social service nonprofits)	To advance the same public purposes for which the entities are funded. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.

Proposed relinquishments and grants that do not meet the criteria for pre-approval, but that meet an appropriate municipal purpose, may be approved by resolution with a majority vote of the City Council.

CITY OF BERKELEY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

A.R. NUMBER: 3.4
ORIGINAL DATE: 07/94
POSTING DATE: 4/14/2009
PAGE 1 of 5 PAGES

SUBJECT: Purchasing Policy & Purchasing Manual

PURPOSE

To ensure that the City receives the most favorable price, quality, and/or service available for all purchases, while adhering to City Council directives. The Precautionary Principle (PP) and Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Policies (EP3) should be considered whenever feasible, and in accordance with the adopted budget. Furthermore, the complete AR provides City employees with appropriate procedures to knowledgeably participate in the procurement process. This is the Executive Summary of AR 3.4, with an introduction to procedures for the City's Purchasing Policy. The Purchasing Manual is the full AR 3.4, and includes the complete policy and procedures. The City Purchasing Manual can be found online at Groupware – Finance: Purchasing Manual.

POLICY

It is the policy of the City Manager that all City purchases, with only specified and approved exceptions, shall be made through a competitive process. Regardless of the value of the purchase, more than one documented quotation, bid, or proposal is strongly encouraged. The City Council periodically sets or adjusts cost levels of purchases for Council review and approval, and the parameters for the formally documented competitive processes.

Responsibility for City Purchases rests with designated positions for implementation of this policy:

1. The City maintains a centralized General Services office through which all purchases of goods and services are processed. Each Department originates requests for procurement.
2. Departments are responsible for requesting the type and quality of product or service required. Sole and single source contracts are discouraged, but may be utilized if approved as provided in the Purchasing Manual. The FUNDS system maintains lists of vendors cross-referenced to commodities and services.
3. The General Services Division is ultimately responsible for determining the means of purchase and the appropriate vendor. All purchases made will be of a quality consistent with the ultimate use intended and will be based on best value to the City of Berkeley, not necessarily on the lowest obtainable price.
4. Only the City Manager has the authority to enter into a contract/agreement, except purchase orders, with a vendor. The authority to enter into a Purchase Order has been delegated to the General Services Manager.
5. A comprehensive list of City restrictions on procurement are addressed in Section I of the manual. In addition to those restrictions prescribed by law the following are prohibitions requested by City Council.

-
- A) On January 29, 2008 Council requested the City Manager prohibit purchases from Chevron Corporation whenever possible.
 - B) On October 28, 2008 Council requested the City Manager research limiting the purchase of bottled water. In response, the City Manager directed staff to eliminate as much as possible the purchasing of individual bottles of water. Bottled water can still be purchased for emergency preparedness and for field events where health and safety are a concern. For all other events, carafes and tap water should be used.

PROCEDURE

See the current version of the City Purchasing Manual, available online at Groupware – Finance: Purchasing Manual, for complete information and procedures. The following is the table of contents for the Purchasing Manual:

- I. General Procedures, Responsibilities and Requirements
- II. Purchasing Requirements by Price
- III. Purchasing Procedures
- IV. Glossary of Terms
- V. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
- VI. Requirement on Contracting with Certain Entities (Forms & Council Actions)
- VII. Council Guidelines on Purchasing Services and Goods
- VIII. How to Guide
- IX. Reports (In Development)
- X. Forms



DEFINITIONS

1. **Procurement:** Procurement refers to the process of managing activities associated with an organization's need to obtain the goods and services required for its operation. To ensure that the correct amount of the product or service is received at the appropriate time, specific steps are taken in the procurement process, including: value assurance; determining which commodities or services are best; choosing the right suppliers and vendors; negotiating the best prices; and awarding contracts. For General Services to conduct the procurement process responsibly, its functions include spend analysis, sourcing, supplier implementation, transaction management, category management, and supplier performance management.
2. **Purchasing:** The processing of a purchase order. The key steps in the process are: departments place and approve requisitions; General Services or departments find the item (sourcing); General Services issues the purchase order (PO); and General Services sends PO to vendor. Upon fulfillment of the order, the City is invoiced and the vendor is paid.

3. Purchasing Requisition (PR): A purchasing requisition is a document that instructs General Services to spend a designated and approved amount from a specific department/division budget account for needed goods or services.
4. Purchase Order (PO): A purchase order is used for the purchase of goods. The PO represents a contractual agreement that is enforceable under law. To have an enforceable contract there must be agreement of the parties, which consists of an offer by one party, acceptance of that offer by the other party, and mutual consideration.
5. Blue-Backed Contract: A blue backed contract is used for the purchase of services. A blue-backed contract represents a contractual agreement that is enforceable under law. To have an enforceable contract there must be agreement of the parties, which consists of an offer by one party, acceptance of that offer by the other party, and mutual consideration.

Attachments:

1. Purchasing Thresholds: Ordinance No. 6,875 – N.S.
2. Purchasing Thresholds: Ordinance No. 7,035 – N.S.

<p>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Finance Department</p> <p>TO BE REVIEWED/REVISED: Every year</p>	<p>Approved by:</p> <p> _____ Finance Director</p> <p> _____ City Manager</p>
---	---

ATTACHMENT 1

ORDINANCE NO. 6,875-N.S.

AMENDING BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 7.18.010B REGARDING EXPENDITURES FOR SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING PLAY AREA IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT WHICH EXCEED \$200,000; AMENDING SECTION 7.18.010C REGARDING EXPENDITURES FOR THE PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT, AND MATERIALS WHICH EXCEED \$100,000; AND AMENDING SECTION 7.18.020A REGARDING EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF EMERGENCY

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code Section 7.18.010 is amended as follows:

Section 7.18.010 Expenditures pursuant to Chapter Article XI, Sections 67 and 67.5.

A. Except as otherwise provided in this Title, expenditures pursuant to Article XI, Sections 67 and 67.5 of the Charter of the City of Berkeley, which exceed the amount of \$25,000 shall require Council approval.

B. Expenditures for specific improvements (public projects), including play area improvements and equipment in public parks which exceed the amount of \$200,000 shall require Council approval pursuant to Article XI, Section 67 of the Charter of the City of Berkeley.

C. Expenditures for the purchase of supplies, equipment, and materials which exceed the amount of \$100,000 shall require Council approval.

Section 2. That Berkeley Municipal Code Section 7.18.020A is amended as follows:

Section 7.18.020 Expenditures pursuant to Charter Article XI, Section 67.4 Emergencies.

A. Expenditures pursuant to Article XI, Section 67.4 of the Charter of the City which exceed the amount of \$100,000 shall require Council approval; and expenditures for public construction projects and playground improvements and equipment which exceed the amount of \$200,000 shall require Council approval.

B. Notwithstanding subsection A of this section, in the event of a declared emergency under Chapter 2.88, the expenditure limitation under Article XI, Section 67.4 of the Charter of the City shall be an amount not exceeding the amount appropriated by the Council in the most recent appropriation ordinance for the fund from which an expenditure is made and for the purpose authorized for such fund.

C. Whenever purchases are made pursuant to this section, the City Manager shall promptly inform the Council as to the nature and amount.

Section 3. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of Old City Hall, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation.

ATTACHMENT 2

ORDINANCE NO: 7,035-N.S.

AMENDING BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 7.18.010 REGARDING EXPENDITURES FOR SERVICE CONTRACTS TO INCREASE CITY MANAGER'S AUTHORITY

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code Section 7.18.010 is amended to read as follows:

Section 7.18.010 Expenditures pursuant to Chapter Article XI, Sections 67 and 67.5.

A. Except as otherwise provided in this Title, expenditures pursuant to Article XI, Sections 67 and 67.5 of the Charter of the City of Berkeley, which exceed the amount of \$50,000 shall require Council approval.

Section 2. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of Council Chambers, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation.

At a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Berkeley held on April 22, 2008, this Ordinance was passed to print and ordered published by posting by the following vote:

Ayes: Anderson, Capitelli, Maio, Moore, Olds, Wozniak and Bates.

Noes: Spring and Worthington.

Absent: None.

At a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Berkeley held on May 6, 2008, this Ordinance was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Anderson, Capitelli, Maio, Moore, Olds, Wozniak and Bates.

Noes: Spring and Worthington.

Absent: None.

ATTEST: [Signature] Deanna Despain, Deputy City Clerk

[Signature] Tom Bates, Mayor

Date signed: [Signature]

A.R. NUMBER: 3.9
ORIGINAL DATE: 07/94
POSTING DATE: 11/3/16
PAGE 1 of 9 PAGES

CITY OF BERKELEY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

**SUBJECT: Attendance and Payment of Expenses Associated with
Conferences, Meetings, Seminars, Trainings, and Workshops**

PURPOSE

To establish policies and procedures for City staff to obtain approval to attend conferences, meetings, seminars, trainings, and workshops; and to establish procedures for the City's direct payment of authorized expenses incurred by an individual for attendance at an approved event or meeting. Obtaining approval of an Attendance & Travel (A&T) Request for an event or meeting, along with associated expenses, ensures that appropriate supervisors and Department Directors have determined an employee's attendance at an event or meeting benefits the City, and that expenses are consistent and in line with the department's adopted budget.

This Administrative Regulation (AR) also complements **Resolution No. 66,295, City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies** for the Mayor and Council (Attachment B); and **Resolution No. 63,413, Establishing Travel and Training Reimbursement Policy for Board and Commission Members** of the Rent Stabilization Board, Board of Library Trustees, and members of other boards or commissions (Attachment C).

POLICY

It is the policy of the City Manager to authorize Department Directors and Supervisors to approve an employee's request to attend, and to receive payment for expenses associated with conferences, meetings, seminars, training, and workshops.

Table of Contents

I. APPROVALS.....	2
II. EXPENDITURES BASICS	2
III. ALLOWABLE EXPENSES	3
IV. PAYMENTS BY CHECK USING A PURCHASE ORDER	5
V. ADVANCE PAYMENTS & RECONCILIATION	5
VI. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT	7
VII. OTHER EXCEPTIONS.....	7
VIII. DEFINITIONS (related to Attendance at Conferences, Workshops, Training, Seminars, Meetings).....	8
IX. ATTACHMENTS/LINKS	9

I. APPROVALS

Note: Employee Must Submit and Obtain Approval for A&T Request before incurring any allowable expenses

City Approval to attend and incur authorized expenses for an eligible event is based on the following factors:

- A. Expectation that the City will derive a specific benefit from staff attendance.
- B. Employee submission of the authorized A&T Request form (the current version in Groupware), and receipt of approval from her/his Supervisor &/or Department Director in advance of an authorized event, including approval for all associated expenses.
- C. All expenditures and reimbursements for the Mayor and Council must adhere to Resolution No. 66,295 and be approved by the City Auditor.
- D. For routine and, or, recurring meetings an A&T Request must be submitted, approved, and on file in the department in advance of the initial date, and must be renewed annually for each fiscal year.
- E. Department Directors are to complete and submit an A&T Request; no other signature is required for approval.
- F. Exceptions to use of the A&T Request form are: Mayor, Council, and Legislative Assistants (when allowed under Resolution No. 66,295); and members of the Rent Stabilization Board, and Board of Library Trustees. Resolution No. 66,295 or Resolution No. 63,413 governs their approvals, expenditures, and related matters.
- G. Expenditures are provided for in the adopted budget for the employee's department. For specific procedures, see item III. Allowable Expenses.

II. EXPENDITURES BASICS

Expenditures must be documented in accordance with all related City ARs and other associated policies, using current forms (published in Groupware), including and not limited to:

- AR 3.4 Purchasing Manual: Employees and Mayor/Council must make full use of the City's Procurement procedures and submit purchase requisitions to generate payment for registration prior to travel. Note: Expenses for Board/Commission members and other non-staff or elected officials eligible to attend an event pursuant to the standards in Resolution No. 63,413 must have payments processed by the designated board or commission Secretary, using FN-024 Payment Vouchers through Accounts Payable.
- AR 3.14 FN-024 Voucher Processing
- AR 7.2 Use of Private Vehicles and Mileage Reimbursement
- Auto Record for Mileage Reimbursement: for further details, see AR 7.2 and Transportation: Private Vehicle, below.

- City Council Resolution No. 66,295 City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies.
- City Council Resolution No. 63,413 Establishing Travel and Training Reimbursement Policy for Board and Commission Members.

In addition:

- Statement of Expense forms and receipts, for reconciliation of an advance &/or reimbursement of expenses incurred, must be submitted to Finance – Accounts Payable within 60 calendar days (30 days for Council/Commission, unless revised) after conclusion of the event. Statement of Expense forms and receipts submitted after this date may not be processed, and individuals assume full, personal responsibility for the costs they incurred.
- Advances or reimbursements to an employee are restricted to expenses for that employee only – they may not cover the expenses of any other employee. Exception to this restriction is for reimbursements only of expenses for Mayor and Council and their Legislative Assistants.

See item V. Advance Payments and Reconciliation.

III. ALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Expenditures should adhere to the following guidelines. In the event that expenses are incurred that exceed these guidelines, the cost borne or reimbursed by the City will be limited to those that fall within these guidelines, unless approved by an appropriate, designated authority. Proof of payment for all expenses must be provided when reconciling the Statement of Expense form, except as indicated.

- A. **Registration:** Registration fee charged for an authorized conference, meeting, seminar, training or workshop is allowable. Employees should register in a timely manner to take advantage of registration discounts. Payments can be made by Purchase Orders (PO). See also: Payments by Check Using a Purchase Order, below.
- B. **Transportation:** Employees must use the most economical mode and class of transportation reasonably consistent with scheduling needs, coordination with other employees traveling together, and cargo space requirements, and following the most direct and time-efficient route incorporating these factors. If an employee chooses a more expensive mode of travel based on personal criteria, reimbursement will be for the lesser cost of transportation.
 1. **Public Transit** should be used for travel to events and meetings outside the City of Berkeley and in other locations, where accessible by transit. Receipts are not required for these expenses.
 2. **Fleet Vehicle:** see AR 7.1 Use of Fleet Vehicles for details.
 3. **Private Vehicle:** see AR 7.2 Use of Private Vehicles & Mileage Reimbursement for details. If use of a private vehicle is authorized, mileage is reimbursed at IRS

rates currently in effect, in addition to parking fees, bridge and road tolls, which are also reimbursable.

- Unless an alternative is proposed by a department and acceptable to Accounts Payable, expenses for approved use of a private vehicle should be submitted with other expenses associated with attendance at an authorized event or meeting on the Statement of Expense.
4. **Rental Vehicle** charges may be reimbursed under this provision with Department Director approval. Rental fees, receipted fuel expenses, and authorized parking fees, **bridge and road tolls will be reimbursed**.
 5. **Air/Train** fares for reimbursement under this policy should be the most economical and reasonable amount available after the Attendance and Travel Request is approved.
 6. **Travel to/from Airports: Employees will be reimbursed for the most economical and appropriate means**; if there's any question about this, obtain department approval before incurring the expense.
 7. **Taxi or Shuttle** fares may be reimbursed with receipts.
- C. **Lodging:** Cost of accommodations will be reimbursed or paid for when travel on official City business reasonably requires an overnight stay.
1. When travel status is more than twelve (12) hours; or when the location is more than 50 miles from the employee's worksite and residence based on odometer, MapQuest or other reliable documentation; or when an event begins before 8:00am or ends after 5:00pm and a documented evening event requires the employee's attendance.
 2. If lodging is associated with a conference, employees should register in a timely manner to take advantage of discounts or conference rates. Lodging expenses that exceed the group rate published by the conference sponsor must be approved by an appropriate, designated authority.
 3. For non-conference lodging, travelers must request government rates, when available and must be authorized by Department Director.
 4. Costs to upgrade rooms from the basic accommodations provided are not reimbursable, unless authorized by the Department Director.
- D. **Meals: Meals are reimbursable only if travel status is over twelve hours or requires overnight lodging.**
1. **Meal expenses**, including non-alcoholic beverages, tax, and tips, are reimbursable up to a total per diem of \$51: the amounts per meal are \$10 breakfast; \$15 lunch; \$26 dinner; and receipts are not required. Expenses above the authorized amounts are the responsibility of the employee.
 2. **Breakfast &/or evening meetings with meals**, which are scheduled before conferences or meetings commence, or after they adjourn, and that require the employee's attendance, will be considered for reimbursement when

documentation is submitted reflecting the requirement of the employee's attendance for the meeting and location.

3. **Meals included with registration or lodging that are taken at additional expense** will only be considered for reimbursement at the authorized per diem by approval of the Department Director when documentation is submitted reflecting the necessity of this expense, such as:
 4. **Meals during approved travel time** to/from an event or meeting destination may be reimbursable with approval by the employee's Department Director, at the authorized amount for the individual meal(s) (see Meal expenses, above).
 5. **NOTE:** Business meals with other employees, commissioners or elected officials of the City of Berkeley are specifically NOT reimbursable. Exceptions for Mayor and Council must be reviewed and approved by the City Auditor. City funds may also NOT be used for expenses related to holiday activities or other office parties or events, unless exempted by AR 3.3.
- E. **Other Travel Related Expenses:** Expenses for which City staff or officials receive reimbursement from another agency are not reimbursable.

IV. PAYMENTS BY CHECK USING A PURCHASE ORDER

Generally, General Services – Procurement will process a PO within three working days, and a check could be issued in the next AP check run. It is the department responsibility to notify Procurement staff when the requisition is approved to ensure timely processing of the PO in order to issue the check promptly. Departments may have internal procedures that require additional time, and employees are expected to familiarize themselves with these internal deadlines.

- A. Expenses for registration should be paid by check using a Purchase Order (PO). This includes online registration when "pay by check" is an option.
- B. Use of an employee's credit card or personal check for registration is only permitted and eligible for reimbursement when time does not permit issuing a City check for payment, and is approved by the Department Director.
- C. Resolution No. 66,295 or Resolution No. 63,413 governs any exceptions for Mayor and Council, or for the Rent Stabilization Board or Board of Library Trustees.
- D. Expenses for accommodations, if lodging is included in the event package, should be paid with the registration fee using a Purchase Order (PO).

V. ADVANCE PAYMENTS & RECONCILIATION

An approved A&T Request is required for any request for an advance. Advances are extended only to employees in classifications that are not included on the list of **Classifications NOT eligible for advances**. Advances are limited to approved air/train fare and lodging only.

In addition:

- Registration or meals, and other transportation expenses may not be advanced to any employee.
- Advances to an employee are restricted to expenses for that employee only – they may not cover the expenses of another employee.
- Departments must maintain a Tracking Worksheet that documents employees' advance requests and reconciliations. These Worksheets must be submitted to the Auditor's Office by the 10th working day of each calendar quarter (January, April, July, October), along with copies of correspondence to those employees who have advance reconciliations outstanding. The Auditor's Office will review departmental travel advance worksheets on a sample basis.
- If an advance is issued to an employee and the employee does not attend the event, whether due to personal circumstances, the event being cancelled, or the City intervened to cancel the employee's attendance, the employee must seek recovery of charges and remit the full refunded amount to the City.

A. Requesting an Advance

1. Requests for an advance must be submitted to Finance – Accounts Payable at least 10 working days before the event start date. Employees are expected to familiarize themselves with any additional internal deadlines or procedures their departments may require.
2. Requests for an advance must include:
3. Approved Attendance and Travel Request, with documentation showing dates and time, and rates offered for travel and accommodations, including meals provided with the event.
4. Completed FN-024 Payment Voucher (current version on Groupware) with required signatures of approval and all specified back-up documentation. See AR 3.14 for details.

B. Reconciling an Advance

1. Each travel advance must be reconciled before an employee can request another; employees are not eligible for multiple advances.
2. Attendance must be documented in the form of a receipt, sign in sheet, or certificate of attendance.
3. Employees must submit a Statement of Expense and receipts to appropriate department staff within 60 calendar days of conclusion of the event (30 days for Council/Commission, unless revised). Statement of Expense forms and receipts submitted after this date may not be processed, and the employee assumes full, personal responsibility for the costs she/he incurred. If an employee fails to reconcile an advance within this timeframe, the City may take disciplinary action.

4. When an advance exceeds the expenses incurred, the employee is responsible for paying the difference by cash or check payable to the City of Berkeley for the balance at the time of reconciliation. Payment is submitted to the City Treasury and a copy of the CR edit report must be attached to the employee's Statement of Expense, in addition to all required original receipts.
5. When an advance is less than the expenses incurred, departments submit an FN-024 Payment Voucher payable to the employee for the difference, along with the employee's Statement of Expense and original receipts for expenses incurred.

VI. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT

See Allowable Expenses, above, for expenses that qualify for reimbursement, and the acceptable rates and limitations for those expenses. To obtain reimbursement of approved expenses incurred:

- A. Employees must submit a completed FN-024 Payment Voucher, and Statement of Expense, and receipts to appropriate department staff within 60 calendar days after conclusion of the event. Statement of Expense forms and receipts submitted after this date may not be processed, and the employee assumes full, personal responsibility for the costs she/he incurred.
- B. Reimbursements to an employee are restricted to expenses for that employee only – they may not cover the expenses of another employee.
- C. Tips, except where documented, are not reimbursable.
- D. Reimbursements are processed by FN-024 Payment Voucher (see AR 3.14) and must include:
 1. Authorized signature/s (see AR 3.12).
 2. Attendance and Travel Request approved by Supervisor &/or Department Director.
 3. Documentation of attendance at the event or meeting (receipt, certificate, sign-in sheet).
 4. Statement of Expense, completed with all required original receipts.
 5. Auto Record for Mileage Reimbursement, if use of a private vehicle was authorized (see AR 7.2 for details and instructions) and these are the only expenses for reimbursement associated with the event.

VII. OTHER EXCEPTIONS

Any exception not already identified within other sections of this AR must be submitted to, and approved by the employee's Department Director. For Mayor, Council, Legislative Assistants, Rent Stabilization Board or Board of Library Trustees, exceptions must be approved as set forth in the appropriate Resolution.

Employees may request an exception to the reimbursement rules when original receipts, or other proof of payment such as a canceled check, cannot be provided to verify expenses. The Supervisor and Department Director (or designee) must approve requests for an exception that require the "Approval of Payment Exception" portion of the Statement of Expense and state the necessity for the exception. In addition, the Finance Director must also approve any payment exceptions.

VIII. DEFINITIONS (related to Attendance at Conferences, Workshops, Training, Seminars, Meetings)

Advance: Payment to an employee with an approved Attendance & Travel Request to purchase air/train travel and qualifying lodging reservations and incur expenses associated with attending the forthcoming event or meeting. See procedures for Requesting an Advance, and Reconciling an Advance.

Event: Conference: A gathering of persons associated with a professional, membership or support organization for discussing matters of common concern, which may include presentations, programs and exhibits related to municipal government &/or related functions.

Event: Workshop, Training Session, or Seminar: A usually brief intensive educational program for a relatively small group of people that focuses on techniques and skills in a particular field.

Meeting: Non-Routine Meeting: A formally arranged gathering for a common purpose that the City will derive a specific benefit from staff attendance.

Meeting: Routine or Recurring Meeting: A gathering that occurs in predictable intervals for a common purpose, where attendance is part of the employee's usual role and responsibilities.

Overnight Stay: Out-of-town accommodations (room and specified meals) required for an employee to attend an approved event or eligible meeting (see Allowable Expenses for details).



Payment Documentation: Documentation is required to provide tangible proof of payment for approved goods or services, and usually specifies: issuer and receiver of receipt; date; purpose or commodity; and dollar amount of the expense. Acceptable back-up for reimbursable expenses includes: original receipts, cancelled checks (copies of front and back), proof of credit card charge and payment (receipt and copy of statement), and printed online payment confirmation with name and amount. Photocopies of receipts are not acceptable.

Point of Origin: Location, if other than Worksite, from which authorized travel may originate or to which travel may conclude, related to attendance at an approved event and calculation of expenses for reimbursement.

Worksite: Main office or work location where an employee usually performs her/his regular job duties with the City of Berkeley.

IX. ATTACHMENTS/LINKS

- A. Classifications NOT eligible for advances
- B. Resolution 66,295 (Mayor/Council Departments)
- C. Resolution 63,413 (Rent Board/Library Trustees)
- D. Attendance & Travel Request
- E. Statement of Expense
- F. AR 7.2 Use of Private Vehicles & Mileage Reimbursement
- G. Auto Record for Mileage Reimbursement
- H. FN-024 Payment Voucher

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Finance Department	Approved by: 
TO BE REVIEWED/REVISED: Every year	_____  City Manager

Attachment A

JOB CODE	REP UNIT	CLASSIFICATION TITLES INELIGIBLE FOR A TRAVEL ADVANCE	JOB CODE	REP UNIT	CLASSIFICATION TITLES INELIGIBLE FOR A TRAVEL ADVANCE
1350	M	Accounting Manager	1374	Z1	Economic Development Manager
1317	M	Animal Services Manager	2923	M	Economic Development Project Mgr.
1213	Z1	Assistant City Attorney	1417	Z1	Emergency Services Manager
1118	Z1	Assistant City Manager	1402	Z1	Employee Relations Officer
8174	Z1	Assistant Fire Chief	1426	M	Energy Officer
1801	Z1	Assistant to the City Manager	1348	M	Equipment Superintendent
1301	Z1	Audit Manager	1121	Z5	Executive Director of Rent Board
1323	Z1	Budget Manager	1344	M	Facilities Maintenance Superintendent
1306	M	Building and Safety Manager	8155	B	Fire Apparatus Operator EMT
1320	Z1	Capital Improvement Programs Manager	8167	B	Fire Captain EMT
1107	Z1	City Attorney	1105	Z1	Fire Chief
1102	Z1	City Auditor	8158	B	Fire Lieutenant EMT
1120	Z1	City Clerk	8164	B	Fire Lieutenant Training EMT
1101	Z1	City Manager	8160	B	Fire Prevention Inspector I EMT
1315	M	Customer Services Manager	8161	B	Fire Prevention Inspector II EMT
2303	Z2	Deputy City Attorney II	1418	Z1	Fire Prevention Manager
2311	Z2	Deputy City Attorney III	1321	M	General Services Manager
1366	Z1	Deputy City Auditor for Payroll Mgmt.	1377	M	Hazardous Materials Manager
1219	Z1	Deputy City Clerk	1223	Z1	Health Officer
1103	Z1	Deputy City Manager	1224	Z1	Health Officer (Cert)
1227	Z1	Deputy Director of Finance	1363	M	Housing Authority Manager
1229	Z1	Deputy Director of Health & Human Services	1352	M	Housing Services Manager
1211	Z1	Deputy Director of Library Services	1380	Z1	Human Resources Manager
1228	Z1	Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation & Waterfront	1221	Z1	Information Systems Manager
1230	Z1	Deputy Director of Planning	1354	M	Land Use Planning Manager
1205	Z1	Deputy Director of Public Works	1803	Z5	Library Building Project Manager
1209	Z1	Deputy Director of Public Works (Reg)	1466	Z2	Library Financial Manager
1204	Z1	Deputy Fire Chief	1465	Z5	Library Network Administrator
8182	B	Deputy Fire Marshal EMT	1373	M	Manager of Economic Development
1203	Z1	Deputy Police Chief	1310	M	Manager of Engineering
1123	Z1	Director of Community Development	1368	M	Manager of Environmental Health
1104	Z1	Director of Finance	1360	M	Manager of Health Promotion
1125	Z1	Director of Health and Human Services	1339	M	Manager of Mental Health Services
1126	Z1	Director of Housing	1362	M	Manager of Program Planning and Administration
1108	Z1	Director of Human Resources	8186	Z1	Paramedic Program Supervisor
1127	Z1	Director of Information Technology	8111	B	Paramedic Supervisor I
1115	Z1	Director of Library Services	8113	B	Paramedic Supervisor II
1112	Z1	Director of Parks, Recreation & Waterfront	1327	M	Parking Services Manager
1124	Z1	Director of Planning	1332	M	Parks Superintendent
1111	Z1	Director of Public Works	1326	M	Planning Manager

JOB CODE	REP UNIT	CLASSIFICATION TITLES INELIGIBLE FOR A TRAVEL ADVANCE	JOB CODE	REP UNIT	CLASSIFICATION TITLES INELIGIBLE FOR A TRAVEL ADVANCE
1307	M	Disability Programs Manager			
8148	E	Police Captain	1353	M	Revenue Collection Manager
1110	Z1	Police Chief	2716	Z2	Senior Human Resources Analyst
8145	F	Police Inspector	1325	M	Seniors Program Administrator
8147	F	Police Lieutenant	1314	M	Solid Waste and Recycling Manager
1473	Z1	Police Review Commission Officer	2316	Z2	Staff Attorney II
8142	F	Police Sergeant	2317	Z2	Staff Attorney III
2458	Z1	Psychiatrist Supervisor	1404	M	Supervising Civil Engineer
1322	M	Public Safety Business Manager	1476	M	Supervising Systems Analyst
1312	M	Public Works Maintenance Superintendent	1340	M	Supervising Traffic Engineer
1475	M	Real Property Administrator	2712	Z2	Training Officer
2890	M	Recycling Program Manager	1369	M	Waterfront Manager

RESOLUTION NO. 66,295-N.S.

CITY COUNCIL EXPENDITURE AND REIMBURSEMENT POLICIES

WHEREAS, each fiscal year, the City Council appropriates funds in the Mayor and Councilmember's departmental budgets to cover the costs of Mayor and Council staff and non-personnel expenditures which are reasonable and necessary for the performance of the duties of Mayor and Councilmember; and

WHEREAS, the Council needs to ensure that the expenditures are incurred and paid in conformity with the requirements of the City Charter; and

WHEREAS, AB 1234, adopted in 2005 and codified as Government Code Sections 53232, et. seq., requires that all cities adopt an expense reimbursement policy for Mayor and Council expenses; and

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2006, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 63,412-N.S. to establish the expenditure and reimbursement policy required by state law; and

WHEREAS, the Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant Policy generally falls under the purview of the existing City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant Policy enumerated in Exhibit A is incorporated by reference into the policy for City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution No. 63,412-N.S. and any amendments thereto are hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the policy concerning City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council departments is hereby adopted to read as follows:

CITY EXPENDITURES AND EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL DEPARTMENTS

I. City Expenditures for Mayor and Council

The Mayor and Council members shall purchase all office supplies, office equipment, furniture, computers, or any other product, good, or service for the actual and necessary expense of their office in the manner normally applicable to all other purchases of goods and services by the City. Such expenses may include membership in organizations of elected officials and the purchase of newspapers and periodicals that provide information needed for the performance of official duties.

II. Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expense of Office

The Mayor and Council members and their staff may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary expenses for the categories of activities set forth below under "Authorized Activities."

A. Authorized Activities.

Travel, meals and/or other food, incidentals, and lodging incurred in connection with the following types of activities set forth below constitute authorized expenses, as long as the other requirements of this Resolution are fulfilled:

1. Communicating with representatives of local, regional, state and national government on City policy positions;
2. Attending educational seminars designed to improve officials' skill and information levels, provided that a brief report of such seminar shall be made by the Mayor and Council at a subsequent Council meeting;
3. Participating in local, regional, state and national organizations of cities whose activities affect the City's interests;
4. Recognizing service to the City (for example, thanking a longtime employee with a retirement gift or celebration of nominal value and cost);
5. Attending City events; or events sponsored by organizations or entities whose activities affect the City's interests where the primary purpose of the event is to discuss subjects which relate to City business;
6. Implementing City approved policies;
7. Meals where the primary purpose of the meal is to conduct City-related business (other than simply meeting constituents) as long as the amount of such meal does not exceed the daily maximum as set forth in this Resolution and meets applicable federal and state standards as to when meal reimbursement may be allowed; and
8. Expenditures for these purposes approved in advance by a Mayor or Council member and undertaken by that person's staff.

Expenditures for all other activities require prior approval by the City Council and must meet an articulated municipal purpose that must be recited in the report proposing the expenditure and the resolution authorizing the expenditure. The policy for relinquishments and grants from Councilmember office budgets is enumerated in Exhibit A.

B. Unauthorized Expenses

The following personal expenditures incurred by City officials shall not be reimbursed:

1. The personal portion of any trip, such as where the official is on his/her own vacation activities;
2. Political contributions or attendance at political or charitable events;
3. Family expenses, including partner's expenses when accompanying official on agency-related business, as well as children or pet-related expenses;
4. Entertainment expenses, including theater, movies (either in-room or at the theater), sporting events (including gym, massage and/or golf related

- expenses), or other recreational and cultural events;
- 5. Alcoholic beverages;
- 6. Non-mileage personal automobile expenses, including repairs, traffic citations, insurance or gasoline; and
- 7. Personal losses incurred while on City business.

Any questions regarding the propriety of a particular type of expense should be resolved by the City Council before the expense is incurred.

C. Particular Types of Authorized Expenditures Defined

To conserve City resources and keep expenses within community standards for public officials, expenditures should adhere to the following guidelines. In the event that expenses are incurred which exceed these guidelines, the cost borne or reimbursed by the City will be limited to the costs that fall within the guidelines.

- 1. **Registration.** Registration fee charged for any authorized convention, conference, seminar or meeting is reimbursable.
- 2. **Transportation.** The most economical mode and class of transportation reasonably consistent with scheduling needs and cargo space requirements must be used, using the most direct and time-efficient route. Charges for rental-vehicles may be reimbursed under this provision if more than one City official is attending an out of town conference, and it is determined that sharing a rental vehicle is more economical than other forms of transportation. In making such determination, the cost of the rental vehicle, parking and gasoline will be compared to the combined cost of such other forms of transportation. Government and group rates must be used when available.
- 3. **Airfare.** Airfares that are equal to or less than those available through the Enhanced Local Government Airfare Program offered through the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties and the State of California are presumed to be the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy. Reimbursement for travel must not exceed the rates available through the League program as published by the California Department of General Services.
- 4. **Automobile.** Automobile mileage is reimbursed at Internal Revenue Service rates presently in effect. These rates are designed to compensate the driver for gasoline, insurance, maintenance, and other expenses associated with operating the vehicle. This amount does not include bridge and road tolls, which are also reimbursable. The Internal Revenue Service rates will not be paid for rental vehicles; only receipted fuel expenses will be reimbursed.
- 5. **Car Rental.** Rental rates that are equal or less than those published by the California Department of General Services shall be considered the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy.
- 6. **Taxis/Shuttles.** Taxis or shuttles fares may be reimbursed, including a 15 percent gratuity per fare, when the cost of such fares is equal or less than

the cost of car rentals, gasoline and parking combined, or when such transportation is necessary for time-efficiency.

7. **Lodging.** Lodging expenses will be reimbursed or paid for when travel on official City business reasonably requires an overnight stay. If such lodging is in connection with a conference, lodging expenses must not exceed the group rates. If lodging at the conference rate is not available, reimbursement will be based on either the published conference rate or government rates as published by the Federal General Services Agency, whichever is greater. Where no conference rate is published, the reimbursement will be based on the government rate or the median rate listed on priceline.com or similar service, whichever is greater.
8. **Meals.** Meal expenses and associated gratuities will be reimbursed at the rate set forth in Administrative Regulation 3.9.
9. **Telephone/Fax/Cellular.** Council members will be reimbursed for actual telephone and fax expenses incurred on City business. Telephone bills should identify which calls were made on City business. For calls made on an official's personal cell phone, the official may obtain reimbursement for business calls based on the following formula: minutes used on public business divided by the total minutes allowed under a monthly plan, plus long-distances charges for those calls.
10. **Airport Parking.** Airport parking must be used for travel exceeding 24-hours.
11. **Other Travel Related Expenses.** Baggage handling fees of up to \$1 per bag and gratuities of up to 15 percent will be reimbursed. Expenses for which City officials receive reimbursement from another agency are not reimbursable.
12. **Miscellaneous Office Products.** Notwithstanding the requirement in Section I, occasionally an elected officer or officer's staff may need to make an immediate small out of pocket purchase of office supplies that are normally ordered by the City for which payment is paid directly to the vendor. The City in accordance with the applicable City Manager Administrative Regulation concerning petty cash refunds may reimburse such purchases.

D. Cash Advance Policy for Airfare and Hotel Only (per A.R, 3.9)

From time to time, it may be necessary for an official to request a cash advance to cover anticipated expenses while traveling or doing business on the City's behalf. Such request for an advance should be submitted to the City Auditor, and copied to the City Manager, ten (10) working days prior to the need for the advance with the following information:

1. The purpose of the expenditure(s);
2. Whether the expenditure is for an authorized activity
3. The benefit to the residents of the City.
4. The anticipated amount of the expenditure(s) (for example, hotel rates, meal costs, and transportation expenses); and
5. The dates of the expenditure(s).

Any unused advance must be returned to the City within five (5) working days of the official's return, along with an expense report and receipts documenting how the advance was used in compliance with this expense policy.

E. Expense Report Content and Submission Deadline

1. A Statement of Expense must be completed, signed and submitted to the City Auditor for review and forwarding to the Finance Department for payment. The Statement of Expense must document that the expense in question met the requirements of this Resolution. For example, if the meeting is with a legislator, the local agency official should explain whose meals were purchased, what issues were discussed and how those relate to the City's adopted legislative positions and priorities.
2. Officials must submit their Statement of Expense reports to the Auditor's Office within 60 days of an expense being incurred, accompanied by receipts documenting each expense. Restaurant receipts, in addition to any credit card receipts, are also part of the necessary documentation. Receipts for gratuities and tolls under \$5 are not required.
3. Inability to provide such documentation in a timely fashion may result in the expense being borne by the official.

F. Audits of Expense Reports

All expenses are subject to verification by the City Auditor of compliance with this policy.

G. Reports

At the following City Council meeting, each official shall briefly report on meetings attended at City expense. If multiple officials attended, a joint report may be made.

H. Compliance with Laws

City officials should keep in mind that some expenditures may be subject to reporting under the Political Reform Act and other laws. All agency expenditures are public records subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act.

I. Violation of This Policy

Use of public resources or falsifying expense reports in violation of this policy may result in any or all of the following:

1. loss of reimbursement privileges;
2. a demand for restitution to the City;
3. the City's reporting the expenses as income to the elected official to state and federal tax authorities;
4. civil penalties of up to \$1,000 per day and three times the value of the resources used; and
5. prosecution for misuse of public resources.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on September 10, 2013 by the following vote:

Ayes: Anderson, Arreguin, Capitelli, Maio, Moore, Wengraf, Worthington, Wozniak and Bates.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.



Tom Bates, Mayor

Attest: 

Mark Numainville, CMC, City Clerk

Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant Policy

Introduction – Limitations on the Expenditure of Public Funds

The basic purpose of the City as an entity is to exist and function as a *municipality*. This is also reflected in the Charter, which limits the Council's powers only to those "municipal affairs adequate to a complete system of local government". (Section 38.)

Exercises of this power may not be used solely to further the interests of particular individuals, although they may incidentally benefit private interests:

The exercise of the police power is available only for the purpose of promoting the general welfare, the interests of the public as distinguished from those of individuals or persons. It cannot be used to promote private gain or advantage, except so far as the same may also promote the public interest and welfare, and it is the latter, and not the former, effect which forms the basis of the power and warrants its exercise.
(*Binford v. Boyd* (1918) 178 Cal. 458, 461.)

The Council's basic powers circumscribe its ability to spend public funds. In other words, the Council cannot spend public funds for purposes that are beyond its authority in the first place. Thus the City may only use its funds for municipal purposes. In any given case the crucial inquiry is whether an expenditure serves such a purpose.

The determination of what constitutes a public purpose is primarily a matter for the legislature, and its discretion will not be disturbed by the courts so long as that determination has a reasonable basis.
(*County of Alameda v. Carlson* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 730, 745-746.)

If the courts find that there is a valid public purpose, they next examine whether the government's actions are reasonably related to effectuating this purpose. (*Tip Top Foods, Inc. v. Lyng* (1972) 28 Cal.App.3d 533, 541.) Public appropriations granted to private interests will not be considered unlawful diversions of public funds when the transaction serves the public interest, merely granting an incidental benefit to the private individual. (*Cane v. City and County of San Francisco* (1978) 78 Cal.App.3d 654, 660.)

Criteria for Grants of City Funds from Councilmember Office Budgets

Relinquishments and grants for purposes and recipients that fall within the categories listed in Table 1 may be "pre-approved" each fiscal year by Council resolution.

Table 1.

Recipient	Purpose
The City (e.g., the Berkeley Public Library, the Berkeley Animal Shelter)	Any purpose already being undertaken, because it already serves a public purpose. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.
BUSD and other public agencies operating in Berkeley	Any purpose already being undertaken, because it already serves a public purpose, assuming the activity is in Berkeley. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.
Entities with which the City is co-sponsoring a public event in Berkeley (e.g., Earth Day, Solano Stroll).	City co-sponsorship suggests but is not conclusive of public purpose; public purpose would need to be stated, and all such events should be open to the public at no cost. Alternatively, a list of ongoing events that have been determined to serve a public purpose could be developed.
Entities in Berkeley to which the City already contributes funds for municipal purposes (e.g., affordable housing or social service nonprofits)	To advance the same public purposes for which the entities are funded. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.

Proposed relinquishments and grants that do not meet the criteria for pre-approval, but that meet an appropriate municipal purpose, may be approved by resolution with a majority vote of the City Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 63,413-N.S.

ESTABLISHING TRAVEL AND TRAINING REIMBURSEMENT POLICY FOR BOARD AND COMMISSION MEMBERS

WHEREAS, AB 1234, a new state law, requires that all cities adopt an expense reimbursement policy before a legislative body member may receive reimbursement for necessary expenses of office; and

WHEREAS, the Rent Stabilization Board and Board of Library Trustees occasionally authorize their Board members to attend specific training seminars and meetings which are designed to facilitate the Board members' performance of their duties; and

WHEREAS, the City Manager will occasionally authorize the use of City funds for a board or commission member from other boards or commissions to attend training programs or conferences designed to improve that official's skill and information level; and

WHEREAS, the Council has adopted an Expenditure and Reimbursement Policy for the Council and Mayor that sets forth those travel and training expenses for which Council will be reimbursed.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Berkeley that the following policy is adopted for reimbursement of board and commission members for travel and training expenses.

TRAVEL AND TRAINING REIMBURSEMENT FOR BOARDS/COMMISSIONS

A. Authorized Activities.

Travel, meals and lodging incurred in connection with attending educational seminars designed to improve officials' skill and information levels constitute authorized expenses, as long as the other requirements of this Resolution are fulfilled. For members of most of the City's boards and commission, other than the Board of Library Trustees and Rent Stabilization Board, such activities will occur only on rare occasions when approved by the City Manager and determined to be within the City's budget. The member of the body attending the educational event shall provide a brief report of the activity to the legislative body at a public meeting subsequent to the seminar. The Rent Stabilization Board may also receive travel meals and lodging incurred in connection with communicating with representatives of local, regional, state and national government on Board policy positions to the extent permitted by the Board.

B. Unauthorized Expenses

The following personal expenditures incurred by City officials shall not be reimbursed:

1. The personal portion of any trip, such as where the official is on his/her own vacation activities;
2. Political contributions or attendance at political or charitable events;

3. Family expenses, including partner's expenses when accompanying official on agency-related business, as well as children or pet-related expenses;
4. Entertainment expenses, including theater, movies (either in-room or at the theater), sporting events (including gym, massage and/or golf related expenses), or other recreational and cultural events;
5. Alcoholic beverages;
6. Non-mileage personal automobile expenses, including repairs, traffic citations, insurance or gasoline; and
7. Personal losses incurred while on City business. Any questions regarding the propriety of a particular type of expense should be resolved by the City Council before the expense is incurred.

C. Particular Types of Authorized Expenditures Defined

To conserve City resources and keep expenses within community standards for public officials, expenditures should adhere to the following guidelines. In the event that expenses are incurred which exceed these guidelines, the cost borne or reimbursed by the City will be limited to the costs that fall within the guidelines.

1. **Registration.** Registration fee charged for any authorized convention, conference, seminar or meeting is reimbursable.
2. **Transportation.** The most economical mode and class of transportation reasonably consistent with scheduling needs and cargo space requirements must be used, using the most direct and time-efficient route. Charges for rental-vehicles may be reimbursed under this provision if more than one City official is attending an out of town conference, and it is determined that sharing a rental vehicle is more economical than other forms of transportation. In making such determination, the cost of the rental vehicle, parking and gasoline will be compared to the combined cost of such other forms of transportation. Government and group rates must be used when available.
3. **Airfare.** Airfares that are equal to or less than those available through the Enhanced Local Government Airfare Program offered through the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties and the State of California are presumed to be the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy.
4. **Automobile.** Automobile mileage is reimbursed at Internal Revenue Service rates presently in effect. These rates are designed to compensate the driver for gasoline, insurance, maintenance, and other expenses associated with operating the vehicle. This amount does not include bridge and road tolls, which are also reimbursable. The Internal Revenue Service rates will not be paid for rental vehicles; only receipted fuel expenses will be reimbursed.
5. **Car Rental.** Rental rates that are equal or less than those available through the State of California's website (<http://www.catravelmart.com/default.htm>) shall be considered the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy.

- 6. **Taxis/Shuttles.** Taxis or shuttles fares may be reimbursed, including a 15 percent gratuity per fare, when the cost of such fares is equal or less than the cost of car rentals, gasoline and parking combined, or when such transportation is necessary for time-efficiency.
- 7. **Lodging.** Lodging expenses will be reimbursed or paid for when travel on official City business which reasonably requires an overnight stay. If such lodging is in connection with a conference, lodging expenses must not exceed the group rate published by the conference sponsor for the meeting in question. Travelers must request government rates, when available. In the event that government rates are not available at a given time or in a given area, lodging rates that do not exceed the IRS per diem rates for a given area are presumed reasonable and hence reimbursable.
- 8. **Meals.** Meal expenses and associated gratuities should be moderate, taking into account community standards and the prevailing restaurant costs of the area. A helpful source of guidance is Internal Revenue Service per diem rates for meals and incidental expenses, which include adjustments for higher costs locations (*see* Publication 1542 at www.irs.gov or www.policyworks.gov/perdiem).
- 9. **Telephone/Fax/Cellular.** Officials will be reimbursed for actual telephone and fax expenses incurred on City business. Telephone bills should identify which calls were made on City business. For calls made on an official's personal cell phone, the official may obtain reimbursement for business calls based on the following formula: minutes used on public business divided by the total minutes allowed under a monthly plan, plus long-distances charges for those calls.
- 10. **Airport Parking.** Airport parking must be used for travel exceeding 24-hours.
- 11. **Other Travel Related Expenses.** Baggage handling fees of up to \$1 per bag and gratuities of up to 15 percent will be reimbursed. Expenses for which City officials receive reimbursement from another agency are not reimbursable.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on July 25, 2006 by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Anderson, Capitelli, Maio, Moore, Olds, Spring, Worthington, Wozniak and Mayor Bates.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

Attest: Sherry M. Kelly
Sherry M. Kelly, City Clerk

Tom Bates
Tom Bates, Mayor

CITY OF BERKELEY
ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

A.R. NUMBER: 3.14
ORIGINAL DATE: 03/01/96
POSTING DATE: 08/30/07
PAGE 1 of 7 PAGES

SUBJECT: FN-024 Voucher Processing

PURPOSE

This AR establishes criteria and procedures for payments using an FN-024.

POLICY

It is the policy of the City Manager that an FN-024 Payment Vouchers (see Groupware – Finance) is limited to making payments for the following purposes.

- A. City Employees, Mayor and Councilmembers, Commissioners¹, or Library Trustees:
1. Employee travel advances and reimbursements (see AR 3.9 and forms in Groupware – Finance)
 2. Employee reimbursements for authorized use of a private vehicle (see AR 7.2 &/or AR 3.19 in process and form Auto Record for Mileage Reimbursement published in Groupware – Finance)
 3. Mayor and Council reimbursement for authorized expenses² (see Resolution 63,412-NS)
 4. Commissioner and Library Trustee³ payments^{Note} (see AR 3.2 for eligibility criteria; and Resolution 63,413-NS)
- B. Refunds
- C. Other Designated Payments:
1. State and Federal taxes
 2. Loan repayment
 3. Various payments associated with payroll and employee benefits
 4. Certain 1-time miscellaneous items under \$5,000
 5. Police Department Special Enforcement Unit Cash Fund (Special Investigative Bureau/SIB)*

¹ “Commissioner” includes Rent Stabilization Board Commissioners for reimbursements or other approved payments.

² Requires review by the City Auditor; SIB reimbursement payment also requires approval by City Auditor.

³ These payments to Commissioners (not including Rent Board) and Library Trustees, are for “... authorized payment in lieu of expenses to members of all Council-appointed boards, commissions, committees, task forces and joint subcommittees who meet certain criteria ...” See AR 3.2 for complete details.

All other goods and services, including subscriptions and membership dues, must be paid by Purchase Order (see AR 3.4 and the online Purchasing Manual). The Director of Finance must approve any exceptions before purchases are made on behalf of the City.

See AR 3.3, Petty Cash Accounts and forms in Groupware – Finance, for reimbursement for purchases \$50 and under.

PROCEDURE

These steps take you through how to make correct entries and complete an FN-024 Payment Voucher; note that WORDS PRINTED LIKE THIS designate a field for your entries on the Voucher form.

- FN-024 Payments
- Payments to City Employees, Elected Officials, or Qualifying Commissioners
- Payments for Refunds
- Other Designated Payments
- Additional Instructions for all FN-024 Payment Vouchers
- Check Printing & Disbursement
- Related items on Groupware – Finance

FN-024 Payments

Use FUNDS\$ GMBA Master Inquiry [FUNDS\$ > 7 > 1 > 2] to confirm all vendor information, including the designated Name on Checks field displayed at the bottom of the FUNDS\$ screen.

1. For an existing vendor/payee: if there are any differences between the data in GMBA Vendor Master file and the remittance information: please notify Finance – General Services: go to Groupware > Finance > Procurement Materials & Forms: Vendor Information Application, and use this form to update/correct the vendor information, and submit it to General Services.
2. For any new vendor or payee: an original and signed Vendor Information Application and/or W-9 (as applicable for vendor/payment) must be on file with Finance – General Services. In the interim, fax a copy to General Services; then attach a copy of completed Vendor Application and/or W-9 to the FN-024; the signed original/s must be mailed within 3 days.
 - a. Vendor Information Application: go to Groupware > Finance > Procurement Materials & Forms: Vendor Information Application, and have the vendor/payee complete this form.
 - b. Tax Payer ID & Certification Form W-9, or go to <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/fw9.pdf>.

Payments to City Employees, Elected Officials, Qualifying Commissioners, or Library Trustees

A. Vendor Information

1. VENDOR NAME: enter the name of individual, followed by "EMPLOYEE," "MAYOR," "COUNCIL," "COMMISSIONER," "RENT BOARD" or "LIBRARY TRUSTEE," as applicable, and highlight the individual's designation.

-
2. VENDOR NO.: enter the number for the individual, as found in FUNDS\$ GMBA Vendor Master Inquiry.
 3. ADDRESS: enter the department and division of payee or Commissioner's mailing address.
 4. Payments to employees, Mayor and Council must be picked up from AP: complete the line for Pick Up Check at AP as instructed under the section Check Printing & Disbursement, below.
Payments to qualifying Commissioners⁴ or Library trustees will be mailed. If payment will be picked up rather than mailed out, complete the line for Pick Up Check at AP as instructed under the section Check Printing & Disbursement, below.

NOTE: FN-024s for Mayor/Council official reimbursements, qualifying Commissioner stipends, and Library Trustees must be reviewed by the City Auditor prior to submitting to Accounts Payable for payment processing. SIB payments must be reviewed and approved by the City Auditor.

- B. Description & Purpose (FUNDS\$ limits this to approximately 25 characters per description field)
 1. DESCRIPTION 1: enter conference name, period/s of mileage reimbursement, or Board or Commission meeting date/s.
 2. DESCRIPTION 2: enter other applicable information, i.e., the reason a request for payment is being made on an FN-024, rather than a Purchase Order.
- C. Invoice Information
 1. INVOICE #: enter conference invoice # or date/s. (FUNDS\$ limit of approximately 15 characters)
 2. INVOICE DATE: for advances or reimbursements to an employee, Mayor, Councilmember or Commissioner*, enter the date of the conference or the last date of the reimbursement period.

Payments for Refunds

- A. Vendor Information
 1. VENDOR NAME: enter payee name followed by "MISC REFUND" and **highlight** it.
 2. VENDOR NO.: enter the assigned miscellaneous vendor number.
 3. ADDRESS: enter the payee mailing address.
 4. Requests for refunds that include deductions for fees should clearly state the original amount paid to the City, the reason for the deduction, and the balance for the refund owed to payee.
 5. Original receipts must be submitted for a refund. If an original receipt is not available, a completed and signed Customer Request for Refund Without Receipt must be attached.
- B. Description & Purpose (FUNDS\$ limits this to approximately 25 characters per description field)
 1. DESCRIPTION 1: enter nature of purchase or service.

⁴ Including members of the Rent Stabilization Board for reimbursements or other approved payments.

2. DESCRIPTION 2: enter other applicable information, i.e., the reason a request for refund is being made.

C. Invoice Information

1. INVOICE #: for refunds, use the receipt number. (FUNDS\$ limit of approximately 15 characters)
2. INVOICE Date: for refunds, enter the original payment date from the original receipt.

Other Designated Payments (see list under Policy on 1st page)

A. Vendor Information

FIRST – For all FN-024 Payments: follow instructions for the initial procedure, above. Then:

1. VENDOR NAME: enter the payee name as it appears in FUNDS\$ GMBA Master Inquiry.
2. VENDOR NO.: enter the vendor # as it appears in FUNDS\$ GMBA Master Inquiry.
3. ADDRESS: when correct information is confirmed or corrected in GMBA, this can be blank.

B. Description & Purpose (FUNDS\$ limits these to approximately 25 characters per description field)

1. DESCRIPTION 1: enter nature of purchase or service.
2. DESCRIPTION 2: enter other applicable information, i.e., the reason a request for payment is being made on an FN-024, rather than a Purchase Order.

C. Invoice Information

1. INVOICE #: enter exactly as it appears on the vendor invoice, with dashes, hyphens, etc; if there is no invoice number, use the statement date as the invoice number (FUNDS\$ has a limit of approximately 15 characters).
2. INVOICE Date: enter the invoice or statement date.

Additional Instructions for all FN-024 Payment Vouchers

A. Account Codes & Project Code

1. Prior to submitting an FN-024, departments must confirm the account codes and project code used are active, correct for the expenditure, and have sufficient, unencumbered balances.
2. If needed, departments must process any budget adjustments prior to submitting the FN-024.
3. Accounts Payable will return FN-024s to departments for inactive budget or project codes, and/or improper budget codes, or insufficient funds.

B. Authorized Signatures

Each department must complete an Authorized Signatures Card with the designated staff authorized to approve invoices and FN-024s (see AR 3.12 and the Authorized Signatures Card form on Groupware – Finance). When there are changes in personnel authorized to approve an FN-024, the Authorized Signatures Card must be updated with Accounts Payable. 1.

PREPARED BY: signature of the person responsible for completing the FN-024.



-
2. **AUTHORIZED DEPT SIGNATURE:** must be signed by authorized personnel, as reflected by the Authorized Signatures Card currently on file with Accounts Payable. FN-024s signed by unauthorized personnel will be returned.
- C. Limitations & Justification for 1-time Miscellaneous Items
1. A 1-time request for payment made on an FN-024, which would otherwise be made using a Purchase Order, means 1-time ever – not once a year or once-in-awhile. 1-time requests are only allowed for payments less than \$5,000.
 2. If a request for payment is being made on an FN-024 that would otherwise be made using a Purchase Order, there must be a justification provided on, or attached to, the FN-024. The Finance Director must approve the justification for use of an FN-024 prior to it being submitted for payment.
- D. Compiling the FN-024 Package: Form & Attachments
1. Place the FN-024 on top, with all required documentation stapled to the upper left-hand corner.
 2. If there is documentation required to be included with payment to the vendor, you must provide copies of this documentation, along with an envelope or mailing label addressed to the vendor. This is in addition to documentation required for Accounts Payable. Attach the documentation (duplicate copies and/or mailing stubs) to the upper right-hand corner.
 3. For payment of two or more items on a single FN-024, list each item separately, with its corresponding amount and account codes, on the FN-024. Attach an adding machine tape that totals the original items, and balances to the total on the FN-024.
 4. Employee reimbursements for authorized use of a private vehicle require an attached corresponding Auto Record for Mileage Reimbursement, available in Groupware. In addition, attach an adding machine tape totaling and balancing to the FN-024 for the period submitted.

Check Printing & Disbursement

1. Checks are usually printed weekly on Thursdays. FN-024s received in Accounts Payable by 5:00pm Monday will be processed for printing that week. Changes to this schedule will be emailed to departmental AP processing personnel and/or posted on the City's intranet.
2. Vendor checks will be mailed; see Compiling the FN-024 Package: Form & Attachments for specific requirements. If payment will be picked up rather than mailed, see instructions below.
3. Employee, Mayor, and Council checks will be available to pick up at Accounts Payable after 4:00pm on Thursday.
4. Pick Up Check at Accounts Payable: If it's been indicated on the FN-024 that a designated person will pick up the check, a City employee may sign for and pick up vendor checks. However, vendors may not pick up checks themselves from Finance – Accounts Payable. If payment will be picked up by an employee, rather than mailed out, complete the line in the upper right hand side of the FN-024 for Pick Up Check at AP: enter and **highlight** the name of authorized person the payment may be released to. This employee will be notified by email when the check is available to be picked up from Finance – Accounts Payable.

EXCEPTIONS

Any exceptions to this AR must be approved in writing by the Director of Finance.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Finance Department	Approved by:  Finance Director
TO BE REVIEWED/REVISED: Every year	 City Manager

The following items are related to this AR, and can be found on Groupware – Finance:

1. FN-024 Payment Voucher – Excel file
2. FN-024 Payment Voucher – PDF file
3. AR 3.12 Authorized Signatures for Invoices and FN-024 Payment Vouchers
4. Authorized Signatures Card
5. Vendor Information Application
6. Tax Payer ID & Certification Form W-9
7. Customer Request for Refund Without Receipt
8. Attendance & Travel Expense Forms – web page with links to individual forms



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

CONSENT CALENDAR

July 28, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Submitted by: Dean Metzger, Chairperson, Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt first reading of an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act, Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts (See [Section 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts, Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission](#)).

POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

On June 29, 2020, the Agenda and Rules Committee adopted the following action: M/S/C (Hahn/Wengraf) to make a Positive Recommendation to the City Council that the item be referred to the Agenda & Rules Committee to be considered with other related referrals from the Fair Campaign Practices Commission. The item will be calendared for the Consent Calendar on the July 28, 2020 agenda. Vote: All Ayes.

SUMMARY

Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also a goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The proposed amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) were adopted by the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) at its regular meeting of November 21, 2019.

Action: M/S/C (Smith/Saver) to adopt the proposed amendments to BERA related to Officeholder Accounts.

Vote: Ayes: Metzger, Ching, Saver, Blome, McLean, Tsang, Smith; Noes: none; Abstain: none; Absent: O'Donnell (excused).

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the “double green light” process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

BACKGROUND

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission has supported creating the circumstances in which the incumbent and challengers during an election play on as level a playing field as possible and reducing the influence of private campaign contributions. For instance, the Berkeley Fair Elections Act of 2016, which was passed by voters and recommended to Council by the Commission, included the following express purposes:

- Eliminate the danger of actual corruption of Berkeley officials caused by the private financing of campaigns.
- Help reduce the influence of private campaign contributions on Berkeley government.
- Reduce the impact of wealth as a determinant of whether a person becomes a candidate.

(Section 2.12.490(B)-(D).)

A recent inquiry to the Commission Secretary regarding the regulation of Officeholder Accounts resulted in a request from a Commissioner to have discussion of these accounts placed on the May 16, 2019 agenda for possible action. The following motion was made and passed at that meeting:

Motion to request staff work with Commissioner Smith to bring to a future meeting background information and a proposal to eliminate officeholder accounts (M/S/C: O'Donnell/Blome; Ayes: Blome, Ching, McLean, Metzger, O'Donnell, Saver, Smith, Tsui; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Harper (excused)).

Definition of an Officeholder Account

Under state law, an “officeholder account” refers to the funds held in a single bank account at a financial institution in the State of California separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder and that are used for “paying expenses associated with holding public office.” Officeholder Account funds cannot be used to pay “campaign expenses.” This definition is drawn from state law applicable to statewide elected officials: Government Code section 85316 (Attachment 2), and the accompanying regulation by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) codified at Title 2, Division 6, of the California Code of Regulations, [Section 18531.62](#) (Attachment 3).

Contributions to or expenditures from an Officeholder Account are not subject to BERA’s reporting requirements. (The FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to Officeholder Accounts, which is available to view on Berkeley’s [Public Access Portal](#).) If, however, a complaint is filed that an Officeholder Account is used for

campaign contributions or to pay “campaign expenses,” BERA can be used to respond to the complaint. The legal arguments for these statements are contained in a memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert, dated December 28, 1999 and a December 9, 1991 memorandum by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, that is attached to the December 28, 1999 memo. (Attachment 4.) Because the BERA provisions relied on in these memoranda have not been amended, and because no other BERA provisions have been added to regulate officeholder accounts, the memoranda’s conclusions remain valid and are still controlling guidance.

Contributions to Officeholder Accounts

Funds raised for Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley are not subject to any limitations, either from the FPPC or BERA. Neither is there a limit on the total amount the Officeholder Account fund may receive in contributions per year. Contributions to an elected official’s Officeholder Account may put that contributor in a more favorable light with the elected official than might otherwise be the case.

Expenditures from Officeholder Accounts

Except for the restriction that Officeholder Account funds cannot be used for “campaign expenses,” BERA does not restrict how funds from Officeholder Accounts can be used.

There are a number of permissible expenditures from Officeholder Accounts that could put an elected official in a favorable light with voters that are not available to a challenger for that office. A donation to a nonprofit organization, although technically not a “campaign expense,” would be seen favorably by those receiving the funds as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds. An individual running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to make contributions to nonprofit organizations.

As long as political campaigns are not included, newsletters mailed to constituents related to events, information, or an officeholder’s position on matters before the Council are a permissible Officeholder Account expenditure. This keeps the incumbent’s name in front of the voter in a way unavailable to a challenger unless they pay for a newsletter and its distribution from their own resources.

Expenditures from Officeholder Account funds for flowers and other expressions of condolences, congratulations, or appreciation, while technically not “campaign expenses,” also increase the probability that the recipient will be favorably predisposed toward the elected official as a candidate for reelection or election to another office. Again, a challenger would have to draw on their own resources to express condolences, congratulations, or appreciation to their potential supporters.

Further, officeholder accounts can be used to pay for a broad range of office expenses, such as meals, travel, parking tickets, or contributions to other candidates or political parties.¹ Eliminating officeholder accounts would reduce reliance on and the influence of private contributions for these expenditures.

Recommendation

To make elections more equitable between challengers and incumbent and for the reasons given above, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission recommends prohibiting Officeholder Accounts.

Berkeley will not be the first to prohibit Officeholder Accounts. The San Jose Municipal Code was amended to prohibit officeholder accounts in January 2008. ([Chapter 12.06 – ELECTIONS, San Jose, CA Code of Ordinances, p. 10](#))

Part 8 - OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

12.06.810 - Officeholder account prohibited.

No city officeholder, or any person or committee on behalf of a city officeholder may establish an officeholder account or an account established under the Political Reform Act, California Government Code Section 8100 et seq. as amended, for the solicitation or expenditure of officeholder funds. Nothing in this section shall prohibit an officeholder from spending personal funds on official or related business activities.

The following additions to BERA are proposed:

2.12.157 Officeholder Account

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.

¹ Under state law applicable to state elected officials, officeholders may use campaign contributions for “expenses that are associated with holding office.” (Govt. Code, § 89510.) To qualify, expenditures must be “reasonably related to a legislative or governmental purpose.” (*Id.*, § 89512.) “Expenditures which confer a substantial personal benefit shall be directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.” (*Ibid.*)

- C. Anyone holding an active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account, in accordance with FPCC guidelines.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identified environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This proposed change to BERA will help to level the playing field between challengers and the incumbent running for elective office.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

A Subcommittee was formed to consider the options of (1) amending the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts, (2) amending BERA to mitigate possible advantages incumbents with an Officeholder Accounts have over challengers, or (3) doing nothing with regard to Officeholder Accounts. The four members of the Subcommittee recommended unanimously to the full Commission to amend the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts.

CITY MANAGER

The City Manager takes no position on the content and recommendations of this report.

CONTACT PERSON

Dean Metzger, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices Commission. 981-6998

Attachments:

- 1: Proposed Ordinance
- 2: Government Code section 85316
- 3: Section 18531.62 (Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts), Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations
- 4: Memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert (including attached memorandum signed by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, to the FCPC)

ORDINANCE NO. ##,###-N.S.

OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNT PROHIBITED; AMENDING BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE
CHAPTER 2.12

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

BMC 2.12.157 Officeholder account

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

Section 2. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.441 is added to read as follows:

BMC 2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.
- C. This provision does not affect a candidate’s ability to establish a legal defense fund or the requirements for such a fund, as set forth in the Political Reform Act or by regulation.
- D. Any active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account.

Section 3. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation


[Home](#)
[Bill Information](#)
[California Law](#)
[Publications](#)
[Other Resources](#)
[My Subscriptions](#)
[My Favorites](#)

 Code:

 Section:


[Up^](#)
[<< Previous](#)
[Next >>](#)
[cross-reference chaptered bills](#)
[PDF](#)
[Add To My Favorites](#)

 Search Phrase:

GOVERNMENT CODE - GOV

TITLE 9. POLITICAL REFORM [81000 - 91014] (Title 9 added June 4, 1974, by initiative Proposition 9.)

CHAPTER 5. Limitations on Contributions [85100 - 85802] (Chapter 5 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73.)

ARTICLE 3. Contribution Limitations [85300 - 85321]

(Article 3 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73.)

85316. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), a contribution for an election may be accepted by a candidate for elective state office after the date of the election only to the extent that the contribution does not exceed net debts outstanding from the election, and the contribution does not otherwise exceed the applicable contribution limit for that election.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), an elected state officer may accept contributions after the date of the election for the purpose of paying expenses associated with holding the office provided that the contributions are not expended for any contribution to any state or local committee. Contributions received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deposited into a bank account established solely for the purposes specified in this subdivision.

(1) No person shall make, and no elected state officer shall receive from a person, a contribution pursuant to this subdivision totaling more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Three thousand dollars (\$3,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) in the case of the Governor.

(2) No elected state officer shall receive contributions pursuant to paragraph (1) that, in the aggregate, total more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) One hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) in the case of the Governor.

(3) Any contribution received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deemed to be a contribution to that candidate for election to any state office that he or she may seek during the term of office to which he or she is currently elected, including, but not limited to, reelection to the office he or she currently holds, and shall be subject to any applicable contribution limit provided in this title. If a contribution received pursuant to this subdivision exceeds the allowable contribution limit for the office sought, the candidate shall return the amount exceeding the limit to the contributor on a basis to be determined by the Commission. None of the expenditures made by elected state officers pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to the voluntary expenditure limitations in Section 85400.

(4) The commission shall adjust the calendar year contribution limitations and aggregate contribution limitations set forth in this subdivision in January of every odd-numbered year to reflect any increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index. Those adjustments shall be rounded to the nearest one hundred dollars (\$100).

(Amended by Stats. 2007, Ch. 130, Sec. 149. Effective January 1, 2008. Note: This section was added by Stats. 2000, Ch. 102, and approved in Prop. 34 on Nov. 7, 2000.)

(Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations.)

§ 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts.

(a) Application and Definitions. For purposes of Section 85316(b) and this regulation, the following definitions apply:

(1) "Officeholder" means an elected state officer.

(2) "Officeholder controlled committee" means a committee formed pursuant to subdivision (c) of this regulation.

(3) "Officeholder account" means the bank account established at a financial institution located in the State of California pursuant to Section 85316(b).

(4) "Officeholder funds" means money in the officeholder account.

(b) Establishing the Officeholder Account: For purposes of Section 85316(b), an officeholder shall maintain officeholder funds in a single bank account separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder.

(c) Establishing the Officeholder Controlled Committee, Reporting and Recordkeeping:

(1) Formation: The officeholder shall establish a controlled committee by filing a statement of organization pursuant to Section 84101 if the officeholder receives \$2,000 or more in officeholder contributions in a calendar year.

(2) Committee Name: The controlled committee name shall include the officeholder's last name, the office held, the year the officeholder was elected to the current term of office, and the words "Officeholder Account." The statement of organization shall include the name, account number, and address of the financial institution where the committee established the officeholder account.

(3) Filing Requirements: The controlled committee shall file campaign statements and reports pursuant to Chapters 4 and 5, except Sections 85200 and 85201, of Title 9 of the Government Code at the same times and in the same places as it otherwise would be required to do for any other controlled committee formed by the officeholder for election to state office.

(4) Required Recordkeeping and Audits. The officeholder and treasurer shall be subject to recordkeeping requirements under Section 84104. The officeholder account and officeholder controlled committee shall be subject to audits under Chapter 10 of Title 9 of the Government Code. Any audit of the officeholder, or any of his or her controlled committees, under Section 90001 shall include all officeholder accounts and officeholder controlled committees maintained by the officeholder during the audit period as described in Regulation 18996(a)(1).

(d) Prohibitions:

(1) Officeholder funds may not be contributed or transferred to another state or local committee, including any other controlled committee of the officeholder, except as permitted in subdivisions (g) (2) and (g)(3).

(2) Officeholders may not use officeholder funds to pay "campaign expenses" as defined in Regulation 18525(a).

(3) The officeholder may not transfer or contribute funds from any other committee he or she controls to the officeholder account, except as permitted in subdivision (g)(2) and (g)(3).

(e) Contributions to the Officeholder Account:

(1)(A) Required Notices: In addition to the requirements of Regulation 18523.1, a written solicitation for contributions to the officeholder account shall include the following: "For purposes of the Political Reform Act's contribution limits, a contribution to an officeholder-

account is also considered to be a contribution to all campaign committees for future elective state office the officeholder seeks during his or her current term of office.

(B) In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A) above, an officeholder who files a statement of intention to be a candidate for any elective state office during the officeholder's term of office shall provide notice of this filing to every person that has made a contribution to his or her officeholder account. The notice shall contain the language in subparagraph (A) and be transmitted or mailed within 10 days of filing the statement of intention to be a candidate.

(2) Cumulation: A contribution to the officeholder account shall also be deemed a contribution to the officeholder's controlled committee for election to elective state office for the purposes of Section 85316(b)(3) only under all of the following circumstances:

(A) The contributor makes the contribution between the day the election was held for the term of office for which the officeholder account was established and the end of that term of office;

(B) The officeholder maintains the controlled committee, established for a future term of elective state office, at any time during the period covered in subparagraph (A).

(3) Cumulation and Primary and General Elections: A person's contributions to the officeholder account, when combined with contributions from the same person for a primary and general election to the elective state office may not exceed the contribution limits applicable to the primary and general election.

(4) Multiple Officeholder Accounts: When an officeholder maintains more than one officeholder account in the same calendar year, he or she may not receive the following contributions to any of those accounts during that calendar year:

(A) Contributions from a single contributor that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount the contributor could give to the officeholder account having the highest per person contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(1).

(B) Contributions from all contributors that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount in total contributions the officeholder could receive in the officeholder account having the highest aggregate contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(2).

(f) Contributions Over the Limits:

(1) An officeholder shall return to the contributor the portion of any contribution to his or her officeholder account that exceeds the limits of Section 85301, 85302 (after cumulation) or 85316 (either alone or after cumulation) by the earlier of 14 days of receipt or 14 days of the date the officeholder files a statement of intention to be a candidate for elective state office pursuant to Section 85200.

(2) A contributor to the officeholder account does not violate the contribution limits applying to the officeholder's election to a future elective state office as otherwise provided under Section 85316(b)(3) if, when he or she makes the contribution, the officeholder has not filed a statement of organization to establish a controlled committee for election to a future elective state office.

(g) Terminating Officeholder Accounts and Committees.

(1) The officeholder may not accept contributions after the officeholder's term of office ends or the date he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier.

(2) The officeholder may redesignate the officeholder account as an officeholder controlled committee for a future term of the same office by amending the statement of

organization for the committee to reflect the redesignation for the future term of office prior to the date the officer's term of office ends.

(3) An officeholder may redesignate officeholder funds in the redesignated officeholder account as officeholder funds for the new term of office, subject to the limitations in subdivision (e)(4).

(4) Once the officeholder's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier, the officeholder may only use his or her officeholder funds for the following purposes:

- (A) Paying outstanding officeholder expenses.
- (B) Repaying contributions to contributors to the officeholder account.
- (C) Making a donation to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious, or similar tax-exempt, nonprofit organization, if no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the officeholder, a member of his or her immediate family, or his or her committee treasurer.

(D) Paying for professional services reasonably required by the officeholder controlled committee to assist in the performance of its administrative functions.

(5) The officeholder shall terminate the officeholder controlled committee within 90 days of the date the officer's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier. The Executive Director may for good cause extend the termination date or permit the candidate to reopen the account.

Note: Authority cited: Section 83112, Government Code. Reference: Sections 84104, 85316 and 90000-90007, Government Code.

HISTORY

1. New section filed 7-3-2007; operative 8-2-2007. Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2007, No. 27). For prior history, see Register 2007, No. 26.
2. Change without regulatory effect amending section filed 3-22-2016; operative 4-21-2016 pursuant to 2 CCR 18312(e). Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2016, No. 13).



Office of the
City Attorney

DATE: December 28, 1999

TO: BARBARA GILBERT,
Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean

FROM: MANUELA ALBUQUERQUE, City Attorney *MA*
By: CAMILLE COUREY, Deputy City Attorney

SUBJECT: APPLICATION OF BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

ISSUE:

Does the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) govern officeholder accounts?

CONCLUSION:

No. The BERA does not govern true officeholder accounts per se. However, the mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under the BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable local laws.

ANALYSIS:

Sarah Reynoso, former secretary and staff counsel to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC), issued an opinion to the FCPC dated December 2, 1991, a copy of which is attached, stating that the BERA's contribution limit does not apply to contributions made to an officeholder account. The opinion reasons that the BERA's contribution limit applies only to "contributions" as defined in the BERA, i.e., which are made directly or indirectly in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) § 2.12.100.) Contributions to a true officeholder account are not made for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate to office, but rather for the use of an officeholder in carrying out the duties of his or her office. Therefore, the contribution limit of the BERA is inapplicable to officeholder accounts.¹ For similar reasons, the BERA does not

¹ However, the opinion also provided that contributions to officeholder accounts still had to be reported on campaign statements because the State Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Regulations broadly defined contributions as any contribution for "political purposes." Since officeholder expenses are for political purposes, they must be reported to the State.

Barbara Gilbert

Re: Application of Berkeley Election Reform Act To Officeholder Accounts

December 28, 1999

Page 2

apply to true officeholder accounts.

The BERA requires the filing of statements to report the amounts received and expended in municipal elections. (See BMC §§ 2.12.015, 2.12.030 through 2.12.050) Specifically, a "campaign statement" required to be filed under the BERA is an itemized report which provides the information required by Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 of the BERA. (BMC § 2.12.080.) Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 govern the reporting of contributions and expenditures. "Contributions" and "expenditures" are defined by the BERA as any amounts received or expended, respectively, in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See BMC §§ 2.12.100 and 2.12.130.) Contributions to or expenditures from a true officeholder account are not subject to the BERA's reporting requirements because they are made for the purpose of carrying out the duties of elective office, and not for the purpose of aiding or opposing the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office.² Therefore, the BERA does not apply to true officeholder accounts.

However, the fact that an account may be designated as an officeholder account will not shield it from scrutiny under the BERA if the officeholder account is, in fact, being used for the receipt of contributions or the making of expenditures in aid of the nomination or election of a candidate for local elective office. Nor will BERA requirements, such as the \$250 contribution limit or the prohibition against contributions from businesses to candidates, be held inapplicable if contributions made initially to an officeholder account are transferred subsequently to a campaign account. Where the actions taken with respect to an officeholder account implicate campaign contributions and expenditures in municipal elections, the officeholder account will be scrutinized under the BERA and other applicable local law.

Attachment

cc: Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Sherry Kelly, City Clerk

City Attorney Opinion Index: ILE.1. and IILG.

CCM

PAUSERSUBEL2\offhldr.mem.doc

² Again, however, the State FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to an officeholder account. (See footnote 1.)

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL**

AMENDMENTS TO THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission is proposing amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act related to the prohibition of officeholder accounts.

The hearing will be held on, February 4, 2020, at 4:00 p.m. in the School District Board Room, 1231 Addison Street.

A copy of the agenda material for this hearing will be available on the City’s website at www.CityofBerkeley.info as of **January 30, 2020**.

For further information, please contact Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary at 981-6998.

Written comments should be mailed or delivered directly to the City Clerk, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, in order to ensure delivery to all Councilmembers and inclusion in the agenda packet.

Communications to the Berkeley 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 or in person to the City Clerk. 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 at 981-6900 or clerk@cityofberkeley.info for further information.

Published: January 24, 2020 – The Berkeley Voice
Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051

~~~~~  
I hereby certify that the Notice for this Public Hearing of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City’s website, on January 30, 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Numainville, City Clerk



Open Government Commission

ACTION CALENDAR  
September 15, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
 From: Open Government Commission  
 Submitted by: Brad Smith, Chair, Open Government Commission  
 Subject: Relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers' office budgets

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution creating a temporary advisory committee consisting of three (3) members each of the City Council and the Open Government Commission ("OGC") to enable discussion between the Council and the OGC to make recommendations governing relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers' office budgets.

FISCAL IMPACT OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The issue of D-13 accounts (Council Budget Funds) being used for purposes other than office expenses has been raised at the OGC. While commission members agree that it is admirable to donate to organizations that serve the City, some members feel the practice of using office budget funds for this purpose and attaching individual Councilmembers' names to the donation may provide unfair advantage to an incumbent.

The two main concerns identified by some commissioners with the current practice are:

1. Councilmembers are able to initiate grants to organizations, at their discretion, which may raise their public profile.
2. Attaching the name of a Councilmember to a grant from the City of Berkeley may confer an advantage for the incumbent over would-be challengers.

The current practice was established in the early 2000's because councilmembers were granting public money to individuals and organizations, without approval of the Council.

This led to a concern about the potential for corruption and favoritism. The City Attorney established the existing system, though because the councilmembers' names are attached to the grants, some concern remains.

From recent discussion at OGC, commissioners are in general agreement that ending the practice of attaching the name of a councilmember to a grant will help to alleviate the main concerns: 1 & 2 above. At the OGC's April 23, 2020 meeting, commissioners unanimously approved forwarding a recommendation to Council to not include the name of an individual councilmember attached to a discretionary grant.

A review of the grants and relinquishment of funds from city council members for 2019 amounts to \$30,130. These are funds that could have been used for office, travel (on city business) and other expenses.

Commission members have discussed recommending to Council for consideration options to address the issue:

1. An amendment requiring that all disbursements from the General Fund be designated as coming from the Council as a whole, without individual names attached to the donations.
2. Create another account specifically for discretionary grants, without reducing the D-13 account budget, to allow Councilmembers to continue recommending a grant or donation to a particular organization, without an individual name attached to the donation.
3. Eliminate discretionary grants.

#### BACKGROUND

On May 21, 2020, the OGC directed four of its members to draft a proposed recommendation to Council related to relinquishment of Councilmembers' office budget funds.

On June 18, 2020, the OGC voted to present this recommendation to Council.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Not applicable.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

An advisory committee will enable collaborative discussion between the Council and the OGC to make recommendations governing relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers' office budgets.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

The OGC has discussed recommending removal of councilmember names from office budget relinquishments, banning relinquishments for grants to organizations, and

creating and funding a separate account for donations to organizations that Council would control, but which would not have councilmember names attached to it.

CITY MANAGER

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

CONTACT PERSON

Brad Smith, Chair, Open Government Commission

Attachments:

1: Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. –N.S.

RESOLUTION CREATING A TEMPORARY JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO  
REVIEW COUNCIL OFFICE BUDGET RELINQUISHMENTS AND GRANTS

WHEREAS, pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code § 2.06.190.A.2, the Open Government Commission (“OGC” or “Commission”) may “advise the City Council as to any . . . action or policy that it deems advisable to enhance open and effective government in Berkeley”; and

WHEREAS, while Commission members agree that it is admirable to donate to organizations that serve the City, some members feel the practice of using office budget funds for this purpose and attaching individual Councilmembers’ names to the donation may raise the public profile of a Councilmember and provide unfair advantage to an incumbent; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has expressed a desire to work collaboratively with the City Council to consider recommendations governing grants made from relinquishments of funds from Councilmembers’ office budgets.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that a temporary joint advisory committee consisting of three (3) members of the City Council and three (3) members of the Open Government Commission is hereby created to enable discussion between the Council and the OGC to make recommendations governing relinquishments and grants from Councilmembers’ office budgets.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council and the Open Government Commission each shall, as soon as practicable and by majority vote, appoint three members to the committee created by this resolution.

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED that the committee created by this resolution shall hold its first meeting within 60 days of passage of this resolution and at that first meeting shall determine the need for any subsequent meetings and shall adopt a schedule for any such subsequent meetings.



Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Open Government Commission

ACTION CALENDAR

January 26, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Brad Smith, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions

Submitted by: Samuel Harvey, Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions

Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) and Change to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.)

RECOMMENDATION

Form a joint subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to (1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Officeholder accounts are not expressly regulated by BERA. However, under existing law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and may trigger various local and state legal requirements.

Donations to nonprofit organizations from Councilmember's discretionary council budgets (D-13 accounts) are allowed by the authority of City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.).

Action: *Motion to submit report to City Council recommending creation of a subcommittee of members of the Council, FCPC and OGC to (1) prepare an ordinance prohibiting or regulating officeholder accounts and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies*

Vote: M/S/C: Blome/Metzger; Ayes: O'Donnell, Ching, Blome, Tsang, Smith; Noes: Metzger, Sheahan; Abstain: none; Absent: McLean.

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the "double green light" process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

Changes to the City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) can be made by a majority vote of the Council.

## BACKGROUND

### ***Officeholder Accounts***

During 2019, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) discussed whether there is a need to amend the law relating to these accounts. These accounts are not expressly regulated by BERA, but under current law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and trigger various local and state legal requirements. A 1999 legal opinion from the City Attorney stated: "[t]he mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable laws."

In the course of its review of the issue of officeholder accounts, the FCPC considered three options:

- (1) leaving the law on officeholder accounts unchanged;
- (2) prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely (an approach used by the City of San Jose), or
- (3) authorizing officeholder accounts but limiting their use and imposing various restrictions and requirements on them (an approach used by the City of Oakland).

The Commission referred the issue of officeholder accounts to a subcommittee, which met several times in the fall of 2019 and considered the options. The subcommittee unanimously recommended prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely. At its regular meeting on November 21, 2019 the Commission voted without opposition to recommend amendments to the BERA that would prohibit officeholder accounts.

The Commission's proposal was presented to the City Council at a February 4, 2020 special meeting. (Report to the Council, with Attachments, is attached.) The FCPC report summarized its proposal: "Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also the goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016." (Report, page 1.)



At the February 4, 2020 meeting, the Council had a lengthy discussion about their D- 13 accounts and the lack of discretionary funds that members have to spend. They also decided not to approve the FCPC recommendation to prohibit officeholder accounts. The City Council referred the issues relating to officeholder and D-13 accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

***Proposed Changes to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies***

At the April 23, 2020 meeting of the Open Government Committee (OGC), a motion to direct staff to develop a proposal recommending Council change City policy to remove councilmember names from donations to nonprofit organizations from D- 13 accounts was approved unanimously.

Donations to nonprofit organizations from the Councilmember’s discretionary council budget (D-13 accounts) puts that elected official in a favorable light with Berkeley citizens at no cost to the Councilmember, an option not available to a challenger for that office. A look at the Consent Calendar of City Council Meeting Agendas will often contain one or more items from one or more Councilmembers making a donation to a nonprofit organization “from the discretionary council budget” of the Councilmember. This line item (“Services and Materials”) from the General Fund was increased from \$50,938 in FY 2017 to \$113,526 in FY 2018 (approximately \$40,000 for the Mayor, the balance evenly divided among the Councilmembers; see Attachment – Council Office Budget Summaries). While not technically a “campaign contribution,” those individuals in the organization as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds would certainly see it favorably. A person running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to match a Councilmember’s contribution from public funds and without the public notice of the contribution the Councilmember receives.

In addition to favoring incumbents, the use of public moneys for contributions to nonprofit organizations from the discretionary council budgets of individual Council members is arguably improper and certainly bad optics. The commissioners of the OGC have no argument with contributions being made to nonprofit organizations from the City of Berkeley, but believe they should be made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley, not from individual Council members. Perhaps a nonprofit fund could be set up from which the donations could be made from recommendations made to one of the Council’s Policy Commissions. This would free funds for other purposes now being directed to nonprofit organizations from individual Councilmember’s D-13 accounts.

Proposed Action:

At this stage, the Council has referred both the issues relating to officeholder accounts and those relating to D-13 accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration. At a special meeting on March 9, 2020, that Committee agreed to work collaboratively with the FCPC and OGC on matters relating to officeholder accounts and D-13 accounts. This collaborative work with the Council was included in the FCPC and OGC 2020-2021 workplans, which were approved on May 21, 2020.

Consistent with the prior actions of the Council and the FCPC/OGC, the Commissions recommend the establishment of a subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to:

(1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts, and

(2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identifiable environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The “double green light” process requires that the FCPC adopt an amendment by a two-thirds vote, and that the City Council hold a public hearing and also adopt an amendment by a two-thirds vote. Evidence to date suggests there are differences of perspective regarding this matter between the City Council and the FCPC regarding the D-13 accounts. It would seem to be a rational step to discuss and come to agreement and possibly compromise prior to the “double green light” process.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

None.

CITY MANAGER


CONTACT PERSON

Brad Smith, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions, (510) 981-6998

Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions, (510) 981-6998

Attachments:

1. FCPC February 4, 2020 report to Council and attachments
2. Mayor and City Council Financial Summary



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Submitted by: Dean Metzger, Chairperson, Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit  
Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt first reading of an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act, Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts (See Section 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts, Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission).

SUMMARY

Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also a goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The proposed amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) were adopted by the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) at its regular meeting of November 21, 2019.

**Action:** M/S/C (Smith/Saver) to adopt the proposed amendments to BERA related to Officeholder Accounts.

**Vote:** Ayes: Metzger, Ching, Saver, Blome, McLean, Tsang, Smith; Noes: none; Abstain: none; Absent: O'Donnell (excused).

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the "double green light" process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

BACKGROUND

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission has supported creating the circumstances in which the incumbent and challengers during an election play on as level a playing field as possible and reducing the influence of private campaign contributions. For instance, the Berkeley Fair Elections Act of 2016, which was passed by voters and recommended to Council by the Commission, included the following express purposes:

- Eliminate the danger of actual corruption of Berkeley officials caused by the private financing of campaigns.
- Help reduce the influence of private campaign contributions on Berkeley government.
- Reduce the impact of wealth as a determinant of whether a person becomes a candidate.

(Section 2.12.490(B)-(D).)

A recent inquiry to the Commission Secretary regarding the regulation of Officeholder Accounts resulted in a request from a Commissioner to have discussion of these accounts placed on the May 16, 2019 agenda for possible action. The following motion was made and passed at that meeting:

Motion to request staff work with Commissioner Smith to bring to a future meeting background information and a proposal to eliminate officeholder accounts (M/S/C: O'Donnell/Blome; Ayes: Blome, Ching, McLean, Metzger, O'Donnell, Saver, Smith, Tsui; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Harper (excused)).

**Definition of an Officeholder Account**

Under state law, an "officeholder account" refers to the funds held in a single bank account at a financial institution in the State of California separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder and that are used for "paying expenses associated with holding public office." Officeholder Account funds cannot be used to pay "campaign expenses." This definition is drawn from state law applicable to statewide elected officials: Government Code section 85316 (Attachment 2), and the accompanying regulation by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) codified at Title 2, Division 6, of the California Code of Regulations, Section 18531.62 (Attachment 3).

Contributions to or expenditures from an Officeholder Account are not subject to BERA's reporting requirements. (The FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to Officeholder Accounts, which is available to view on Berkeley's Public Access Portal.) If, however, a complaint is filed that an Officeholder Account is used for

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

campaign contributions or to pay "campaign expenses," BERA can be used to respond to the complaint. The legal arguments for these statements are contained in a memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert, dated December 28, 1999 and a December 9, 1991 memorandum by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, that is attached to the December 28, 1999 memo. (Attachment 4.) Because the BERA provisions relied on in these memoranda have not been amended, and because no other BERA provisions have been added to regulate officeholder accounts, the memoranda's conclusions remain valid and are still controlling guidance.

### **Contributions to Officeholder Accounts**

Funds raised for Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley are not subject to any limitations, either from the FPPC or BERA. Neither is there a limit on the total amount the Officeholder Account fund may receive in contributions per year. Contributions to an elected official's Officeholder Account may put that contributor in a more favorable light with the elected official than might otherwise be the case.

### **Expenditures from Officeholder Accounts**

Except for the restriction that Officeholder Account funds cannot be used for "campaign expenses," BERA does not restrict how funds from Officeholder Accounts can be used.

There are a number of permissible expenditures from Officeholder Accounts that could put an elected official in a favorable light with voters that are not available to a challenger for that office. A donation to a nonprofit organization, although technically not a "campaign expense," would be seen favorably by those receiving the funds as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds. An individual running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to make contributions to nonprofit organizations.

As long as political campaigns are not included, newsletters mailed to constituents related to events, information, or an officeholder's position on matters before the Council are a permissible Officeholder Account expenditure. This keeps the incumbent's name in front of the voter in a way unavailable to a challenger unless they pay for a newsletter and its distribution from their own resources.

Expenditures from Officeholder Account funds for flowers and other expressions of condolences, congratulations, or appreciation, while technically not "campaign expenses," also increase the probability that the recipient will be favorably predisposed toward the elected official as a candidate for reelection or election to another office. Again, a challenger would have to draw on their own resources to express condolences, congratulations, or appreciation to their potential supporters.

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

Further, officeholder accounts can be used to pay for a broad range of office expenses, such as meals, travel, parking tickets, or contributions to other candidates or political parties.<sup>1</sup> Eliminating officeholder accounts would reduce reliance on and the influence of private contributions for these expenditures.

**Recommendation**

To make elections more equitable between challengers and incumbent and for the reasons given above, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission recommends prohibiting Officeholder Accounts.

Berkeley will not be the first to prohibit Officeholder Accounts. The San Jose Municipal Code was amended to prohibit officeholder accounts in January 2008. (Chapter 12.06 – ELECTIONS, San Jose, CA Code of Ordinances, p. 10)

**Part 8 - OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS**

**12.06.810 - Officeholder account prohibited.**

No city officeholder, or any person or committee on behalf of a city officeholder may establish an officeholder account or an account established under the Political Reform Act, California Government Code Section 8100 et seq. as amended, for the solicitation or expenditure of officeholder funds. Nothing in this section shall prohibit an officeholder from spending personal funds on official or related business activities.

The following additions to BERA are proposed:

**2.12.157 Officeholder Account**

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

**2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited**

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under state law applicable to state elected officials, officeholders may use campaign contributions for “expenses that are associated with holding office.” (Govt. Code, § 89510.) To qualify, expenditures must be “reasonably related to a legislative or governmental purpose.” (*Id.*, § 89512.) “Expenditures which confer a substantial personal benefit shall be directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.” (*Ibid.*)

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
January 21, 2020

- C. Anyone holding an active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account, in accordance with FPPC guidelines.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identified environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This proposed change to BERA will help to level the playing field between challengers and the incumbent running for elective office.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

A Subcommittee was formed to consider the options of (1) amending the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts, (2) amending BERA to mitigate possible advantages incumbents with an Officeholder Accounts have over challengers, or (3) doing nothing with regard to Officeholder Accounts. The four members of the Subcommittee recommended unanimously to the full Commission to amend the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts.

CITY MANAGER

The City Manager takes no position on the content and recommendations of this report.

CONTACT PERSON

Dean Metzger, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices Commission. 981-6998

Attachments:

- 1: Proposed Ordinance
- 2: Government Code section 85316
- 3: Section 18531.62 (Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts), Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations
- 4: Memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert (including attached memorandum signed by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, to the FCPC)

ORDINANCE NO. ##,###-N.S.

OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNT PROHIBITED; AMENDING BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE  
CHAPTER 2.12

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

**BMC 2.12.157 Officeholder account**

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

Section 2. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.441 is added to read as follows:

**BMC 2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited**

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.
- C. This provision does not affect a candidate’s ability to establish a legal defense fund or the requirements for such a fund, as set forth in the Political Reform Act or by regulation.
- D. Any active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account.

Section 3. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation




[Home](#)
[Bill Information](#)
[California Law](#)
[Publications](#)
[Other Resources](#)
[My Subscriptions](#)
[My Favorites](#)

 Code: 

 Section: 


[Up^](#)   [<< Previous](#)   [Next >>](#)
[cross-reference chaptered bills](#)
[PDF](#) | [Add To My Favorites](#)


Search Phrase:

**GOVERNMENT CODE - GOV**
**TITLE 9. POLITICAL REFORM [81000 - 91014]** ( Title 9 added June 4, 1974, by initiative Proposition 9. )

**CHAPTER 5. Limitations on Contributions [85100 - 85802]** ( Chapter 5 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73. )

**ARTICLE 3. Contribution Limitations [85300 - 85321]** ( Article 3 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73. )

**85316.** (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), a contribution for an election may be accepted by a candidate for elective state office after the date of the election only to the extent that the contribution does not exceed net debts outstanding from the election, and the contribution does not otherwise exceed the applicable contribution limit for that election.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), an elected state officer may accept contributions after the date of the election for the purpose of paying expenses associated with holding the office provided that the contributions are not expended for any contribution to any state or local committee. Contributions received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deposited into a bank account established solely for the purposes specified in this subdivision.

(1) No person shall make, and no elected state officer shall receive from a person, a contribution pursuant to this subdivision totaling more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Three thousand dollars (\$3,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) in the case of the Governor.

(2) No elected state officer shall receive contributions pursuant to paragraph (1) that, in the aggregate, total more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) One hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) in the case of the Governor.

(3) Any contribution received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deemed to be a contribution to that candidate for election to any state office that he or she may seek during the term of office to which he or she is currently elected, including, but not limited to, reelection to the office he or she currently holds, and shall be subject to any applicable contribution limit provided in this title. If a contribution received pursuant to this subdivision exceeds the allowable contribution limit for the office sought, the candidate shall return the amount exceeding the limit to the contributor on a basis to be determined by the Commission. None of the expenditures made by elected state officers pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to the voluntary expenditure limitations in Section 85400.

(4) The commission shall adjust the calendar year contribution limitations and aggregate contribution limitations set forth in this subdivision in January of every odd-numbered year to reflect any increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index. Those adjustments shall be rounded to the nearest one hundred dollars (\$100).

(Amended by Stats. 2007, Ch. 130, Sec. 149. Effective January 1, 2008. Note: This section was added by Stats. 2000, Ch. 102, and approved in Prop. 34 on Nov. 7, 2000.)

(Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations.)

**§ 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts.**

(a) Application and Definitions. For purposes of Section 85316(b) and this regulation, the following definitions apply:

(1) "Officeholder" means an elected state officer.

(2) "Officeholder controlled committee" means a committee formed pursuant to subdivision (c) of this regulation.

(3) "Officeholder account" means the bank account established at a financial institution located in the State of California pursuant to Section 85316(b).

(4) "Officeholder funds" means money in the officeholder account.

(b) Establishing the Officeholder Account: For purposes of Section 85316(b), an officeholder shall maintain officeholder funds in a single bank account separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder.

(c) Establishing the Officeholder Controlled Committee, Reporting and Recordkeeping:

(1) Formation: The officeholder shall establish a controlled committee by filing a statement of organization pursuant to Section 84101 if the officeholder receives \$2,000 or more in officeholder contributions in a calendar year.

(2) Committee Name: The controlled committee name shall include the officeholder's last name, the office held, the year the officeholder was elected to the current term of office, and the words "Officeholder Account." The statement of organization shall include the name, account number, and address of the financial institution where the committee established the officeholder account.

(3) Filing Requirements: The controlled committee shall file campaign statements and reports pursuant to Chapters 4 and 5, except Sections 85200 and 85201, of Title 9 of the Government Code at the same times and in the same places as it otherwise would be required to do for any other controlled committee formed by the officeholder for election to state office.

(4) Required Recordkeeping and Audits. The officeholder and treasurer shall be subject to recordkeeping requirements under Section 84104. The officeholder account and officeholder controlled committee shall be subject to audits under Chapter 10 of Title 9 of the Government Code. Any audit of the officeholder, or any of his or her controlled committees, under Section 90001 shall include all officeholder accounts and officeholder controlled committees maintained by the officeholder during the audit period as described in Regulation 18996(a)(1).

(d) Prohibitions:

(1) Officeholder funds may not be contributed or transferred to another state or local committee, including any other controlled committee of the officeholder, except as permitted in subdivisions (g) (2) and (g)(3).

(2) Officeholders may not use officeholder funds to pay "campaign expenses" as defined in Regulation 18525(a).

(3) The officeholder may not transfer or contribute funds from any other committee he or she controls to the officeholder account, except as permitted in subdivision (g)(2) and (g)(3).

(e) Contributions to the Officeholder Account:

(1)(A) Required Notices: In addition to the requirements of Regulation 18523.1, a written solicitation for contributions to the officeholder account shall include the following: "For purposes of the Political Reform Act's contribution limits, a contribution to an officeholder

account is also considered to be a contribution to all campaign committees for future elective state office the officeholder seeks during his or her current term of office."

(B) In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A) above, an officeholder who files a statement of intention to be a candidate for any elective state office during the officeholder's term of office shall provide notice of this filing to every person that has made a contribution to his or her officeholder account. The notice shall contain the language in subparagraph (A) and be transmitted or mailed within 10 days of filing the statement of intention to be a candidate.

(2) Cumulation: A contribution to the officeholder account shall also be deemed a contribution to the officeholder's controlled committee for election to elective state office for the purposes of Section 85316(b)(3) only under all of the following circumstances:

(A) The contributor makes the contribution between the day the election was held for the term of office for which the officeholder account was established and the end of that term of office;

(B) The officeholder maintains the controlled committee, established for a future term of elective state office, at any time during the period covered in subparagraph (A).

(3) Cumulation and Primary and General Elections: A person's contributions to the officeholder account, when combined with contributions from the same person for a primary and general election to the elective state office may not exceed the contribution limits applicable to the primary and general election.

(4) Multiple Officeholder Accounts: When an officeholder maintains more than one officeholder account in the same calendar year, he or she may not receive the following contributions to any of those accounts during that calendar year:

(A) Contributions from a single contributor that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount the contributor could give to the officeholder account having the highest per person contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(1).

(B) Contributions from all contributors that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount in total contributions the officeholder could receive in the officeholder account having the highest aggregate contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(2).

(f) Contributions Over the Limits:

(1) An officeholder shall return to the contributor the portion of any contribution to his or her officeholder account that exceeds the limits of Section 85301, 85302 (after cumulation) or 85316 (either alone or after cumulation) by the earlier of 14 days of receipt or 14 days of the date the officeholder files a statement of intention to be a candidate for elective state office pursuant to Section 85200.

(2) A contributor to the officeholder account does not violate the contribution limits applying to the officeholder's election to a future elective state office as otherwise provided under Section 85316(b)(3) if, when he or she makes the contribution, the officeholder has not filed a statement of organization to establish a controlled committee for election to a future elective state office.

(g) Terminating Officeholder Accounts and Committees:

(1) The officeholder may not accept contributions after the officeholder's term of office ends or the date he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier.

(2) The officeholder may redesignate the officeholder account as an officeholder controlled committee for a future term of the same office by amending the statement of

organization for the committee to reflect the redesignation for the future term of office prior to the date the officer's term of office ends.

(3) An officeholder may redesignate officeholder funds in the redesignated officeholder account as officeholder funds for the new term of office, subject to the limitations in subdivision

(e)(4).

(4) Once the officeholder's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier, the officeholder may only use his or her officeholder funds for the following purposes:

(A) Paying outstanding officeholder expenses.

(B) Repaying contributions to contributors to the officeholder account.

(C) Making a donation to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious, or similar tax-exempt, nonprofit organization, if no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the officeholder, a member of his or her immediate family, or his or her committee treasurer.

(D) Paying for professional services reasonably required by the officeholder controlled committee to assist in the performance of its administrative functions.

(5) The officeholder shall terminate the officeholder controlled committee within 90 days of the date the officer's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier. The Executive Director may for good cause extend the termination date or permit the candidate to reopen the account.

Note: Authority cited: Section 83112, Government Code. Reference: Sections 84104, 85316 and 90000-90007, Government Code.

**HISTORY**

1. New section filed 7-3-2007; operative 8-2-2007. Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2007, No. 27). For prior history, see Register 2007, No. 26.

2. Change without regulatory effect amending section filed 3-22-2016; operative 4-21-2016 pursuant to 2 CCR 18312(e). Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2016, No. 13).



Office of the  
City Attorney

**DATE:** December 28, 1999

**TO:** BARBARA GILBERT,  
Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean

**FROM:** MANUELA ALBUQUERQUE, City Attorney *MA*  
By: CAMILLE COUREY, Deputy City Attorney

**SUBJECT:** APPLICATION OF BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

ISSUE:

Does the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) govern officeholder accounts?

CONCLUSION:

No. The BERA does not govern true officeholder accounts per se. However, the mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under the BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable local laws.

ANALYSIS:

Sarah Raynoso, former secretary and staff counsel to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC), issued an opinion to the FCPC dated December 2, 1991, a copy of which is attached, stating that the BERA's contribution limit does not apply to contributions made to an officeholder account. The opinion reasons that the BERA's contribution limit applies only to "contributions" as defined in the BERA, i.e., which are made directly or indirectly in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) § 2.12.100.) Contributions to a true officeholder account are not made for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate to office, but rather for the use of an officeholder in carrying out the duties of his or her office. Therefore, the contribution limit of the BERA is inapplicable to officeholder accounts.<sup>1</sup> For similar reasons, the BERA does not

<sup>1</sup> However, the opinion also provided that contributions to officeholder accounts still had to be reported on campaign statements because the State Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Regulations broadly defined contributions as any contribution for "political purposes." Since officeholder expenses are for political purposes, they must be reported to the State.



Barbara Gilbert  
Re: Application of Berkeley Election Reform Act To Officeholder Accounts  
December 28, 1999  
Page 2

apply to true officeholder accounts.

The BERA requires the filing of statements to report the amounts received and expended in municipal elections. (See BMC §§ 2.12.015, 2.12.030 through 2.12.050) Specifically, a "campaign statement" required to be filed under the BERA is an itemized report which provides the information required by Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 of the BERA. (BMC § 2.12.080.) Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 govern the reporting of contributions and expenditures. "Contributions" and "expenditures" are defined by the BERA as any amounts received or expended, respectively, in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See BMC §§ 2.12.100 and 2.12.130.) Contributions to or expenditures from a true officeholder account are not subject to the BERA's reporting requirements because they are made for the purpose of carrying out the duties of elective office, and not for the purpose of aiding or opposing the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the BERA does not apply to true officeholder accounts.

However, the fact that an account may be designated as an officeholder account will not shield it from scrutiny under the BERA if the officeholder account is, in fact, being used for the receipt of contributions or the making of expenditures in aid of the nomination or election of a candidate for local elective office. Nor will BERA requirements, such as the \$250 contribution limit or the prohibition against contributions from businesses to candidates, be held inapplicable if contributions made initially to an officeholder account are transferred subsequently to a campaign account. Where the actions taken with respect to an officeholder account implicate campaign contributions and expenditures in municipal elections, the officeholder account will be scrutinized under the BERA and other applicable local law.

Attachment

cc: Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Sherry Kelly, City Clerk

City Attorney Opinions Index: H.E.I. and H.L.G.

CCM

PAUSERS\BBL2\ofhldr.mem.doc

<sup>2</sup> Again, however, the State FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to an officeholder account. (See footnote 1.)

CITY OF BERKELEY

DATE: December 9, 1991 Memorandum

TO: FCPC COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Sarah Reynoso, Secretary & Staff Counsel

SUBJECT: APPLICABILITY OF BERA'S CONTRIBUTION LIMIT TO FUNDS RAISED FOR OFFICEHOLDER EXPENSES

BACKGROUND AND ISSUE

I received the attached letter from Richard N. Lerner, treasurer of Friends of Ioni Hancock Committee ("Committee"), regarding the applicability of BERA's (Berkeley Election Reform Act) \$250 contribution limit to funds raised to cover officeholder expenses. The Committee would like to raise money to cover activities by the Mayor for which the City has not allocated funds, for example, distribution of a newsletter and international travel to visit Berkeley Sister Cities.

Thus, the issue presented to the Commission is as follows: Is BERA's \$250 contribution limit applicable to funds raised for officeholder expenses?

CONCLUSION

No. The BERA's contribution limitation is only applicable to money raised "in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election" of a candidate. Since the Committee intends to raise these funds for activities unrelated to the nomination or election of the Mayor, they are not subject to the BERA's \$250 contribution limitation. However, such funds must be reported as contributions under the State Political Reform Act and their expenditure itemized on the disclosure forms.

ANALYSIS

The BERA prohibits candidates for elective office from soliciting or accepting a contribution of more than \$250 from any one contributor. (BERA section 2.12.415.) Thus, funds which fall within BERA's definition of a contribution, are subject to the \$250 limit. In order to determine whether funds raised for officeholder expenses are subject to the contribution limitation, BERA's definition of contribution must be reviewed.

The BERA defines contribution, in part, as follows:

"Contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, made directly or indirectly in aid of or

FCPC COMMISSIONERS  
December 9, 1991  
Page 2

in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates . . . . (Emphasis added.)

Thus, the plain language of the BERA requires that a contribution be solicited for purposes related to the nomination or election of a candidate for office to be subject to its contribution limitation. Since the Committee intends to raise funds for purposes unrelated to the Mayor's nomination or election for elective office, such funds do not fall within the BERA's definition and are therefore not subject to its \$250 limitation.

However, because the state Political Reform Act defines contribution to include any funds raised for political purposes, funds raised for officeholder expenses are considered contributions and must be reported on campaign disclosure forms.<sup>1/</sup> (Government Code section 82015.) Additionally, since the court's ruling in SEIU v. FPPC invalidated the state's \$1,000 contribution limit, funds raised for officeholder expenses are not subject to any limitation.

As a final precaution, the Committee should be advised that the FPPC has issued regulations concerning officeholder expenses and it should review them with respect to their interaction with the BERA.

Attachment

---

<sup>1/</sup>I spoke with the FPPC's legal staff and confirmed that funds raised for officeholder expenses must be reported as contributions on the campaign disclosure forms.

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL**

**AMENDMENTS TO THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT**

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission is proposing amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act related to the prohibition of officeholder accounts.

The hearing will be held on, February 4, 2020, at 4:00 p.m. in the School District Board Room, 1231 Addison Street.

A copy of the agenda material for this hearing will be available on the City’s website at [www.CityofBerkeley.info](http://www.CityofBerkeley.info) as of **January 30, 2020**.

For further information, please contact Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary at 981-6998.


Written comments should be mailed or delivered directly to the City Clerk, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, in order to ensure delivery to all Councilmembers and inclusion in the agenda packet.

Communications to the Berkeley 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 or in person to the City Clerk. 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 at 981-6900 or [clerk@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:clerk@cityofberkeley.info) for further information.

**Published:** January 24, 2020 – The Berkeley Voice  
Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051

~~~~~  
I hereby certify that the Notice for this Public Hearing of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City’s website, on January 30, 2020.

Mark Numainville, City Clerk



[First Last name]
Councilmember District [District No.]

SUPPLEMENTAL REVISED AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 2

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020


Item Number: 2

Item Description: Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

Submitted by: Councilmember Hahn

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.



SOPHIE HAHN

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

ACTION CALENDAR

February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Vice Mayor Sophie Hahn
Subject: Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

Officeholder accounts are accounts an elected official can open, and raise funds for, to pay for expenses related to the office they hold.¹ They are not campaign accounts, and cannot be used for campaign purposes. The types of expenses Officeholder Accounts can be used for include research, conferences, events attended in the performance of government duties, printed newsletters, office supplies, travel related to official duties, etc. Cities can place limits on Officeholder Accounts, as Oakland has done.² Officeholder Accounts must be registered as official "Committees" and adhere to strict public reporting requirements, like campaign accounts. They provide full transparency to the public about sources and uses of funds.

The FCPC bases its recommendation to prohibit Officeholder Accounts on arguments about "equity" and potential "corruption" in elections. The report refers repeatedly to "challengers" and "incumbents," suggesting that Officeholder Accounts are vehicles for unfairness in the election context.

I believe that the FCPC's recommendations reflect a misunderstanding of the purpose and uses of Officeholder Accounts, equating them with campaign accounts and suggesting that they create an imbalance between community members who apparently have already decided to run against an incumbent (so-called "challengers") and elected officials who are presumed to be

¹ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS-Documents/LegalDiv/Regulations/Index/Chapter5/18531.62.pdf>

² <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>

always running for office. The recommendations do not take into account some important framing: the question of what funds are otherwise available to pay for Officeholder-type expenses for Officeholders or members of the public. Contrary to the conclusions of the FCPC, I believe Officeholder accounts are an important vehicle to redress a significant disadvantage for elected officials, whose ability to exercise free speech in the community and participate in conferences and events related to their profession is constrained by virtue of holding public office, as compared to community members, whose speech rights are unrestricted in any manner whatsoever, and who can raise money to use for whatever purposes they desire.

Outlawing Officeholder Accounts is also posited as a means to create equity between more and less wealthy Officeholders, on the theory that less affluent Officeholders will have less access to fundraising for Officeholder Accounts than more affluent Officeholders. Because there are no prohibition on using personal funds for many of the purposes for which Officeholder Account funds can be used, prohibiting Officeholder Accounts I believe has the opposite effect; it leaves more affluent Officeholders with the ability to pay for Officeholder expenses from personal funds, without providing an avenue for less affluent Officeholders, who may not have available personal funds, to raise money from their supporters to pay for such Officeholder expenses.

The question of whether Officeholder Accounts should be allowed in Berkeley plays out in the context of a number of rules and realities that are important to framing any analysis.

First, by State Law, elected officials are prohibited from using public funds for a variety of communications that many constituents nevertheless expect. For example, an elected official may not use public funds to send a mailing announcing municipal information to constituents, "such as a newsletter or brochure, [] delivered, by any means [] to a person's residence, place of employment or business, or post office box."³ Nor may an elected official mail an item using public funds that features a reference to the elected official affiliated with their public position.⁴ Note that Electronic newsletters are not covered by these rules, and can and do include all of these features, even if the newsletter service is paid for by the public entity. That said, while technically not required, many elected officials prefer to use email newsletter distribution services (Constant Contact, MailChimp, Nationbuilder, etc.) paid for with personal (or "Officeholder") funds, to operate in the spirit of the original rules against using public funds for communications that include a photo of, or references to, the elected official.

Without the ability to raise funds for an Officeholder Account, for an elected official to send a paper newsletter to constituents or to use an email newsletter service that is not paid for with public funds, they must use personal funds. A printed newsletter mailed to 5-6,000 households (a typical number of households in a Berkeley City Council District) can easily cost \$5,000+, and an electronic mail service subscription typically costs \$10 (for the most basic service) to \$45 per month, a cost of \$120.00 to over \$500 per year - in personal funds.

³ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

⁴ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

Second, Berkeley City Councilmembers and the Mayor of Berkeley are not paid enough for there to be any reasonable expectation that personal funds should be used for these types of expenses.⁵ For many Councilmembers and/or the Mayor, work hours are full time - or more - and there is no other source of income.

Finally, and most importantly, local elected officials are restricted from accepting money or gifts. An elected official cannot under any circumstances raise money to pay for Officeholder expenses such as printed communications, email newsletter services, travel and admission to industry conferences for which the elected official is not an official delegate (e.g., conferences on City Planning, Green Cities, Municipal Finance, etc.), and other expenses related to holding office that are not covered by public funds. Again, without the possibility of an Officeholder Account, an elected official generally must use personal funds for these expenses, allowing more affluent elected officials to participate while placing a hardship or in some cases a prohibition on the ability of less affluent elected officials to undertake these Officeholder-type activities - which support expected communications with constituents and participation in industry activities that improve the elected official's effectiveness.

The elected official's inability to raise funds from others must be contrasted with the ability of a community member - a potential "challenger" who has not yet declared themselves to be an actual candidate - or perhaps a neighborhood association, business or corporation (Chevron, for example) - to engage in similar activities. Nothing restricts any community member or organization from using their own funds - or funds obtained from anyone - a wealthy friend, a corporation, a local business, a community organization or their neighbors - for any purpose whatsoever.

Someone who doesn't like the job an elected official is doing could raise money from family or connections anywhere in the community - or the world - and mail a letter to every person in the District or City criticizing the elected official, or buy up every billboard or banner ad on Facebook or Berkeleyside to broadcast their point of view. By contrast, the elected official, without access to an Officeholder Account, could only use personal funds to "speak" with their own printed letter, billboard or advertisement. Community members (including future "challengers") can also attend any and all conferences they want, engage in travel to visit interesting cities and projects that might inform their thoughts on how a city should be run, and pay for those things with money raised from friends, colleagues, businesses, corporations, foreign governments - *anyone*. They are private citizens with full first amendment rights and have no limitations, no reporting requirements, no requirements of transparency or accountability whatsoever.

The imbalance is significant. Outside of the campaign setting, where all declared candidates can raise funds and must abide by the same rules of spending and communications, *elected officials cannot raise money for any expenses whatsoever, from any source, while community*

⁵ Councilmembers receive annual compensation of approximately \$36,000, while the Mayor receives annual compensation of approximately \$55,000.⁵

members, including organizations and private companies, can raise as much money as they want from any sources, and use that money for anything they choose.

Without the ability to establish and fund an Officeholder Account, the only option an elected official has is to use personal funds, which exacerbates the potential imbalance between elected officials with more and less personal funds to spend. Elected officials work within a highly regulated system, which can limit their ability to “speak” and engage in other activities members of the public are able to undertake without restriction. Officeholder Accounts restore some flexibility by allowing elected officials to raise money for expenses related to holding office, so long as the sources and uses of those funds is made transparent.

By allowing Officeholder Accounts and regulating them, Berkeley can place limits on amounts that can be raised, and on the individuals/entities from whom funds can be accepted, similar (or identical) to the limits Berkeley places on sources of campaign funds. Similarly, Berkeley can restrict uses of funds beyond the State’s restrictions, to ensure funds are not used for things like family members’ travel, as is currently allowed by the State. Oakland has taken this approach, and has a set of Officeholder Account regulations that provide a good starting point for Berkeley to consider.⁶

I respectfully ask for a vote to send the question of potential allowance for, and regulation of, Officeholder Accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

CONTACT: Sophie Hahn, District 5: (510) 981-7150

⁶ <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Adopted	FY 2018 Proposed	FY 2019 Proposed
EXPENDITURES					
By Type:					
Salaries and Benefits	1,660,661	1,760,619	1,723,617	1,833,734	1,880,031
Services and Materials	36,942	43,407	113,526	113,526	113,526
Capital Outlay	1,953	7,674			
Internal Services	89,100	81,181	81,181	81,181	81,181
Indirect Cost Transfer					
	<u>1,788,656</u>	<u>1,892,881</u>	<u>1,918,324</u>	<u>2,028,441</u>	<u>2,074,738</u>
By Division:					
Mayor's Office	515,095	558,137	584,877	554,389	566,917
Council Offices	1,273,561	1,334,744	1,333,447	1,474,052	1,507,821
Exiting Officials					
	<u>1,788,656</u>	<u>1,892,881</u>	<u>1,918,324</u>	<u>2,028,441</u>	<u>2,074,738</u>
By Fund:					
General Fund	1,788,656	1,892,881	1,918,324	2,028,441	2,074,738
	<u>1,788,656</u>	<u>1,892,881</u>	<u>1,918,324</u>	<u>2,028,441</u>	<u>2,074,738</u>
General Fund FTE	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Total FTE	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00



Lori Droste
Councilmember, District 8

ACTION CALENDAR

June 30, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

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

Subject: Commission Reorganization for Post-COVID19 Budget Recovery

RECOMMENDATION

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

PROBLEM/SUMMARY STATEMENT

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

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

BACKGROUND

Review of Existing Plans, Programs, Policies, and Laws

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Consultation and Outreach

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

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

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

Gray=charter
 Red=state/federal mandate
 Yellow=quasi-judicial
 Blue=ballot initiative
 Orange=state/federal mandate and quasi-judicial
 Green=quasi-judicial and ballot initiative

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

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

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

Department and Policy Committee alignment

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

CRITERIA CONSIDERED

Effectiveness

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

Fiscal Impacts/Staffing Costs

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

Administrative Burden/Productivity Loss

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

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

Environmental Sustainability

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

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative #1–The Current Situation

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

Alternative #2–Collaborative Approach with Quantity Parameters

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

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

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

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

Alternative #4: Extreme Consolidation

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

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

PROJECTED OUTCOMES (CRITERIA X ALTERNATIVES)

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

Current Situation and Its Effects (Alternative #1)

Effectiveness of the Current Situation

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

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

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

Staffing Costs

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

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

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

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

Productivity Losses and Administrative Burden

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

Environmental Sustainability

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

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Effectiveness

Alternative #2--Collaborative approach

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

Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment

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

Alternative 4--Extreme Consolidation--

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

Costs/Fiscal Impact

Alternative 2--Collaborative Approach

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

Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment

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

Alternative 4--Extreme Consolidation

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

Productivity

Alternative 2--Collaborative Approach

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

Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment

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

Alternative 4–Extreme Consolidation

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

Environmental Sustainability

Alternative 2–Collaborative approach

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

Alternative 3--Policy Committee Alignment

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

Alternative 4–Extreme Consolidation

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

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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