

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m.

Present: Ronald Gerhard, Jeff Levin, Elsa Ortiz
Anne Campbell – Washington, Tony Smith
Frank Tucker

Excused: Chair Keith Carson

Staff: Fred Blackwell, Sarah Schlenk, Dan Rossi

2. Approval of minutes for May 7, 2012 meeting

A motion was made by Elsa Ortiz, seconded by Frank Tucker to accept the minutes from the meeting held May 7, 2012. The motion passed with a vote of 6 Ayes, 1 Absent – Carson.

3. Legislative Update from Townsend Public Affairs (continued from April 23rd)

- a. June 8, 2012 email
- b. June 15, 2012 email

Niccolo DeLuca was not present at the June 18, 2012 meeting. City of Oakland staff member Sarah Schlenk briefly reviewed the emails with the board.

4. Retention of outside legal counsel for the Oakland Oversight Board

Jarvis, Fay, Deporto and Gibson were able to make a presentation pursuant to the direction given by Chair Carson at the June 4, 2012 meeting. Rick Jarvis delivered the presentation to the board. He described the firm's familiarity with the Brown and Public Records act. He also discussed the firm's experience with parliamentary procedure, Redevelopment law and dissolution. On the subject of diversity, Mr. Jarvis stated that the firm's professional staff is "majority minority". The firm's non-professional staff, which consists of two people, has no minorities. In dealing with the conflict of the Oversight Board and the entities represented by its members. Mr. Jarvis said that the firm is clear about who the client is. However, there may be some conflicts of interest and breach of contract issues. The board thanked Mr. Jarvis for his time.

Mr. Tucker then asked staff why there were so few Oakland firms represented. Staff responded that due to the already limited pool, the fact that most of the remaining

firms currently work for Oakland in some capacity that removes them from consideration. Mr. Tucker was still concerned that there may have been a lack of outreach to viable candidates that are based in Oakland. Assistant City Administrator Blackwell further explained that staff had very specific criteria:

1. Solid Redevelopment Agency and/or Public Agency work
2. Local agency – government experience
3. familiarity with dissolution legislation.

Mr. Blackwell said that agencies fitting these criteria are better suited to serve the board at this time. He went on to mention that the amount of firms in Oakland that could respond to the informal RFP were extremely limited.

Following the discussion the board laid out their top three choices, they are as follows:

1. “Jarvis, Fay” – Campbell – Washington, Ortiz, Gerhard, Levin, Tucker (5)
2. Renne – Campbell – Washington, Gerhard, Levin, Smith (4)
3. Stein – Campbell – Washington, Ortiz, Gerhard, Levin, Smith (5)
4. Roush – Ortiz, Smith (2)

Jarvis, Fay, Deporto and Gibson, and Stein and Lubin received the most votes. A motion was then made by Elsa Ortiz, seconded by Tony Smith to retain Stein and Lubin as the Oversight Board’s Counsel. A substitute motion was then made by Frank Tucker, seconded by Jeff Levin to retain “Jarvis Fay” as the Board’s Counsel. After a roll call, the motion was tied 3 Ayes, 3 No – Gerhard, Ortiz, Smith. The board returned to consider the original motion. After a roll call, the vote was again tied, 3 Ayes, - 3 No – Tucker, Levin, Campbell – Washington. The board voted to continue the item until such time that Chair Carson could cast the deciding vote.

There was one speaker on this item, Clinton Killian.

5. Discussion on former Oakland Redevelopment Agency real property currently owned by the City of Oakland

Assistant City Administrator Fred Blackwell stated that the next task is for the Oakland Oversight board to dispense with the real property and distribute the funds collected from the transaction. Mr. Blackwell said that there is talk of excluding the properties that are for public use, but nothing is definite. He went on to explain that there are 3 categories of property.

1. Properties that have an LDDA/ENA
2. Properties that can have an LDDA/ENA shortly
3. Properties that are not prepared for construction

The board has the understanding that only the properties that fall in the third category are within the Board’s purview at this time. Mr. Blackwell suggested that the board be prepared to discuss disposition strategies at the next meeting. Staff will provide a recommendation and a list of all properties. He also explained that in some instances it may be more prudent to develop vs. selling. Developing the property could produce

property tax revenue and/or a public benefit. Selling the property will result in one time funds that will need to be distributed among the taxing agencies. Ms. Ortiz expressed a concern about quickly dispensing with properties prior to a ruling of whether or not transfers made after January 1, 2012 will be allowed. Mr. Blackwell explained that the disposition strategy would only affect the properties currently and potentially will be under the Board's jurisdiction. There for the ruling will not affect those properties. The city will send a list of all properties transferred to the city. The properties transferred back to the successor agency will be under the Oversight Boards jurisdiction. The Oversight board must present a disposition plan to the Department of Finance. Also further decisions made by the oversight board will be subject to DOF approval.

5. Open Forum

There were no speakers during Open Forum.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:16 pm.