



CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT

Special Meeting
October 26, 2015

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:03 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach arrived at 6:08 P.M.

Absent:

Study Session

1. Study Session on Status of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Program.

Mayor Holman: Our first item this evening on the agenda is a Study Session on the status of the Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Program.

James Keene, City Manager: Turn it over to Josh Mello and Sara.

Mayor Holman: Thank you very much.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Good evening, Mayor, members of Council. Tonight we'd like to update you on our progress on the City Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. This evening I'm joined by Sara Syed who's a Senior Transportation Planner in our division. She started back in April, and she joined us from the VTA Engineering and Construction Division where she was a project manager for transit, capital projects. Prior to that she worked for BART as well as the City of Oakland and was a researcher at UC Berkeley. We're honored to have Sara here. She's been managing the bulk of the bicycle and pedestrians projects. She'll be a valuable asset tonight as we move into the Study Session. As most of you know, back in 2012 the City of Palo Alto adopted the 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. It was completed by a consultant under contract for the City. This identified kind of the ultimate build-out of the City's bicycle and pedestrian network Citywide. It identified different types of bikeway facilities as well as pedestrian improvements at assorted intersections and some important gap closures, particularly along the Caltrain/Alma corridor. There's several gap closure projects identified that are shown in red on

TRANSCRIPT

there. There's also some key east-west trail connectivity projects. Last year there was funding programmed in our capital improvement budget to advance a couple dozen projects pulled directly from the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The map that's shown here illustrates the different corridors that we were able to advance starting last year. Shown in purple are the bike boulevard corridors. These include key connections like the Bryant Street north-south corridor, Park and Wilkie as well as Ross, Greer and Amarillo, Moreno and Midtown, and then a couple of corridors in south Palo Alto. Through a partnership with Google we were able to supplement this project list and actually add about four additional corridors. The concept planning for those was funded directly by Google, but we advanced those projects concurrently with the City-funded projects. Shown in green is the Midtown connector project. We're going to appear a little bit later this year to update you on that project. Since it was originally envisioned, it's become more of a comprehensive study of east-west connectivity through the Midtown neighborhood. Those corridors that are under study as part of that project are shown in green on the map. After kicking off the concept planning for this package of projects, we started with a series of bicycle ride-alongs where we met members of the community out at different shopping centers and schools and rode bikes and walked and basically toured the corridors with all the members of the community, receiving input along the way. We videotaped those bike-alongs. A lot of parents elected to bring their children, so we were able to see how different rider types handled the existing facilities that are out there as well as document some of the challenges folks faced when they crossed the major streets or attempted to navigate some of the corridors. We followed that up with some direct marketing at the farmer's market on California Avenue. We set up a table, and we had a big map of all the bike boulevard corridors. The goal of that was to solicit input from people who don't necessarily ride bicycles today and may want to and be interested in the program. We got a lot of good feedback from that. We also had an interactive map of all of the corridors where folks could drop dots on the map and then note challenges, obstacles, opportunities that they saw along the network. Since that early stages of planning, we've held several rounds of community meetings. We've been kind of in an iterative process of development of the different concept plans. Some of the concept planning efforts have moved a lot more smoothly than others. There's a couple of projects that present some assorted challenges, and we're recommending rethinking some of those projects as we move forward. More recently, we have brought forward the Churchill Avenue Phase 1 Concept Plan which you approved earlier this year. We also brought forward the Park Boulevard, Wilkie and Stanford concept plan which was also

TRANSCRIPT

approved, as well as Maybell Avenue. Immediately upon adoption of the concept plan for Maybell Avenue, we were able to implement some small improvements through some City maintenance projects as well as some cooperation with the School District. More recently, you approved the concept plan for the Charleston Road-Arastradero multimodal complete street project. The concept plans that we're currently working on are kind of a base map, aerial photography overlaid with CAD drawings, engineering drawings. We think this is a good way to illustrate the improvements to the public. This is an example of the Bryant Street extension concept plan line which we'll actually be bringing forward in November for your approval. This is extending the existing bike boulevard south across Meadow Drive. We think this is a pretty good tool. This is just the first phase in the design process. After the concept plan, we move into final design which would actually produce construction drawings.

Sara Syed, Senior Planner: Thanks, Josh. At this point, I'm going to briefly touch upon our early implementation and current projects. As Josh mentioned, after we have approved concept plans, we really look for ways where we can implement projects cost effectively prior to awarding the design and going through a more formal construction process. We work closely with our colleagues in the Department of Public Works and in the School District to advance elements of our approved concept plans. This summer we were able to advance part of the Maybell Avenue bicycle boulevard. I'll share a couple of photos of that on the next slide. We also were able to advance the Matadero Avenue bicycle boulevard with the recent repaving project to remove the center line and add sharrows. Here's a snapshot of bulb-outs on El Camino Way that the City constructed as part of the Maybell project as well as a pathway connection from Terman Middle School to the Los Altos/Palo Alto bicycle path. Our Public Works Department constructed that path this summer. You probably have also seen around town many high visibility green pavement markings and a bicycle signal that was installed at Alma and Lytton. This is just an example of partnering with development projects to implement improvements cost effectively. This summer the School District stepped up in a big way to construct spot improvements near both Gunn High School and Palo Alto High School. The Georgia Avenue pathway connecting to Gunn was previously a narrow, constrained path shared by hundreds of cyclists and pedestrians. We worked with the School District on a design to double the width and to add lighting as well as a treatment at the opening of the path to ensure that motor vehicles don't drive on the path with some new landscaping. Changes were also made to the Los Robles Ave. entrance to the path to Gunn High School to allow families, people with trailers, people with special needs to

TRANSCRIPT

access that. Previously there were stairs that reduced the ability of the public to use the path. Here at Paly, construction impacts on campus closed off an existing path. Following complaints from the community, we worked with the School District right after school started to collaborate to construct a new pathway right through the driveway. As Josh mentioned, we are currently bringing forward some recommendations to rethink some of our current projects. I wanted to briefly discuss that before we hear your thoughts on the Bryant Street bicycle boulevard update. Bryant Street is the nation's first bicycle boulevard. Palo Alto is still looked to as a leader for the changes that were made on Bryant to reduce the levels of motor vehicle traffic to create a safe space. The kind of changes we're looking at aren't too significant. Nevertheless, we haven't had broad support from the community for these changes. There have been a lot of questions about on-street parking changes proposed near intersections. Some of these changes are proposed due to visibility concerns. We want to go back and take a closer look and do the parking occupancy studies before we advance this project. We heard a lot of feedback from parents that they let their kids on Bryant Street, but they're uncomfortable on Bryant Street Downtown due to the parking maneuvers with the diagonal parking and also just the increased traffic volumes. We'd also like to revisit the Downtown segment of the Bryant Street bicycle boulevard update, do more engagement with the business community. We didn't get a lot of turnout from those stakeholders. The other change, which was very well received by the community at the last meeting we did, was to remove the high-visibility green markings throughout the residential portions of the bike boulevard based on community input. We really do want to continue to utilize those treatments but not in a broad-brush manner, just using them at high conflict points, so we can really preserve their effectiveness. The next project we are also recommending rethinking is the Homer Avenue and Channing Avenue enhanced bikeway. Similar to the Bryant Street bike boulevard, we had a lack of Downtown business involvement. We're proposing some pretty significant changes. Before we move forward with this type of plan, we'd like to look at some less drastic concepts that still meet the project goals. We would like to focus more on the issue of connectivity between the Homer Tunnel to Downtown, really facilitating the north-south movements that are needed in the Downtown area for cyclists. Finally, thank you very much for approving the Park Boulevard and Wilkie Way concept plans at the end of August; we have been moving forward. One of the items that we identified when we came in August was the need for additional community meetings due to lower turnout from the Stanford Avenue area. We held that meeting earlier this month. Following the meeting and in conversations with many in

TRANSCRIPT

the community, we received input to look at a more protected, high-quality bikeway on the area of Park Boulevard between Cal. Ave. and south towards Lambert Avenue, the segment of Park Boulevard that is in the commercial district and near Page Mill Expressway which currently has bicycle lanes. We are going to be moving forward to the design phase for Park. We do want to mention that, with approved development projects on Park, implementing a high-quality, protected bikeway may be more challenging, so we will be looking very carefully at opportunities to provide a higher level of comfort on Park in the design phase. Finally, many of our current projects involve a high level of interagency coordination, and we wanted to touch upon our recent work primarily with Caltrain on the Churchill Avenue corridor improvements projects. We have a great opportunity to partner to receive some federal funding through the Section 130 program and have been just really delighted with Caltrain and the California Public Utility Commission's engagement and support for moving forward with improvements to the at-grade crossing of Churchill and Alma. No funding is guaranteed at this time, but we had a community meeting last Thursday night and received a lot of great feedback in support of safety improvements to that intersection. We're looking at not only pedestrian and bicycle improvements but also improvements to reduce the chance of a vehicle being stopped on the tracks at that crossing. We're also working closely with the City of Mountain View; they are updating their bicycle plan. There are many border areas particularly in south Palo Alto where there's gaps in the network that we're working with Mountain View to close. Finally, we're partnering with VTA on a number of efforts. One more recently is to bring more adult bicycle education to Palo Alto. That's all I have for now. I'll turn it back over to Josh.

Mr. Mello: Thank you, Sara. More immediately, some items that we anticipate bringing before you before the end of 2016 include a contract award for a final design phase for Park Boulevard, Wilkie, Stanford Avenue as well as Maybell Avenue and then Churchill Avenue Phase 2. Churchill Avenue Phase 2 is the segment of Churchill kind of east of the Caltrain tracks all the way to Bryant Street. That was not included in the Phase 1 concept plan that was adopted earlier this year. We think that's a priority especially given the work that we've been doing with Caltrain and California Public Utilities Commission. We're actually going to be bringing those items forward to you in November. Early 2016, we would like to advance the concept plans for approval for Moreno, Amarillo, Ross Road and the Bryant Street update. We've also started to envision a more comprehensive look at Downtown. This would be a Downtown bicycle and pedestrian circulation and safety study. We would like to look at both the Alma Street, Homer

TRANSCRIPT

Tunnel connection, Homer-Channing and then the Bryant Street bike boulevard segment within Downtown more comprehensively. We'd like to do some more intensive business outreach, perhaps do some type of tactical urbanism demonstration to let the business community see what a protected bikeway would look like Downtown. We also would like to modify some of the traffic signal timing Downtown to make it more pedestrian friendly and develop some timing plans for that. We anticipate bringing some type of scope of work forward to you in 2016 for that Downtown pedestrian and bicycle circulation study. We'll also be coming back to you in November to give you an update on the Midtown connector project. That's a fairly complex project that's evolved pretty significantly over the last several months. We'd like to spend some time discussing that with you in early November. We've been working cooperatively with Caltrans to develop new Class 4 bikeway design standards. On your Consent Agenda this evening is the approval of the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide as well as the Urban Street Design Guide. That will give us the flexibility to start to incorporate some of these separated bikeways, cycle track, protected bikeway designs into our bike boulevard and enhanced bikeway projects. Along with that, we are excited to announce that Palo Alto is now the newest affiliate member of NACTO which opens up a lot of the resources that are available to consult with other cities that are on the cutting edge of bikeway design and share knowledge with those staff members at the other cities. Last but not least, we'd like to start to harness the data that we'll be collecting through the pedestrian and bicycle counter program that was approved around the elementary and middle schools as well as our new traffic signal system which we'll also be updating you on shortly. The traffic signal system has the capability to conduct much more robust bicycle counts at our signalized intersections. That coupled with the pedestrian and bicycle counters that we're installing around the schools, I think we can start to build a really good database of bicycle and pedestrian activity throughout the City, which will help us be more competitive when it comes to grant applications and other requests for funding. I'm also excited to announce this evening that we've transitioned at the Transportation Division over to the Palo Alto 311 system. We've started using that exclusively for all work requests. Any requests related to bikeways, traffic signals, signage, pavement markings, parking regulations can now all be submitted through Palo Alto 311. That will enable us to more effectively track where citizen demand is and citizen concern is. All of the requests are mapped and tracked all the way from entry to closeout. With that, we'll end our presentation.

Mayor Holman: Thank you. Since there's not a Staff Report and we've become aware of the breadth of discussion items in the presentation, you'll

TRANSCRIPT

notice on Slide 12 that it references Homer Avenue and Channing Avenue. As I live on Homer, if there's any discussion about Homer beyond where the pedestrian bicycle tunnel is, the underpass is, I'd ask Council Members if you'd hold those to the end. If need be, I can step out of the room. It seems not likely, but just in an abundance of caution. With that, Council Members, questions? Council Member Burt.

Council Member Burt: I have a few comments and questions. I'll let you kind of jot down the questions and maybe answer them toward the end. One has to do with places where we have off-road bike paths. I know you mentioned that some of the ones around schools you'd looked at widening. I wanted to find out whether we're looking at segregating pedestrians from bikes potentially where we have combination paths of bikes and pedestrians and long term having a pedestrian path and a bike path next to each other where space allows. I also am interested in within the Ross and Greer bike boulevards whether there will be consideration of some turn restrictions, whether they're closures like we have on Bryant or simply partial restrictions that would reduce the use of those boulevards for kind of longer distance car travel, still making them accessible for local driving. With the Matadero or the Midtown bike path, do we have a clear intention to have a pedestrian crossing under the tracks to connect that with the Matadero path that is on the, we'll call it the southwest side of the tracks? If so, would it cross under both Alma and the tracks, given that we don't have a signal there currently or would we add a signal? Mayor, your potential conflict is with Homer on the other side of Middlefield. I don't think there's an issue out toward Alma, so I'll just lay this out as a question of whether there's a reexamination of once we hit High Street and we have the counter-directional lane. There had been discussion a few years ago about either potentially putting a counter-directional on High or turning High from Forest to Homer into a two-way street. You may not know that historically that section down there of one-way High Street was driven by Peninsula Creamery trucks needing to turn in. That's been a while since we've had that need, but we kind of have this artifact of a two-lane one-way street. On Bryant, one of the things that I've been concerned about for a long while is cars that cross Bryant aren't really notified clearly that they're crossing this heavy traffic bike lane and whether there'd be warning signs at the stop signs and/or stencils on the street. I know I've been told that stencils on the bike boulevard aren't a typical practice. At an intuitive level, when I'm a driver, they are a real strong reminder that I'm crossing a bike boulevard. Even though I'm also a rider, I know that I need that kind of reminder to double check that I'm not just looking for cars and an occasional bike; I'm looking for a lot of bikes. I think they're real valuable. I'm glad that you're looking at the Downtown

TRANSCRIPT

crossways on Bryant. That's really been a gap for a long while. It's not just for kids. Those of us who want to cross Downtown, it can add a lot of time on a bike trip. If we're really trying to make bicycling a preferred choice, having at least one route where we can move quickly across town is real valuable. The picture with Park Boulevard showed a counter-directional lane. I don't know if that's what you're actually considering; I'd be curious on that. I've also had members of the community recently bring to my attention that the Downtown area and Stanford—that's not our jurisdiction—has become an increasing problem on bike theft. We can have a great bicycle system, but people will be discouraged from riding if they have to keep buying bikes. You mentioned the Mountain View connections. I know that San Antonio Center is a real bear to get to by bicycle. I'm real glad that you're working with Caltrans on some of the rule making. One in addition to the counter-directional lanes is where we have T-intersections and you're on the bike lane at, I'll call it the top of the T where you're riding through, whether it's a traffic signal or a stop sign, bikes are legally required to stop even though cars can't go legally into the bike lane. I'd be interested in if a curb was placed, whether Caltrans would accept allowing bikes to legally proceed in the bike lane through a T-intersection without having to stop. Thanks, and I appreciate all the progress we're getting.

Mayor Holman: Would Staff like to hear questions and comments from everybody, then respond all at once or would you like to do these as they come?

Mr. Mello: I think, given the number, it might make more sense to do them as they come, so that we can formulate our answers appropriately.

Mayor Holman: Very good.

Mr. Mello: I'll respond to the questions first. If you need me to respond to the comments, I can do that as well. Your first question was are we looking at segregating pedestrians and bicyclists on high-use, shared-use paths that are off-road. There are no current plans to construct parallel cycle tracks to any of the shared-use paths in town. That's not saying that we would preclude that as an option if there was room available. I think that may be difficult to enforce in the long run. I think you'd end up with pedestrians on the bicycle way and bikes on the pedestrian way. We'd have to probably ramp up enforcement if we're going to move in that direction. I do think we may want to look into a courtesy campaign on both the shared-use paths and the tunnels to help folks share the space. That's something we can work with the community on, if there was an interest in that. Second

TRANSCRIPT

question was on Ross and Greer are we looking at turn restrictions, half closures, full closures. We have not identified any locations for turn restrictions or half closures or full closures. There's some language in the Comp Plan that makes that difficult, when you're interrupting the connectivity. However, I think the Comp Plan also references our bike boulevard network and mentions that partial closures may be an appropriate solution in some cases. If there's any specific locations along those corridors, we can definitely look at that as we move forward in the concept planning process. To date, we have not identified any partial or full closures along those corridors. The third question was regarding Midtown connector, are we looking at a crossing of Caltrain. We're actually going to be coming back to you in November to give you a full update on the Midtown connector project. I'd be glad to answer that tonight, but we'll have more substantial discussion about that in November. That is part of the original proposal for the corridor, with some type of a cross-barrier connection at that point. Next question was regarding the Homer Tunnel connection. Are we looking at either converting High Street to two-way or adding a contra-flow bike lane? I think we'd like to look at those options as part of the Downtown circulation and mobility study. I'd also like to look at a bikeway on Alma Street. There's potentially some extra capacity on Alma, and there's some modifications that could be made to on-street parking that may allow for a northbound bikeway to be installed on Alma that would allow people to make that movement. I think there's probably about four different alternatives that we'd want to look at. High Street would be a big, strong candidate for that connection. For Park Boulevard, you asked if we were considering a two-way, separated bikeway. The answer is yes, I think we would look at a two-way, separated bikeway as well as one-way, separated bikeways. It's a fairly constrained right-of-way there, so I don't know if we can fit a two-way, separated bikeway. That's appealing to us because of the high number of turning movements onto the ramp for Page Mill Road that conflict with the southbound bike lane. If we could move cyclists over to the east side of the roadway, they would be out of that conflict zone for the expressway ramp. I think the remainder were comments. We can certainly talk to Caltrans about bicycle regulations at T-intersections. I know there are some jurisdictions that have already made that change to their ordinances, to allow that movement.

Mayor Holman: Thank you very much. Vice Mayor Schmid.

Vice Mayor Schmid: I wonder if you could put Slide 2 on. I just want to talk about the Matadero and Midtown connector. I know we're going to have this

TRANSCRIPT

back in November 9th, so you don't need to respond. Just to give a few thoughts. If you could go to "3," I guess is a better picture. Two.

Mr. Mello: This one?

Vice Mayor Schmid: Yeah. I'm particularly concerned with the east-west connections around town. We've spent a lot of time talking about El Camino and the rail corridors and how they disrupt east-west traffic. East-west connectors in town are really absolutely necessary to make this a community. The Matadero Creek is especially interesting because it connects the Baylands to Bol Park. It has potential barrier breakers on both 101 and Alma tracks. It's off-road, which I think is the only bike path in town that would be off-road potentially. Also, there are dollars that could come from the Santa Clara Valley Water District on that. I think it's an important element, and there are examples in our neighboring communities, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Los Altos, Cupertino, who have all used the Santa Clara Valley roadways, pathways for bike and pedestrian paths. There's a lot of examples out there. I would think in our discussion it would be good to have maybe some pictures of what a creek-side pathway looks like; two, some sense of the property values around the pathways. Do they go up or down near the trails? Three, some sense of police activity along the pathways. Has it increased or decreased or the same as streets and pedestrian activity elsewhere? I think those would be important elements in the discussion. I look forward to November 9th.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: Thank you. I want to ask about bike share. In the Staff Report it looks like in about six months we're going to have to make a decision whether to invest in it or cut it back. Can you give us sort of like the 30-second, quick status update on where we are on that? Also, are there differences in our experience between the University Avenue station and the Cal. Avenue station?

Mr. Mello: The pilot project done through the Air Quality Management District is currently scheduled to end in June of 2016. At that point in time, the MTC is going to take over the contract with Motivate, which is the private operator of the Bay Area Bike Share system. Motivate has submitted a proposal to us to continue as-is bike share service in the City of Palo Alto. Due to the poor siting of the stations within the City and kind of a lack of density of stations and service, the general feeling is that the current configuration is probably not where we want to be permanently. We're

TRANSCRIPT

currently in discussions with SamTrans and MTC to use some supplemental funding from Bay Area Bike Share to do some additional study to help us determine what bike share in Palo Alto should look like, what our options are. We'll probably be bringing that to you in the spring, once the study has wrapped up. The only proposal that's on the table is to continue the service as is starting in July with Motivate as the operator and the exact same number of bikes and stations. That's the only decision that's been kind of offered. We're hoping that the SamTrans/MTC study will give us additional information and additional choices that could potentially be on the table.

Council Member Filseth: I know that the usage of it hasn't met everybody's expectations or comparable to San Francisco and so forth. Have we seen differences between the University Avenue station and the Cal. Ave. station? It seems to me that the last ...

Mr. Mello: (inaudible)

Council Member Filseth: This is a last-mile problem kind of thing. The dynamics around the University station versus the Cal. Ave. station and the Research Park and so forth seem like a lot different. Are we seeing differences between those?

Ms. Syed: Very slight differences. The busiest stations are near Caltrain, both in Downtown and on Cal. Ave.

Council Member Filseth: I guess you would expect that. The answer is we'll know more in the spring?

Mr. Mello: Yeah, the answer is we're hoping to bring you kind of a menu of options in the spring as to what our next step would be after June.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss.

Council Member Kniss: I think it is probably the same question that Eric just asked. On page 18, where you've talked about the Peninsula pilot cities, is that the same issue that you just discussed or is that a different one? It's right in the middle of the page.

Mr. Mello: Yes. The Peninsula pilot cities are jointly working with SamTrans and MTC to do a Peninsula-specific study of bike share.

Council Member Kniss: Same thing you just mentioned to Eric, as a result of us not participating fully in the pilot sharing program. Correct?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Yes. The general feeling ...

Council Member Kniss: We're not using the bikes enough.

Mr. Mello: ... is the pilot was not as effective as it could have been.

Council Member Kniss: Looking at some of the other graphs that you had in here. I can't find Boulder at the moment, but Boulder is a lot like we are. It looks as though they are using bikes half again as much as we are. Why would you guess that's the case? Better placement? I would tell you what page that's on, but I remember it's in here somewhere, where Boulder and Palo Alto are compared. There's also the very long chart on trips per day that's on page 17, packet page 21.

Mr. Keene: While they're looking at that, Council Member, population's obviously just a little bigger than ours. I mean the campus is big and it's integrated more directly with the city than Stanford is here. I'm sure you've got a lot of student usage in Boulder, would be my guess. In a way that we just don't have, in the same way it's between Stanford and our town.

Council Member Kniss: I guess—go ahead.

Mr. Mello: The chart on page 17 shows the trips per bike per day for the largest systems in the world. It also includes Mountain View, San Jose, Palo Alto and Redwood City. I think the root of the issue is that the pilot did not really serve Palo Alto well. There are stations located at the Caltrain stations, but then there's a bike share station two blocks away. That's about the extent of the trip that you can make. There's no additional stations on the east side of Downtown. Bike trips are generally 1-2 miles. We really don't have any stations that are 1-2 miles from Caltrain. Your options for making trips are fairly limited under the current configuration. I think it just hasn't performed up to expectations because of the design of the system.

Council Member Kniss: It sounds as though it's not gone forever, however. We'll be looking at it more.

Mr. Mello: Yes.

Council Member Kniss: Just coming back to us though. Certainly the Alma Downtown is one that I have heard a number of comments about, which Pat mentioned. I also have heard from others—I confess I don't bike. I hope somebody on Staff has ridden all of these areas that you have talked about. A number of really intense bike riders have said the sharrows often are not

TRANSCRIPT

feeling as though they're protecting them on a bike. Since I have not gotten out and ridden, I'm sure that either Eric or Pat has done that. I think it would be helpful to know exactly where those are. I know several people in the community have said even though the sharrows are painted, it still makes them uneasy.

Mr. Mello: One of our takeaways from this whole concept planning process has been that we need to be more deliberative about where we use sharrows, restrict them to areas where we have conflicts. We need to direct cyclists on where to ride or notify motorists that there will be merging cyclists or cyclists making maneuvers in the roadway. Using them wholesale on every corridor I don't think makes sense. There's some aesthetic issues around that, but also people would start to ignore them and they would just kind of blend into the background. I think we have to be more strategic about where we use sharrows moving forward.

Council Member Kniss: Thanks.

Ms. Syed: Another thing we're working on is stress mapping of our bicycle network. Sometimes we think about how many miles of bike lanes do we have or bicycle boulevards, but if the last block is very stressful, sometimes that has a larger impact on bike mode share, just that one block. Next year we're going to be working with IT to deploy a ride app where local cyclists will be encouraged to track their rides. At the end of each ride, they'll be asked to rate the trip. They can mark high hazards and stressful areas. That will improve our ability for data-driven planning.

Mayor Holman: Is that it Council Member Kniss?

Council Member Kniss: Yes, thank you.

Mayor Holman: Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: First of all, thanks for the great overview. It looks like you guys have been doing a lot of work. Looks good. I just wanted to say I hope that future concept plans will come to us and not on Consent, so we can talk about them. I think we get a lot of push back or feedback from the community and can give you guys some of that feedback. I want to talk a little bit about the importance of protecting our major arterials. I think we're lucky in that a lot of Palo Alto is a grid system, and we can really separate a lot of our major bike boulevards from our major car boulevards. That's why I think Bryant works so well. I think Park Boulevard makes a tremendous amount of sense, and they basically parallel Alma. I think the

TRANSCRIPT

more we can do that kind of thing—we don't have that many major arterials across town. When we start to look at plans that start to remove lanes of cars from those major arterials, I think that's when we need to start to get a lot of feedback. I think we need to do similar parallel kinds of routes for Oregon, Embarcadero, University. I haven't heard anybody complain that there are too many bikes on their local streets. I think, again, making those the bike routes—we do hear it when cars start cutting through on local streets. I think that's what we want to avoid. Going through some of your projects real quick. I did see there was an idea that we might reduce lanes on Middlefield. I hope we get a lot of data on that before we go there. I had similar concerns about San Antonio. San Antonio and Middlefield both seem like places where we could look at parallel local streets. I also wanted to say on the County plans, I did support the County plan kind of as-is. I think there was a little disagreement on Council on that one. In general, I think with transportation there's kind of a large silent majority of drivers. We have a lot of drivers from out of town. We just need to be sensitive that a lot of times in this community outreach, I think we hear a lot from the bikers. We just need to keep that in mind. On the bike share, I think part of it was it doesn't make economic sense for a lot of people. It was hard to rent a bike for a one-way trip, work for eight or ten hours, and then rent again. You're basically looking at renting all day, and it didn't make sense. In particular, maybe at Cal. Ave. to Stanford Research Park, if you could drop your bike off pretty near your building in the Research Park, that might make a lot more sense than Downtown which, I think, is pretty walkable. Some quick questions. I'll just rattle them off, and then you can go through them. I think data sources is really critical. I'm glad to hear you guys are focused on that. I'd like to ask that we collect car data as well. It wasn't clear if you were going to do that for the Downtown circulation study. I'm also really interested in continuous sources of data. I think over a year ago we talked a little bit to ways about getting real-time continuous data. People are traveling around with smartphones, regardless of mode of transportation there might be some good data sources for that stuff. I had a question about how you're going to look at sharrows and green paint in general. You kind of partially answered that question already, it sounds like, on quiet neighborhood streets versus where there's more traffic. A question about the bike bridge. I seemed like the bike paths weren't necessarily ending up where the bike bridge is going to be built. I'd like to hear a little bit about that. Again, maybe moving that one bike path off of San Antonio and having it dead end at 101. If you were on a parallel street and you ended up at the bike bridge, seemed like that would make more sense. A question about the Paly flow. I think right now students are using the bridge

TRANSCRIPT

because of the construction over there. It seems to be working pretty well, so I'm wondering if that's something that we could look at longer term instead of kind of reopening that crosswalk. The last question is about the NACTO Guidelines which we're adopting later tonight. It seems like a lot of those are urban environments. I'm wondering how they get applied in suburban areas of the City. I know like on the Bryant Street boulevard in Old Palo Alto, I think we decided not to paint as many green sharrows. Parts of the guidelines say they're mandatory, but in our ordinance, it says we're going to determine the best solution. I'm just wondering how we weigh those things out. That's it.

Mr. Mello: First question was are we going to collect car data with the Downtown circulation study. The answer is yes. I think there's going to be some key decision points where we have to look at where we prioritize the use of the roadway, specific streets Downtown. Having the motor vehicle data is going to be a very key point of data that we need to make those decisions.

Council Member DuBois: Also, the idea of like looking for continuous data sources rather than measuring at certain points in time.

Mr. Mello: The new bike and ped counters that are being installed around the different schools will be a continuous stream of data. The new traffic signal system will count motor vehicle volumes at all of the intersections on a continuing basis as well as bicyclists and pedestrians that are actuating the signals. The clearing house that I'd like to investigate would attempt to consolidate all of that continuous data and make it usable for City Staff and the general public when we get to key decision points. In regard to sharrows and green pavement markings, we're going to be much more deliberative about that moving forward. I don't think on local streets the likelihood of those being appropriate is fairly slim. I think we're going to look more at collector streets and arterials and high-conflict zones, at right-turn lanes where bicyclists and motor vehicles are mixing. Those are the kind of areas where you want to have enhanced pavement markings and use green pavement markings. The bike bridge, this is the Adobe Creek/101 bike bridge. If you look at the map that's on the slide there—do we have a laser pointer?

Council Member DuBois: I don't think anything connects to it.

Mr. Mello: Both the San Antonio enhanced bikeway and the Louis/Montrose/Cubberley Bike Boulevard Projects that were funded through

TRANSCRIPT

the partnership with Google will offer a fairly good connection across town to the 101 bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing via Fabian.

Council Member Dubois: I guess it's not shown on this map, but it seems like in terms of removing a lane of traffic on San Antonio versus getting people over on Montrose to Fabian or—was it Meadow? I guess the bridge is kind of—it's Meadow and Loma Verde, I guess, is where the bridge is in between. There's going to be some jog over to that bridge.

Mr. Mello: The current concept plan for San Antonio does not involve removing any travel lanes. It's just narrowing the lanes and modifying the on-street parking. In regards to Paly students using the bridge instead of the crosswalk across Embarcadero, we just kicked off the Embarcadero Phase 2 project a couple of weeks ago. We'll be meeting with you, coming out to the community to kind of propose some different options and different treatments. Relocating and/or removing crosswalks is certainly something that could be considered through that design process. In regard to NACTO being relevant in suburban areas, by adopting the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide and the Urban Street Design Guide, we are not locking ourselves into using any of those design criteria. It's merely just another tool in our toolbox that we'll be able to pull from when appropriate. There are some instances where we may want to look to NACTO for guidance, but there are other instances where we may stick with the standard Caltrans Highway Design Manual and/or AASHTO standards which are what a lot of folks are using now.

Council Member DuBois: Just a quick follow up. If it says it's required in NACTO, that doesn't mean ...

Mr. Mello: That means if you're using that treatment, they strongly recommend that you include those elements in that treatment.

Council Member DuBois: Thank you very much.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff.

Council Member Scharff: Thank you. Thank you for your hard work on this. It's nice to see it starting to take shape. A couple of things. First of all, when you take Churchill across Alma, if you want to go towards Town and Country or Downtown or the Caltrain station, that currently doesn't work. You can't really get on that path without going through the railroad tracks or going around and then jumping the curb or going all the way down and then

TRANSCRIPT

cutting in and coming back. Is that part of Phase 2? What exactly were we doing? I couldn't quite follow it.

Ms. Syed: Improving the transition from Churchill to the existing Caltrain bike path is part of the Phase 2 proposal. We are also working on more near-term improvements to clear up some of the landscaping on the school side to make that more seamless. In the long term, what we're proposing with the Phase 2 project is to double the width of the bicycle and pedestrian crossing of Caltrain. The road would stay the same width as it is today, but we would have a doubly wide path with separate spaces for bicycles and pedestrians that would connect to the multiuse trail and facilitate those movements in any direction on the path.

Council Member Scharff: It would be seamless then to drive through. You arrive on the path and you could go right or left without having—okay.

Ms. Syed: Yes.

Council Member Scharff: That's great. I had a similar question with the 101 bridge. The Midtown connector feasibility, that was going to come down and be close to where that bridge is going over. Right or not?

Ms. Syed: Matadero Creek is north of Adobe Creek.

Council Member Scharff: Right. If that Midtown connector came down, was that hook into where you could then come down and go to the bike bridge to get over 101?

Ms. Syed: Yeah. Generally the concept has been that it's not cost effective to improve both of the creek crossings. With our focus on the Adobe Creek overcrossing, that the Matadero Creek connection would be an on-street facility. There are many of our north-south bike boulevards. The last piece would be adding the Adobe Reach trail connection which would reduce the usage of Bayshore Road to make that last block or two.

Council Member Scharff: Thanks. I also wanted to just comment briefly on the bike share. I mean, I'm really glad you guys are focused on—I do think the problem is that it goes to the wrong places, frankly. I mean, I think that's fairly obvious. Are you coming back to us with it? How are you planning on—people have talked about getting Stanford University, Stanford Shopping Center, the Research Park. You could even have a couple of bikes in Midtown, I suppose. I don't know if that would work. Are you going to do a feasibility study? Are you hiring a consultant? How is that going to work?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: We've been working with SamTrans who has put together a scope of work for a consultant that they already have under contract. The funding is coming from the MTC Bike Share program, and it's being routed through SamTrans. One of the things I asked to be included in the scope was what's called a demand analysis. This is where you look at where people live, work and play. There's formulas that have been developed to determine how likely those people are to use bike share to make trips. We'll get a heat map for the entire City that shows where people are likely to make bike share trips. Using that demand analysis, we can then calculate how many bikes and how many stations we would need to have an ideal system that serves our residents and our community effectively. That'll give us the tools we need to negotiate with Motivate, with MTC and/or an additional vendor depending on the outcome of the study this spring.

Council Member Scharff: I also wanted to support your concept of where possible to put in separated bike lanes. I really like that. I mean, I think that's one of the real—a lot of the people who bike, they're comfortable with that. To bring new people into biking and get those numbers up, I think people are much more comfortable when it's separate. I think when we look at those major arterials, it's no fun to bike along El Camino or Alma or frankly even Middlefield. I don't even like biking down north California. I biked down Middlefield the other day to get to the JCC; that was not a great experience. To the extent possible, I actually agree with Tom that we should as much as possible try and separate the cars from the bikes. You want to keep our arterials with the cars and bike lanes without the bikes. I thought that was a really good comment that Council Member DuBois made. I also want to comment briefly on Council Member Burt's comment about—you were talking about pedestrian paths in certain places. I think that's a great idea. I like that. If feasible, I actually would also like jogging trails next to it in which you have not concrete or asphalt or pavement, but something you can run on without destroying your knees. I think that's really helpful. You see that on Stanford's, where they have the little dirt tracks—it doesn't have to be wide—right on the side. I don't think it's that expensive to add the little dirt track. I think that makes a huge difference. I think you guys did a great job. I'm looking forward to hearing about the Midtown connector. I find it really hard to get east to west on my bike. I usually try and do it and end up getting stuck and like going around in circles and dead-ends and stuff. I think it'd be great. Thanks.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Berman.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Berman: Thank you guys for the work and for the really impressive presentation. One of the things that struck out to me that I was kind of impressed by was you guys are being flexible. If you get feedback, you're willing to tack and do more research and get more input before committing to a plan, which I think is really important. Speaking of which, of the kind of common denominators that I seemed to notice in some of the challenges sections was outreach and feedback. You mentioned you didn't get as much feedback from the Downtown business community as you wanted. There was one of the projects where you didn't get as much feedback from the Stanford community as you wanted. Are there things that looking back didn't work and how are you kind of changing your strategy to make sure that we—it's hard. You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink. We can have all the meetings we want, and we can send out a lot of notices, but sometimes folks just are really busy and don't really feel like engaging with the City on some of the projects we're working on. What are you guys doing to try to improve that moving forward?

Mr. Mello: I can talk about the general challenges, and then I'll let Sara talk about our plan to perform a little bit in the future. Generally, it's hard to get folks interested in a project that's just a concept. You don't want to go to the community with something already written down and get the reaction that "you haven't consulted with us." At the same time, you have to bring something to the meeting to help people get interested. It's really hard, especially when you have this number of projects going on to do the kind of targeted outreach that needs to be done and to get people excited. To be honest, the projects move fairly slowly. When you're not in the transportation sector, it's hard to understand why something moves as slowly as it does. I think our biggest challenge has just been getting people excited and getting them to come out on a regular basis and providing enough information that they can help us make decisions without feeling like we've already moved too far along without getting their input.

Ms. Syed: Some of the plans that we have to improve outreach include whenever we have a community meeting in the evening, doing school-based outreach, often our meetings are at elementary schools or middle schools or high schools. Just setting up information on our projects during the pick-up and drop-off hour is relatively easy to do. It will help us reach parents and the school community who often can't attend an evening meeting. We're also working to make our plans available. For example, our Churchill plans from Thursday and the Park Boulevard plans from our earlier meeting, those are up on the website. That hasn't always been the case. We are asking people who come out to those meetings, share them with your neighbors,

TRANSCRIPT

share them with your friends, share them wide and far and get folks to give us their thoughts and feedback. We want to meet people where they are and where they can review our plans most convenient for them. We're also looking at a pilot program to use 3-D virtual reality kiosks to improve outreach. This is something that's been used in San Francisco on their better Market Street study and on a BRT project as well as by FEMA in Marin County on sea level rise. It's a way to engage people in the immediate project area, where projects are proposed. Putting out a kiosk which allows the public to learn more about a project and answer a survey and provide input right there on the spot. Those are generally our ideas. If anybody has any others, we welcome them.

Council Member Berman: It sounds like you've put a lot of thought into it. Are you guys also reaching out to your more traditional—the Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Business District, the Cal. Ave. Business Association that doesn't exist but the leaders on Cal. Ave., the Stanford residents association, and some of those types of groups to hopefully push out communication through their channels?

Ms. Syed: Yes, definitely. Also on Nextdoor, just all of the different medias that our community members are using.

Council Member Berman: Perfect, perfect. Josh, I think you'd mentioned tactical urbanism as a possible way to get folks' attention. That caught my attention. What kind of thoughts did you have in mind?

Mr. Mello: Before joining the City, I was fortunate to work on a project down in Morgan Hill where for an entire weekend the downtown business association and volunteers actually went out and repurposed two travel lanes on Monterrey Road which is their main street downtown. They did an expanded sidewalk on one side, and they did a protected bikeway on the other side. They left it in place the entire weekend. We set up booths along the roadway, little kiosks, where people could stop and give us feedback on what they liked, which one they liked better, what some of the challenges are. That's kind of the new practice in planning, to do these on-the-ground demonstrations. It's hard to ignore. You get really valuable feedback. You learn lessons in real time. You can actually evolve your plan in process.

Mr. Keene: I can just sort of add to that. This is sort of a hip, emergent term over the past two years in planning, so not just in transportation planning. Again, as Josh was saying, the idea of rather than having to go out with a full-blown process and adopt a policy into a permanent thing, to

TRANSCRIPT

just sort of test things out in a short period of time, just to see what happens. It's a lot easier to try something, it doesn't work out, just move away from it.

Council Member Berman: I think it's a great idea. For people psychologically, they know it's just temporary. You can learn a lot. You actually see what the impact is. I saw a lot of articles around the papal visit to Philadelphia where they were going to close down like a 5-mile by 5-mile stretch of Philadelphia. I think beforehand there was a lot of concern about it. Afterwards, now there's actually a proposal to do that, to close down the streets in downtown on various weekends on a permanent basis. People want to implement it next year, in 2016. I think the Mayor came out and said, "Next year? Let's do it right now." Clearly the experience that people had from that was a lot more freeing than they were expecting. You don't know that until you have to do it. It could be a fun way for us in Palo Alto, the heart of Silicon Valley, to experiment a little bit and just kind of test things out and see how it works. I'll be curious to see what ideas you guys come back with.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: First, I just want to say thanks on a few things and just highlight and encourage a few things to continue. First, actually to the City Manager and also Staff, I really want to say thanks on that contract with VIMOC for the pedestrian-bike counters. Thanks for going back and working in some privacy language into the contractual language just to confirm that resident privacy will be not an issue with those bicycle and pedestrian counters. I really appreciate looping back on that. Also, the stress mapping and the community feedback, so the people can report on, as you were saying, their rides and identify weak points on their bike routes, a really great idea. I really want to encourage that. As a couple of others have mentioned, the Class 4 bike lanes, very exciting, just absolutely has my very strong support. I'm ambivalent but interested in considering more about this question of whether we want to add more bike lanes and more protected bike lanes on roads like El Camino and Middlefield or whether we should try to encourage those bicyclists onto other streets. I think that there are strong arguments on both sides. I definitely understand them and look forward to a more robust conversation about that. It's a tricky question, and it might vary from arterial to arterial. As far as the Matadero Creek trail or the Midtown connector, I'm glad that you're utilizing a citizens advisory committee, given the potential for that, but also some of the concerns from people especially who live right adjacent to the creek. I think

TRANSCRIPT

it's important to get that community input. I think that'll be invaluable. As far as your coordination with other cities and other agencies, again just want to say thank you for that. When it comes to coordination, one thing—I'm sorry I missed just the first couple of minutes of your presentation. If you already addressed it, please just say that and feel free to not say any more. I'm curious about coordination between our bicycle plan and also our shuttle plan. I know that we're starting to put together a five-year shuttle plan that looks at some potentially significant improvements, changes, revamps, which I'm very, very excited about and curious about how that intersects with our Bike and Pedestrian Plan including routes and also storage capacity on our shuttles. Tying with that, the same thing, how are we working with the TMA and also with Stanford, especially around their Marguerite when it comes to bikes and pedestrians and making sure everything is working well? A couple of other things. As far as bike shares go, I think one of the keys, especially as we're talking about people who, as Council Member Filseth pointed out, use the bike share potentially as a last-mile solution. They take Caltrain into town or some other transit into town, get off of some intercity transit and hop on an intra-city mode which is a bike share. They're then starting from a hub which is a transit point like Cal. Ave. train station or Downtown train station, and they're hopping on a bike and going out on spokes to wherever their workplace is. That makes it hard to set up bike share stations at every single business around town. I think the key might be really making sure that we have affordable day rentals through our bike share. You can pick up the bike at the start of the day, go to work for the day and return it. A cheap 12-hour or 24-hour pass might really be a useful thing to explore. Just one other thing. I'll admit I actually spend more time on another kind of vehicle with two wheels which is a motorcycle than I do on a bicycle. When it comes down to prioritizing between the two, I definitely think as a matter of policy we need to give the priority to bicycles. One thing I just want to make sure is considered. When you reduce the width of motor lanes, the space for lane sharing especially at red lights is reduced for motorcycles. I know this is a controversial issue, but the evidence is in that lane sharing especially at red lights by motorcycles actually dramatically improves safety for motorcyclists, also reduces the stacking of cars and improves traffic. It might be worth it to narrow the lanes, for instance, on San Antonio as you had mentioned to improve bike-ability. I just want to make sure that maybe just a quick consideration of the other two-wheeled riders out there. Again, my priority is still going to be for the bicycles even though I'm less of one of them myself. That's it for my questions and thoughts. If you have any thoughts on any of those topics, feel free to chime in. Otherwise, I'll let it go on to the next person.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: In regard to the shuttle plan, that's being managed by my group as well. I definitely will look for opportunities to coordinate shuttle and bike planning as much as possible. I don't know what that looks like right now, but I think it needs to be done.

Mayor Holman: Thank you very much. Before we get to our two speakers we have this evening, I just have a handful of things here. I guess partly a segue from Council Member Wolbach's question. I couldn't remember if Marguerite shuttles have bike racks on them. I know our Palo Alto shuttles don't. Just because we're using a shuttle doesn't mean especially—like just say on Stanford campus and the industrial park, if you're landing at a spot, you might still have a ways to go. Is there talk of putting bike racks on either one of those vehicles?

Mr. Mello: The shuttle planning effort that we're kicking off is going to look at everything under the sun. Any kind of improvements we can make to the shuttle service are on the table. I think adding bike racks would certainly be something that would be appropriate to look at as part of that effort.

Mayor Holman: Bike racks are under the sun. I want to re-emphasize what comments have been made about separating—I've spoken about this for a long time, as some of the rest of us have too—the importance of separating bicycles from vehicular traffic. I was at Bol Park this weekend, for instance, and that trail gets used through there. It gets used a lot. Now, it does go to a high school, so that accentuates it. Just having that access—the one that goes to Paly is off-road too—it makes for so much safer and more pleasant and less stressful transit. It's really wonderful. The other thing about separating them is if we could do something to more physically separate. Sometimes we might have pretty great constraints on how we can separate or how much we can separate them. If we can look at plantings to help separate and better delineate what the separation is, that would be really helpful. How did the Google funding come to be?

Mr. Mello: That was before my time. I don't know if ... I was actually the project manager on the consultant side for those projects. I think there was just some coordination with the City. With Google expanding to new locations in Mountain View, I think they saw it as an opportune moment to help accelerate some of the planning for bikeways in south Palo Alto, that would help their employees access their different locations.

Mayor Holman: Go forth and duplicate. To go on with Council Member Berman's comments about Stanford, whether it's Stanford or wherever.

TRANSCRIPT

Some of the mapping just doesn't exist on here. Stanford's a little complicated, because you can have a roadway, and then all of a sudden it becomes inaccessible to cars. It seems like it would be important to have those included on a map like this, so you can figure out where connectivities are and could be and should be. Yeah, these kinds of projects take a long time too. This goes broader than just on campus. These projects do take a good long while. At the same time, development happens and sometimes we don't get the plan out there and kind of aggressive about putting a plan out there. We're precluding opportunities as part of development projects. I would hope that we could get a little bit more aggressive in getting our plan out there. There's something else that's been at play in the Parks and Recreation Commission and department that still hasn't happened, but I'm hoping will happen. The map that you've provided does indicate where schools are and indicates where parks are. There's an app that's been talked about for probably four years now, three years at least, probably more like four years, that would show you where pedestrian and bicycle paths are and also where parks are and where community facilities are. Coordinating that kind of an app would be so helpful. A more recent comment has been to add where art installations are too on that same app map. Just to reiterate one of Council Member Burt's comments about the High Street. That's something that's been lingering for a while. I'm glad to hear you're going to be considering that because it does, I think, merit discussion. With that, I don't know if you have any responses to any of that. It's mostly comments than questions. With that, we have two members of the public. You'll each have three minutes. Robert Neff to be followed by Cedric de la Beaujardiere.

Robert Neff: Thanks. First, I wanted to say that the recent work on our bicycle network has just been outstanding. The updates to the plan lines, particularly on Wilkie, have focused on effective improvements that will make the route safe and also very efficient for traveling on a bicycle. I was at the recent community meeting for the Churchill/Caltrain plan. I've been to three of those. That was the first time that the real world issues of Paly bicyclists were really addressed in the plan. It was so good to see. I think it was treated—there's hundreds of bicyclists coming out of Paly, and we have to deal with them as traffic. We can't just decide that they are kind of—I don't know—fairies or something. We have to have space for them in the street. I think the plan will start the conversation of how to do that best. I was impressed with the materials and the tone of education and collaboration at that community meeting from all the City Staff who was there. Let's see. Our Bike Plan provides a blueprint for projects to pursue. At this time, we're about four years away from when inputs were given, and

TRANSCRIPT

then the plan was adopted in 2012. I think it's apparent there's a few important areas where we can make improvements, but they're not in that Bike Plan. I think the City Staff and Council can think about ways of adding a few more areas. I have a couple of ideas, but maybe there's some others as well. One is that the Newell Road bridge plan connects a bike path on the Palo Alto side, but the bike bridge over 101 that East Palo Alto is building does not include bike lanes. The EIR doesn't include enough roadway width to really fit standard bike lanes. That may be worth addressing. Second, as the example, on south California, south of El Camino Real, there's nothing in the Bike Plan. No one brought it up at the time. Actually there's Stanford housing go in at the end of south California, and they're building a bike lane partway up the street, and then there's a gap. It's not in the Bike Plan to actually close that gap in the bike path. We should think about what's the process for making amendments to that Bike Plan to move forward. I'm glad to see the progress on the plans. I'm enjoying the improvements on Meadow and on El Camino Way every day. It's far safer than it was just four years ago. I'd encourage the City to move forward as quickly as possible on detailed designs, maybe by doing more of the design in-house instead of contracting out. Maybe that's a way we can move forward more quickly and maybe develop design expertise with the existing Staff with the City. Finally, I wanted to mention Vision Zero. Vision Zero is this idea of we should figure out how to minimize the number of traffic accidents and fatalities, serious injuries that happen in automobiles, bicycles and pedestrians. I think the first part of that is getting good data. Mountain View and San Jose are moving forward with this. Mountain View now is presenting quarterly a list of all the serious accidents—I'm off time—and so is San Jose. It's a good way to see what we can do to move forward. Finally, thank you for putting the transportation department onto the PA 311 system. I'll use it.

Mayor Holman: Thank you. Our next speaker is Cedric de la Beaujardiere, who comes to us fresh from Make a Difference Day and a major Canopy planting. Thank you, Cedric.

Cedric de La Beaujardiere: Thank you. Thanks for coming out to the Canopy planting at Bol Park. I don't have much. Park Boulevard, I'm kind of concerned about the new development that's there. I mean, it looks beautiful, but I'm afraid it's going to dump a lot of traffic onto Park which is a main access way. I was thinking that if there's any changes we want to make to Park, we might want to do them as quickly as we can so that new residents that come to live there know what they're getting into. They don't like move in, and then we say, "We want to put a bunch of speed bumps."

TRANSCRIPT

They're like, "Geez," freaking out. If you get those changes in first, then they'll move in, they're already there, existing conditions. They'll be more comfortable with what's there. On the bike share, the ubiquity of stations is really key. Paris is a really great system. Obviously it's a much different city; it's a huge city. I was there a year ago or so, and anywhere I wanted to be within a 5-10 minute walk, there was a bike share station. I used to take the metro every time I went to Paris. It's stinky, it's crowded, it's hot. I'll take the bike share from now on. It was great, a really wonderful experience. Having stations everywhere you need to go is important. The cost was something like \$10 for a week of rental, and you had the first half hour free of your ride. Pretty much anywhere you needed to go was in about a half hour. It was a really great system. Someone mentioned the possibility of closing streets on some occasional basis. That can be really controversial, but it can also be really successful. Curitiba, Brazil, did an experiment with that in the '70s, and drivers and businesses freaked out. You're going to destroy our city. The mayor managed to do it anyways. Now, I was there a couple of years ago. It's full of people, full of shoppers. It looks like Downtown Palo Alto, extremely successful. It goes for miles and miles and miles. I also would support the Vision Zero. I think that's a great project. Thanks to the City Staff and the Council for all your supportive comments. Thanks.

Mayor Holman: Thank you. Thank you to Staff, Sara and Josh both. You've got a good plan in front of you. I think you heard some very positive comments tonight from Council Members as well as public ...

Council Member Kniss: Mayor Holman, could I ask one question that they could get back to us with?

Mayor Holman: Sure, of course.

Council Member Kniss: Can we close down streets? I occasionally see people riding under Oregon with the overpass, where it's unbelievably unsafe. Is that something we can do, to say no bikes? You can answer that at another time; you don't have to answer it tonight. Thanks.

Mayor Holman: Can I just add as a follow-on to that? San Francisco does something called Sunday Streets. They move it all around town.

Council Member Kniss: Simply says no bikes?

Mayor Holman: They open the street up to pedestrians, skateboarders, whatever, and have all kinds of activities. It's really

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Keene: She was saying the opposite.

Council Member Kniss: I'm saying can we say on certain streets no bikes.

Mayor Holman: No bikes, I see. You weren't saying just (crosstalk)

Council Member Kniss: Not more bikes, no bikes.

Mayor Holman: I guess you could do one or the other. Staff will come back with a response to both of those, I guess.

Mr. Keene: We won't do both of those simultaneously (inaudible).

Mayor Holman: Could make for interesting signage, couldn't it? Thank you very much.

Special Orders of the Day

2. Appointment of Candidates to the Architectural Review Board and the Planning and Transportation Commission.

Mayor Holman: That takes us to Item Number 2 which is appointments of candidates for the Architectural Review Board and the Planning and Transportation Commission. Council Members, we have ballots in front of us. I don't see lights from anyone. As we say when we interview folks, it's really important to realize that it's not a slam dunk usually in making these decisions. Encourage anyone who maybe doesn't make it this time to apply again. With that, we will go to Agenda Changes and Deletions while Clerk is counting the votes.

[The Council returned to this item after City Manager Comments.]

Mayor Holman: We go now to the City Clerk. Do you have results of the votes for ARB and Planning Commission?

First Round of voting for three positions on the Architectural Review Board with terms ending December 15, 2018:

Voting For Peter Baltay: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach

Voting For Robert Gooyer: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Wolbach

TRANSCRIPT

Voting For Alexander Lew: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid

Voting For Flore Schmidt: Filseth, Schmid, Wolbach

Beth Minor, City Clerk: Yes, I do. Peter Baltay with nine votes, Robert Gooyer with seven and Alexander Lew with eight are all appointed to the Architectural Review Board.

First Round of voting for one position on the Planning and Transportation Commission with a term ending December 15, 2019:

Voting For Louis Fried:

Voting For John Hamilton: Wolbach

Voting For William Ross:

Voting For Asher Waldfogel: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid

Mayor Holman: Thank you, and congratulations. Planning and Transportation Commission?

Ms. Minor: I do. Asher Waldfogel with eight votes is appointed to the Planning and Transportation Commission.

Mayor Holman: Congratulations also. I look forward to you getting sworn in.

[The Council next moved to Oral Communications.]

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Mayor Holman: Knowing of none, we will go then to City Manager Comments.

City Manager Comments

Mayor Holman: Jim, City Manager Comments.

James Keene, City Manager: Thank you, Madam Mayor, members of the Council. David, are you going to help me with something? I will start elsewhere first of all. I'll read something else while you're doing that, David.

TRANSCRIPT

Does that work? You probably saw out front the finishing touches are going up on the temporary art installation for the Rondo sculpture, which actually I think does look quite nice in front of City Hall. There will be again a reminder of a public opening celebration for the sculpture this Thursday, October 29th, at 5:30 p.m. The artist, Bruce Beasley, will be there. We'll have live music. There could be more to learn about the artwork that will remain there until September of 2016. Just a reminder that the City will be honoring veterans at a special recognition ceremony on Monday, November 9th, prior to your Council meeting on King Plaza. We'll be honoring all armed forces veterans, active duty, National Guard and Reserve military service members. The event will start at 4:00 p.m. followed by a color guard. The City Council will also read a Proclamation at its meeting starting around 5:45 p.m. We invite and encourage all veterans within the community to attend as part of this recognition event. There's more information on our website under veterans. Are we good to go? Make a Difference Day. Last Saturday more than 220 volunteers came together to participate at various service project sites as part of the Make a Difference Day. This is the 24th year since National Make a Difference Day was initiated. I mentioned it at the last Council meeting or the one before that. Projects in Palo Alto included Canopy tree planting. There were 75 volunteers for the planting in Barron Park, and 60 trees were planted and 45 other plants. Sunrise Senior Center, the Palo Alto Junior Museum, Avenidas random acts of flowers and other locations around town. There also were a number of project sites in neighborhoods in our neighboring sister cities of East Palo Alto and Menlo Park. Thanks to the many organizations and individuals who participated to truly make a difference. Cal. Avenue Halloween. There we go. Make a Difference Day or is that Halloween? Make a difference on Halloween. Yesterday lots of kids and their families joined the fun with Halloween celebrations on California Avenue with one of Palo Alto's really most popular Halloween events for the whole family, the 21st Annual California Trick or Treat and Blossom Festival. It's organized every year by Blossom and supported by the Cal. Avenue merchants in the City. Do we have just the one photo? Pardon me? The next one is just follow-up to the announcement I made about the Repair Café event. There's a picture of the Mayor with Peter Skinner at the event yesterday. As I mentioned before, we introduced the first Repair Café in 2012, following the debut of the concept in the Netherlands. We certainly appreciate his dedication to Repair Café and do understand that he will be moving away from our town down Monterrey way. Lastly, the City is hosting the Building Carbon Zero California Conference, November 13th and featuring keynote speaker Diana Urge-Vorsatz, lead author of the Nobel Peace Prize winning

TRANSCRIPT

report from the intergovernmental panel on climate change. Recognizing the implications that buildings have for affecting climate change, this conference brings together national and international speakers to talk about the ergonomics, mechanics, health and comfortability of sustainable and passive housing design. We've asked the Mayor to help kickoff the conference. Attendees are invited to join Former Mayor Peter Drekmeier on a bicycle tour of five completed buildings in Palo Alto on the next day, Saturday, November 14th. For more information on the event, a complete list of speakers, a conference agenda, tickets visit co2zero.org for a complete list of speakers. That's all I have to report.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Berman, you had something to add?

Council Member Berman: Yes, just a quick thing. I was going to mention at the end of the meeting, but since the City Manager brought it up. The Cal. Ave. Trick or Treat and Blossom Festival was awesome. One thing that I would suggest—I don't know to what extent the City is involved in the planning. The intersection at Cal. Ave. and Birch, which was where the farmers market ended and the children's festival began, there needs to be more kind of guidance of traffic there. I thought when I walked past it this is a terrible idea. You've got cars coming through and so many little kids and that kind of thing. I heard the same thing from a family that was there that morning also. Just something to consider for next time.

Mr. Keene: Thank you. Much appreciated.

Mayor Holman: Thank you. I guess it shouldn't go without comment that Council Members Kniss and DuBois and I were at Palo Alto High School Friday doing the judging for the dances and floats for Spirit Week. What a talented community of youth we have. Pretty amazing.

Council Member Kniss: I have it all on my phone if you want to watch it.

[The Council returned to Agenda Item Number 2]

Oral Communications

Mayor Holman: With that then, we go to Oral Communications. I have but one card under Oral Communications, which is Stephanie Munoz. You'll have three minutes.

Stephanie Munoz: Good evening, Mayor Holman and Council Members. I'd like to report to you on a educational forum that our State Senator had

TRANSCRIPT

recently. It being on a Monday you couldn't very well go. I didn't think I had to go. All I needed to do, I thought, was just call the office and make sure that the question I wanted to ask—it was in one of those question formats where you write little cards—that the question format I was going to ask was one of the questions that was going to come up. The way that they do these, they have cards that you write in these questions. Some of the cards, they have (inaudible). Some of the cards they have to begin with. The whole point is to get the thinking of these important people out, so that the people can understand what's going on. There wasn't anybody in the office who knew anything about what was going to happen. All the knowledgeable people were up at (inaudible) College preparing for it. I went, and I filled out a couple of cards. As it happened, I sat way down in front. I was within stone's throw of the speakers. I filled out a couple of cards and I hung onto them, because I could see the possibility of just simply handing it to the moderator or Senator. Several people came by and said, "We really want those cards. Don't try to give it to him. Just give them to us." What could I say? I gave it to them, and then I anxiously watched. My question would have to do, as you can imagine, about teacher housing and whether the State was going to do anything so that the school boards and the cities would take up that idea. The hour went on. The main speakers, they were Torlakson, the State Education Supervisor, and Anne Campbell of San Mateo County and a man named Gundry from Santa Clara County. They said everything that you could imagine, even phonics. People in the audience wanted to know about one thing and another. Early on, our State Superintendent of Instruction, Mr. Goodwin, said there's also the problem of how we're going to manage without teachers when the teachers don't have any place to live. I thought, "He's asking for my question." I kept watching. Our Senator was just looking carefully through these cards. I could see them. He wasn't ignoring them or just taking the first one that came along. The question never came up. I talked to Mr. Gundry afterwards and I said, "This problem of teachers not having any place to live, what's happening?" He said, "That conversation is going on at higher levels." I mean, I'd be glad to contribute to that conversation; although, it's obvious. That's my thought. Thanks.

Mayor Holman: Thank you very much. Rita Vrhel please.

Rita Vrhel: Good evening. I'm here again to keep the subject of dewatering before the City Council. While I was gone on vacation, one of my friends, Judy Fields, a Palo Alto resident, took 13 of the 15 dewatering sites that were either in progress or certified for 2015. She put together a list of the square footage of the house and then the square footage of the basement.

TRANSCRIPT

They're actually really astounding. 1950 Newell, square footage of the house was 3,508, square footage of the basement was 2,973. This is a huge basement. This is twice the size of my cute little bungalow. 1405 Harker, square footage of the house was 3,460, square footage of the basement was 2,104. 713 South Hampton, square footage of the house was 3,550, square footage of the basement was 2,755. The largest was at 736 Garland which I just believe was torn down and is just getting started. The square footage of the house was 3,691, square footage of the basement was 3,545. At 1210 Newell, the project right across the street from the Main Library, square footage of the house is 3,376, and square footage of the basement is 2,491. Judy did not look up how deep the basements were. If you go to the one on 1210 Newell, you can see that the basement is still being made. They have the wooden structures up, and it certainly looks deeper than 10 feet. I have not checked these, but Judy is very accurate. I do believe that these are probably fairly accurate. Also in the paper this last week was an article on the dying trees in Palo Alto. I can't help but somehow think that the amount of water that is being pumped out for these basements in some way could be contributing to the problem of the dying trees. I suppose that somebody would have to take a map of all the projects, figure out how much exactly water has been pumped out, estimated to be 8-10 million gallons per project, and then pinpoint the dying trees. I certainly think that in times of drought this is not a good practice. Thank you very much.

Mayor Holman: Question for you. Council Member Burt.

Council Member Burt: Can you confirm are those all two-story homes?

Ms. Vrhel: I don't know how tall they are. I know that the basements are this size, and the footprint of the house is that size. I don't know if they're two-story or not.

Council Member Burt: I'm sorry. That figure of the home was the footprint, not the floor area necessarily?

Ms. Vrhel: What she wrote was the square footage of the house.

Council Member Burt: Square footage is normally total floor area ...

Ms. Vrhel: From the ground up.

Council Member Burt: ... not footprint.

Ms. Vrhel: Does that make sense? From the ground up.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Burt: That would be footprint, I think, is maybe what she's meaning, not floor area. Thank you. We'll check on it. Thanks.

Mayor Holman: Also, the public should know that the issue of dewatering is going to Policy and Services Committee on December 8th. Thank you.

Minutes Approval

3. Approval of Action Minutes for the May 18, 2015, May 26, 2015, May 27, 2015, June 1, 2015, and June 8, 2015 Council Meetings.

Mayor Holman: Having finished Oral Communications, we'll now go to Minutes Approval. We have Minutes for May 18, May 26, May 27, June 1 and June 8. Do we have Council Member comments or motion?

Council Member Kniss: I would move approval, and I'd also like to speak to that.

Vice Mayor Schmid: Second.

Mayor Holman: Speak to the Minutes?

Council Member Kniss: Speak to the process.

Mayor Holman: We have a motion by Council Member Kniss to move approval of the Minutes, a second by Vice Mayor Schmid.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Schmid to approve the Minutes for the May 18, 2015, May 26, 2015, May 27, 2015, June 1, 2015, and June 8, 2015.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss, you wanted to speak to your motion.

Council Member Kniss: Let me speak to it after we vote, and I'll just make a comment.

Mayor Holman: All right. We have a motion and a second, no lights by Council Members. Vote on the board please.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss, you wanted to speak to your motion after the vote.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Kniss: I just would once again express my frustration with the lack of information in the Minutes. I presume if we want verbatim, we need to talk to you, Beth, and ask to have verbatim included. Correct?

Beth Minor, City Clerk: That's correct.

Council Member Kniss: I rest my case.

Mayor Holman: Thank you.

Consent Calendar

Mayor Holman: Now, we move to the Consent Calendar. We have Items 4 through 10 on the Consent Calendar. Are there any comments or any motions?

Council Member DuBois: I'd move the Consent Calendar.

Mayor Holman: Council Member DuBois moves approval of the Consent Calendar. Was that Council Member Scharff with a second?

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to approve Agenda Item Numbers 4-10.

4. Resolution 9556 Entitled, "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto to Adopt the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Design Guidelines."
5. Approval of a Two-Year Contract With SZS Consulting Group for the ADA Transition Plan Update With Funding for the First Year Not to Exceed \$164,923 and a Total Contract Amount Not to Exceed \$251,141, Capital Improvement Program Project PF-93009.
6. Resolutions: (1) Resolution 9557 Entitled, "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Formally Adopt the Methodology for Calculating the City's Net Energy Metering (NEM) Cap," and (2) Resolution 9558 Entitled, "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto to Amend Utilities Rule and Regulations 2 and 29; and Delegation of Authority to the City Manager to Update Associated NEM Agreements to Incorporate the NEM Cap Definition, as Needed."
7. Approval of Comments on the Salt Pond Restoration Project Phase 2 Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement.

TRANSCRIPT

8. Ordinance 5356 Entitled, "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Chapters 18.18, Downtown Commercial (CD) District and 18.52, Parking and Loading Requirements, to Eliminate Certain Parking Exemptions within the Downtown Area (FIRST READING: October 5, 2015 PASSED: 9-0)."
9. Interim Ordinance 5357 Entitled, "Interim Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Adding Section 18.85.200 (Annual Office Limit) to Chapter 18.85 Entitled "Interim Zoning Ordinances" Imposing an Office Annual Limit of 50,000 Net New Square Feet in Designated Areas of City (FIRST READING: September 21, 2015 PASSED: 9-0)."
10. Ordinance 5358 Entitled, "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Chapters 18.04, 18.08 and 18.30 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Amend Retail Zoning Regulations for the (CC2) California Avenue District (FIRST READING: September 12, 2015 PASSED: 9-0)."

Mayor Holman: Any comments to make about your motion? Seeing no other lights, vote on the board please. That passes unanimously with all members participating, one of us twice.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

Action Items

- 10a. PUBLIC HEARING: Adoption of an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 18.79 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code Related to Development Project Preliminary Review Procedures. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15305 of the CEQA Guidelines (Continued from August 24, 2015 and October 19, 2015).

Mayor Holman: With that then, we go to our first Action Item which is adoption of an ordinance to amend Chapter 18.79 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code related to development project preliminary review procedures. Does Staff have a presentation?

Molly Stump, City Attorney: We'll do a joint and brief presentation. City Attorney Molly Stump. Good evening, Council Members, Mayor Holman. This item responds to Council's direction to bring back some changes to strengthen the prescreening process. Council first reviewed this item in conjunction with potential reformation of the Planned Community zoning

TRANSCRIPT

ordinance process which the Council has deferred to the Comprehensive Plan Update and asked that this prescreening review come back. There is an ordinance before you on first reading tonight. The primary change in this ordinance is to make prescreening mandatory in four situations where there are significant projects contemplated. Those are Planned Community zones which, of course, are on hold at this time, development agreements, general plan amendments and specific plans, district maps—I'm sorry, there are five—and zoning text amendments. The revised ordinance does retain a voluntary process for any other type of significant project not captured by that list. We can't immediately think of what one might be, but in case there is one, there is a voluntary process that can be used to use a prescreening for that type of project. Assistant Planning Director Jonathan Lait is here before you to answer questions, as am I. We welcome the Council's comments and questions.

Mayor Holman: Council Members, questions? Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: If I understand, there was a change that a voluntary prescreening would come to Council. Is that correct? Why that change?

Ms. Stump: There is an at-places memo, Council Members. As we looked more closely at the language and at Council's recent prescreening experience, there was some older language which we proposed to not include, which allowed the Council to direct the prescreening process through a subordinate body or to do a conjunctive meeting in conjunction with another body. We felt that it was more in line with Council's direction and a more straightforward process to have prescreening conducted by the Council in all cases in the first instance.

Council Member DuBois: How does that impact our agenda? Do we have kind of say over timing, if we get a bunch of requests for prescreenings?

Ms. Stump: The Council always controls its agenda. The City Manager and the City Clerk take the first stab at managing the Council's agenda in making sure there are enough but not too many meaty items for every Council meeting.

Council Member DuBois: There's no clock that we have to hear a prescreening within a certain amount of time?

Ms. Stump: That may depend on the stage that the prescreening comes to you. Certainly before an application is filed, there is not. It there was a

TRANSCRIPT

situation where there was a clock, then we would manage that in conjunction with the Council Member who's sitting in the Mayor's chair. That has not been a problem to date. You can tell from the five listed types that there are not a large number of projects falling into that category, at least in recent years.

Council Member DuBois: It was the optional ones I was concerned about. You're saying the optional ones would come to us as well.

Ms. Stump: The optional ones come to you. Again, there have been a few of those, but just a few in recent months and years.

Council Member DuBois: Thank you.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: Thanks very much to Staff for doing this. I had a question. In a prescreening that comes to the Council, what is the expected sort of range of outcomes from the Council? I assume that one of them is to say, "No, this is too far outside the envelope. It's going to stop here in its current form." What are the other alternatives?

Ms. Stump: This is an interesting question for Jonathan, Hillary and I. We are all here with five or fewer years of experience. I've seen a few of these. These are Study Sessions. They specifically do not allow the Council to take a majority vote or take action on an application. They are to provide an initial sense of the Council. As I've seen them play out, Council Members are able to express views on the project scope, on its purpose, on its mix of uses, on its density, its relation to the surrounding community, other types of significant concerns that may arise for Council Members, such as transportation-related issues. Perhaps some of your colleagues who've had experience on the Council may wish to add their comments as to how they've found that process valuable. In my experience watching a few of them play out, it has been an opportunity for the community to weigh in on a project, express their concerns, Council Members to do the same, and project applicants to explain a project's purpose and also to hear from officials about the sense of the project and to potentially respond then to early input.

Council Member Filseth: Then if the Council does not vote and take a specific action on it, what is normally the next step in the process? The applicant comes back with what? And where does it go?

TRANSCRIPT

Ms. Stump: As I've seen the process work, an application may have been filed or a prescreening could occur, I think more generally has occurred, before an application is filed. An application that can then be filed, which could be an evolution or an iteration of the project that takes into account the feedback that's heard. Then the project goes through the normal process, whatever that is, typically ARB. There may be also a trip to HRB or other bodies. Then back to Council. The ordinance specifically states that the prescreening process shall not be either a denial or an approval of a project. The Council's full discretion is available to you when the project comes back for a vote.

Council Member Filseth: Last question on this topic. Once the project goes past the prescreening into the normal channels, to what extent is there any sort of implicit approval from the Council on this? It sounds like explicitly there's none. Implicitly?

Ms. Stump: As I've seen the process play out, Council has always had additional comments, concerns, requirements when the process has come back through. I think knowledgeable developers in Palo Alto have that expectation.

Council Member Filseth: Thank you.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss.

Council Member Kniss: Simple question. We have heard a couple of times now regarding CEQA which is listed on the front regarding the environmental assessment exempt from CEQA. Do you want to just put it on the record once more?

Ms. Stump: Sure. This ordinance is exempt from CEQA both under Category 5, which there is a member of the public who commented on that, and the general rule exclusion which is what we actually put into the ordinance itself. This is a procedural ordinance. Projects themselves will carry environmental review with them. It might be a quite substantial environmental review, whatever is appropriate for that project. The adoption of this ordinance which takes a voluntary process and makes it mandatory, adds process, does not require any environmental review in and of itself.

Council Member Kniss: I think it's important that we said that out loud. I know it has been a question. Thanks.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff.

Council Member Scharff: Thank you for the revisions. I just wanted to move the Staff recommendation on the ordinance as revised at places.

Council Member Kniss: Second.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to adopt an Ordinance to implement changes to the Development Project Preliminary Review procedures by amending Title 18 (Zoning) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code.

Mayor Holman: Would you care to speak to your motion, Council Member Scharff?

Council Member Scharff: Just briefly. I remember when this came to us in Policy and Services. I'm glad we're doing this. I think it really clarifies the ordinance. I think it's also really important that developers can come before the Council and have a prescreening and get a sense of whether or not their project will in fact have some possibility of moving forward or what the obstacles to it are. I think that's really helpful. I'm glad we're doing this. I think it's good for everyone.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss, speak to your second?

Council Member Kniss: I think I would just underscore what Greg just said. It has great clarity. Clearly, you have gone through this and thought it through. I appreciate the detailed information that it now provides. I think this takes it out of the question category which it had been in before. I'm ready to vote at any point.

Mayor Holman: Vice Mayor Schmid.

Vice Mayor Schmid: I think this is a great idea of giving an opportunity for developers to ask questions early about what issues might be important for them to think through. I have just a question that's been troubling me. In 18.79.10(b), it says this is set up to deal with the issues of Comprehensive Plan consistency, economics, social costs and benefits, fiscal costs and benefits. I keep coming back to cumulative impacts. I know when projects come to us, they're usually bunched in certain areas, the Downtown or Cal. Ave., where each one of them pass the CEQA test. When you look at two or three or four together, they might not. Is that an appropriate subject matter for prescreening?

TRANSCRIPT

Jonathan Lait, Planning and Community Environment Assistant Director: I guess to the extent that the Council was considering a project that qualified under the prescreening and that was an area of concern that you thought needed to be evaluated as the project moved forward, it would be an appropriate comment to articulate that. With any discretionary project, we would evaluate projects to the standards that we have for traffic, growth modeling. That would be the same for the project as it moves through post-preliminary screening. If the question is does there need to be something explicit in the ordinance to have a conversation about that, I would say no, that's covered in the CEQA analysis when the project moves forward.

Ms. Stump: I guess what I would add to that is that, of course, when the City does its CEQA analysis, it needs to take a consistent and evenhanded approach. However, this type of process actually provides a good opportunity for more general comments and feedback and contextual concerns from Council. I think it's worked well in that regard, just giving applicants an opportunity to get a sense of the Council and what the concerns are. Those types of concerns about how a project fits in its environment and its context, I think, have been made effectively in that process and do allow a developer to have an early indication of items where the Council might be focusing in a more specific and concrete way when an application comes back.

Vice Mayor Schmid: Thank you.

Mayor Holman: Council Members, before we go any further, we got a little ahead of your Chair here. We do have one member of the public who wants to speak to this item. We came up with a motion much more quickly. Herb Borock, if you'd come. We have three minutes please.

Public Hearing opened at 7:59 P.M.

Herb Borock: Thank you, Mayor Holman. I oppose this proposal. You have a letter from me at your places. Before getting into that, I'd like to start with the memorandum you have from the City Attorney at places. One issue is to exempt projects that have preliminary review before the Architectural Review Board. The purpose of the ordinance is to focus public and environmental review of development projects on certain issues. However, in recent years, the Attorney's Office has admonished the Architectural Review Board that planning issues are not within their purview, that they're just design issues on development. It's kind of strange, after having given that kind of advice over the years to the Architectural Review Board, that

TRANSCRIPT

when you have an ordinance proposed for you focusing issues on environmental review that somehow projects that go for preliminary review for the ARB should be exempt when preliminary review applications before the ARB can only happen when there's not an actual project application already filed. It's the actual project application that would contain the environmental review. The maker and seconder of the motion made it clear at the beginning that this is for developers, then sort of covering themselves and said it's also good for everybody. Really this is putting in the public view what often happens outside public view, which is developers talking to Council Members about projects outside of the public hearing process that takes place when there is an environmental assessment available for the project which would inform the Council and the public. Also, removing the possibility of a two-step process having your advice from the Planning Commission and others, which are there to give you advice on environmental issues, is a backwards approach. In sense, I guess I can make an analogy with your election of Mayor and Vice Mayor. For a long time, votes would occur for Mayor and Vice Mayor, whether it's one ballot or 46 ballots, and there was very little talk on the Council about why people are voting for anybody. Then there was concern, how can you have nine to nothing votes unless it was decided ahead of time outside of the Council chambers. Now we have these elaborate, I don't know if they're charades, but we have nominations and seconds and speeches and Council Members saying things. Miraculously, the same thing happens then as happens outside when you didn't have those things. I suspect the same thing here. What the developers gain here is that they're pinning you down in public with commitments you made to them or would have made to them if they're having private meetings with you. Thank you.

Public Hearing closed at 8:02 P.M.

Mayor Holman: Thank you. Would City Attorney care to respond to questions or comments?

Ms. Stump: Maybe just to clarify that the ARB reference in the revised ordinance that we brought forward just clarifies that if there is already a prescreening before the ARB, then it would not participate also in the voluntary part of the Council prescreening. The mandatory section is the same.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Wolbach.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Wolbach: I just wanted to say that I think this is important. As we try and make sure that the community and their elected officials are taking a leading role in determining and influencing what the future of our community looks like, I think that is really important especially for these major projects. I can think of some cases in the not so distant past when if we'd had a prescreening, I think, it would have avoided a lot of concern and consternation by the community about projects. We did have ourselves a prescreening not long ago about a development at El Camino and Page Mill Road that, I think, was a very useful meeting. We still get to see what feedback offered by Council Members at that prescreening is taken to heart by the developer. I think it was a good chance for the community and the Council to express some of our concerns and perhaps nudge the developer in a different direction. I'll be supporting the motion.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Burt.

Council Member Burt: I just wanted to go back and make sure I understand the process for this issue of the exception for projects that go before Architectural Review Board preliminary review. Are we saying that ...

Mayor Holman: Council Member Burt, it might be helpful to refer to the section, if you have that.

Council Member Burt: It would be D3 at the at-places memo, page 3. I just wanted to make sure I understand this process correctly. Is it that if they are projects that are already authorized to have an ARB prescreening, they are not eligible for the voluntary one? Can you clarify that?

Mr. Lait: The reference is to the Municipal Code Section 18.76.020. That is a section that deals with architectural review. In the architectural review section, there is a path for an applicant to seek what's called a preliminary review. It's an informal process by which somebody who'd just be going to AR, architectural review, can get some early feedback in a similar concept that might result in some design changes. Community members might have some concerns that they can articulate. Then after that feedback was received, they go through their standard Architectural Review Board process. I think the purpose of this section is to just distinguish that is an existing codified section of the Code that is not implicated by any changes that are taking place here today. If you're concerned about workload, your workload would definitely increase if you wanted to see all the architectural review preliminary reviews, because we do get a fair number of those.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Burt: It would be one thing if we wanted to see all of them, but are we saying that an applicant cannot come before the Council? Say they have a large project, but it would be subject to ARB review. They're concerned about a potentially contentious nature to what they want to do. They want to get a sense of not just whether ARB would support it, but whether at a conceptual level, early in the process, before they spend a lot of money, they want to know a sense of the Council. Would this deny them the opportunity to come to the Council for that prescreening?

Mr. Lait: I would direct you just further up on that page 3 to Section, in the middle of the page there, D1 and 2. "D" says that outside of these mandatory reasons, "D" suggests that any prescreening may be initiated for an application that is a major alteration or expansion of an existing use which implicates major land use or other policy or planning concerns subject to the following requirements, and it sets forth the requirements by which one of those types of projects could go forward.

Council Member Burt: Down on "3," it says "except for."

Mr. Lait: "3" is a—excuse me for interrupting. "3" is just making a distinction that if you're just seeking—we should probably change the terminology to match the Code. The Code here says preliminary review. All we're saying is that if you're trying to apply for a preliminary review under the Architectural Review Board, you don't have to come to the City Council, but you may if you qualify under Subsection D.

Council Member Burt: We're still saying that they may.

Ms. Stump: The language as drafted suggests—I believe what it's intended to capture is that if the application, it does need to be a filed application in order to get to ARB. If it qualifies for preliminary review under ARB, that's where it goes. You don't need to do it that way. You could make several different choices. You could give the applicant an option to decide instead to go to Council or the prior language that was drafted there had the Council deciding whether to hear it itself or to send it to ARB. We in talking through the mechanics of that thought that that posed some challenges and some coordination and confusion. The proposal is to streamline that and to send those to ARB, just the ones that focus on the architectural issues. If you wish to make a different policy choice, you can do that.

Council Member Burt: My question was—I think you just now have answered it. My question is whether the applicant would have the discretion

TRANSCRIPT

to go to Council under this language. I think you said that they would not. Is that correct?

Ms. Stump: That's the way the language is drafted now. Subsection 3 is a limitation on "D," and so it would send those architectural review-eligible projects where an application has been filed and is just AR review to ARB and not to Council. That's correct.

Council Member Burt: I'll just say to my colleagues I'm in my own mind thinking through the pros and cons of this. I want to make sure that we're cognizant that that's what this language would stipulate. If somebody had a big project that they thought was potentially contentious and they don't want to spend a ton of money based on just a nod from the ARB on a prescreening, they instead would like to get a pulse of the Council, we wouldn't allow them to do that in this circumstance, with this language is what I think I just heard.

Male: There's no way they could get both of them, is that what you're saying?

Council Member Burt: That's my understanding. They can't get both. If I didn't understand the City Attorney correctly, then please correct me. What I think I heard was Jonathan describe it differently from the City Attorney. Maybe we need to make sure that the two parties are aligned in their interpretation.

Ms. Stump: If Council wants to clarify what your preferred rule will be, we will go back and have an extensive discussion which is what we do at the Staff level to make sure that the language clearly captures that.

Council Member Burt: What I want to be clear on is what does this language mean as it's proposed in the Staff Report.

Ms. Stump: The ARB section is an exception. Again, the mandatory is the mandatory process. All of those five types of projects come to Council for prescreening, and they're required to do that. On the voluntary process only, it's projects that don't qualify under those five. If they're eligible for ARB prescreening, an application has been filed and its architectural review, it goes there. It does not have the ability to come to Council for a prescreening. If you wish to make a different rule, please let us know that and we'll adjust the language.

Council Member Burt: Thanks.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Holman: I think at a minimum if we have different interpretations by Staff, we need to clarify the language no matter, whatever the Council wants to do. I have a couple of other lights, but I actually have—in addition to Council Member Burt's clarification, I have another one too. That is that I cannot think of a preliminary review that has come to the Council that hasn't been accompanied by a full set of full-blown drawings. I would hardly call that preliminary review. I had this conversation with City Attorney earlier today, and I actually have an amendment to offer to the maker and seconder of the motion. On page 1 of the proposed ordinance under 18.79.010(a), to add some words. Currently it reads "to maximize opportunities for meaningful public discussion of development projects at the earliest feasible time for the guidance of the public, project proponents, and City decision makers." To add the language that "prescreening is intended to focus on project purpose, scope, conceptual design and other similar matters and is not intended to involve review of complete drawings and documentation." I'll go through that again. Again, what happens is when we get a project that is so completely vetted by an applicant, not only has the applicant spent considerable time and expense, but it really hardly presents before the Council a concept or a preliminary review. What we've seen—I'll speak for myself here. What I've seen happen is it seems like from that point on, very little changes about a project unless the Council really dislikes the project. On a preliminary basis, we're really almost giving the indication that the Council supports the project as it was presented. Again, my proposed amendment is at the end of "A" is "preliminary review is intended to focus on project purpose, scope, conceptual design and other similar matters and is not intended to involve review of complete drawings and documentation." I offer that as an amendment to the maker of the motion.

Council Member Scharff: I'm actually inclined to accept that. I just wanted to ask a quick question, if that's all right.

Mayor Holman: Sure, of course.

Council Member Scharff: I actually wanted to ask the Planning Director. I think this also goes back to the Council Member Burt's issue. It struck me that I agree with Mayor Holman in that my understanding of a preliminary review is that you come forward not to look at the drawings itself and not to look at the design features, because that would require all this drawing and all this investment. It would negate the benefits of a preliminary review. That's why you would look at it differently. That's why I wanted to understand how that would work with the ARB. The ARB is separate than

TRANSCRIPT

that then. The ARB is you're looking at the architectural issues and looking at the design elements. We'd have two different things. Was that your understanding of what we're doing here, what Mayor Holman really suggested on a preliminary review? I mean, normally you wouldn't expect us to look at design stuff.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director: Thank you, Council Member Scharff. Hillary Gitelman, the Planning Director. I think Mayor Holman makes a good point about the intent of preliminary review. It would be fine to add it in that intent or purpose section. Alternatively, you could consider adding that in Section 18.79.050 which is actually where the procedures for this preliminary review Study Session are noted. If you really want to tell applicants, "Look, we don't want to see your complete drawings," that might be a stronger place to insert the suggested language, in one of those paragraphs in 050. Going back to the architectural review question. I saw some consultation here between Planning Staff and the City Attorney. I think the section that was referred to is really—we were intending by drafting that paragraph to simply say that these procedures do not apply to that process, which is a separate process established in the Code for preliminary review or prescreening, whatever it's called, of architectural review applications.

Council Member Scharff: Then any project could come to us if the applicant or Council wanted it to and the applicant agreed. Right?

Ms. Gitelman: I think Council Member Burt has pointed out a lack of clarity with regard to that one section that was added or changed at the bottom of page 3. The intention of that Section D, Items 1 and 2, was to say that any project could come to you if it's important enough and, in Number 1, if the City Council and the applicant concurred and, in Number 2, if the applicant requests it. I guess they're both concurrence with the City Council. I don't know if the two of you had some resolution on the ...

Ms. Stump: We did. The Planning Staff recommends, and we can certainly draft it this way, to clarify that the voluntary process is available to projects that also could use the ARB pre-review process. We would adjust the language simply to say that the use of the ARB process doesn't preclude also using this process if the applicant wishes to do so. If Council's comfortable with that, that would be the recommendation we would make. We would make small adjustments to the language to clarify that.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Scharff: On that point, aren't they two separate processes? Like you'd have a prescreening if they wanted to come to Council, and it wouldn't involve the architectural issues. Later, you go to ARB, and that's your prescreening that focuses on the architectural issues that ARB looks at. That's the way I understood it. That's what you're clarifying right?

Ms. Gitelman: That's right. Council Member Scharff, you're leading us in an interesting direction that raises a question about the language that Mayor Holman has suggested. If it's possible that one of the prescreenings that could get to Council was an architectural review application, in that instance you really would want completed drawings. The ARB would have looked at complete drawings, and the Council would want to do so as well. If we add this language, we may need to find a way to carve that out.

Council Member Scharff: Now I'm actually confused.

Ms. Stump: If I could? The Council prescreening process is somewhat broad, it's general. You want to leave yourself discretion to address whatever project-specific issues really are raised. I think that's what the Planning Director is pointing out. In some cases, while you're not doing a detailed architectural review, there may be some overarching design considerations that you'd like to express some thoughts on. You don't want to preclude yourself from doing so.

Council Member Scharff: Where you've left is I was going to ask Mayor Holman if she wanted to move this to 050. Now you're saying that we should have some carve-out language that says "except in the case where Council specifically requests complete drawings."

Ms. Stump: It's always dangerous to draft at a Council meeting, but I think that the language there is general enough to allow that.

Council Member Scharff: I can accept this and you will go back and redraft with the understanding ...

Ms. Stump: Yes. It does not bar or ban architectural drawings. It says what's generally intended.

Mayor Holman: If I can add something here? One is there's a couple of little changes that need to happen to the language here. One is "not intended to involve review of complete drawings and documentation." It seems like to me—I want to leave this actually in 010 because that's where the purpose—that is the purpose section. This is the purpose. It seems to

TRANSCRIPT

me its stronger and more appropriate to keep it here. It seems to me, based on your questions, Council Member Scharff, and Council Member Burt's questions, it seems like we do maybe need to come back with a carve-out for the ARB projects. Some kind of clear language that delineates the chain that those would follow. I don't know how others feel about that. Council Member Scharff, it sounds like you were going to accept my amendment.

Council Member Scharff: Yes, I'm fine with it.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss, are you agreeable?

Council Member Kniss: I am.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, "add to Municipal Code Section 18.79.010 (a), 'that preliminary review is intended to focus on purpose, scope, conceptual design and other similar matters and is not intended to involve review of complete drawings and documentation.'"

Council Member Kniss: I just want to point out on this that I don't think this has happened recently. Can any of you think of a time in the last year that this has happened?

Mayor Holman: Yeah. The Page Mill/El Camino project. Not so long ago Council Member Wolbach referenced it.

Council Member Kniss: I don't remember it coming to us in this particular way. Perhaps you do. I guess some of that then is the semantics of it, the purpose, scope, conceptual design and other simple matters. I'm glad to leave it in, but I think there's going to be a lot of interpretation of this whole ordinance tonight. We've asked so many questions, and we've had some different answers. I'm glad to leave it as is and ask Staff if they will tweak it a bit so that it's clearer to those who read it. I think most of us understand it, but I think it is a different kind of document than what we've operated from before.

Ms. Stump: Happy to do that. Happy to take another look at the language. Again, Council Members, this is not a precise recipe or formula. The process is a general one. It allows an applicant to come before you and get some general feedback. You want to leave some discretion for yourself in the process.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Kniss: Good, thanks.

Mayor Holman: I had one other question. I actually concur with Council Member Kniss' comments. We want to leave ourselves some discretion, but we want to make sure that the process is clear enough that somebody coming forward isn't at the discretion, if you will, of depending on who's sitting in the Attorney's chair or who's sitting in the Planning Director's chair. We want to be clear on what the process is. How we do the review is a whole other thing. I had one other question, though, about 18.79.030 on page 2, Number 5, zoning text amendment. I wanted to be clear. Does that mean a zone change? If that means a zone change, unless of course it's a PC or something of that nature. Let's just say something could be zoned RM-15 and somebody comes along and wants an RM-40 designation. Why are we exempting that?

Mr. Lait: That would actually come under Item 4, the district map amendment. If somebody wanted to go to 15, to 40 or whatever, that would qualify under a district map amendment.

Mayor Holman: Point noted. Thank you very much. The other thing—maybe this is a separate dialog. It's always seemed to me that if someone is going to apply for something that requires a map change or a map amendment, that that ought to be on a higher level even than this. It's like do we want to change this, do we want to consider. I think it would be helpful for an applicant. If we want to consider moving from RM-15 to RM-40, why don't we look at that first instead of in conjunction with a project? It seems like it would be a big waste of time on the part of an applicant if the community has no interest or the Council has no interest in going from RM-15 to RM-40.

Mr. Lait: I agree. I feel like that's what this process is. If somebody does have an interest in changing the zone, they would—they'll spend some time to vet out a concept so that they're not just bringing a blank canvas to the Council, but some kind of schematic of what is being envisioned. If the Council was not interested in making that kind of amendment, I think that's exactly the kind of comment that would be helpful in this process. I think that's what this is about really.

Mayor Holman: I have lights from Council Member DuBois, Burt, Wolbach and Vice Mayor Schmid. Council Member DuBois.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member DuBois: I'll be speedy. Following up on Mayor Holman's question real quick. On that exemption for zoning text, why the exemption for hotels and automobile?

Mr. Lait: We put that in there because there's an existing process in the Code today that seems to, my word, encourage an overlay or at least an application process for automobiles and hotels. There's an existing policy that's been codified. We thought that's different than some anticipated and studied and evaluated in public hearings, so we have that process in place in the Code today. To us, that's distinguished from an example that the Mayor just brought up, where I want to change from RM-15 to RM-30.

Council Member DuBois: I just wanted to say quickly. My interpretation, the bottom of page 3, I think was similar to Council Member Scharff's that if it's an ARB matter under this Code, it'd go to ARB, but that wouldn't preclude them coming to us in a more general manner. I would support clarifying it like that.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Burt, back to you.

Council Member Burt: My concern was along the same lines. I do support the amendment, but it does raise the need for a clarification on the issue that I was raising before. What it seems to me is that if we want to allow the applicant to come before the Council instead of ARB, it should be instead of what they would normally go to the ARB with more detailed drawings, it would be, in the context of this amendment, they would come at a more conceptual stage. Around architectural issues, if that's what they're wanting to have addressed, but they wouldn't be necessarily full detailed architectural drawings. I'm not sure what clarifying language we need to have in regards to what Staff was already going to come back and come up with clarifying language D3. I think we need to be clear. If that's our intent, we want to make that clear.

Council Member Scharff: Council Member Burt, I don't know if you misspoke or if you meant to say it that way. My view of it was you could come to Council, but then you'd still have to go to ARB, that they're actually separate processes. You can't circumvent ARB, for instance, by coming at a conceptual level here, and then not have to deal with all of the architectural issues that we actually as laypeople may not raise.

Council Member Burt: Right. This would be a conceptual, and it would be at their discretion.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Holman: City Attorney.

Ms. Stump: Council Members, nothing about the prescreening process exempts any applicant from going through the mandatory steps in our Code. There's also another voluntary process for ARB pre-review. I think what we would simply say is that use of this process is available and use of this process does not preclude an applicant who wishes to also use the ARB pre-review from doing so subsequent.

Council Member Burt: We have two choices. One that's clear. It's not really a choice. If they elected this process, they would still have to go through the mandatory ARB. Then we have a second question that we should be considering. If they chose this process, would they still have at their discretion to subsequently go through the ARB prescreening. We really haven't talked about that yet.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: Picking up off of what Council Member Burt was just pointing out and this discussion. I certainly think it is important that we don't preclude opportunities for City bodies to review projects as they come forward. I want to make sure we don't preclude opportunities for projects to get an early public hearing and public airing. I want to make sure that we've heard from the City Attorney that City Staff will come back with clarifying language. This is essentially a first reading tonight. If it's not really changing the substance, it's just clarifying the language, it could probably come back on Consent and not add to our agenda. Just some clarifying language around that Item 3 at the bottom of page 3. Correct?

Ms. Stump: That's correct. We would make that small change and also add Mayor Holman's language on second reading, and it would come back on Consent. Council could always pull it off if you were not happy with the language.

Council Member Wolbach: Procedurally, we have clarity about what our next steps are with this ordinance. I appreciate that. I want to make sure that Staff is clear. If we need to make any more amendments to the motion, let us know. If any of my colleagues disagree, as Council Member Burt said, maybe we haven't discussed this enough. Again, my position is we don't want this process, this voluntary process, to preclude either mandatory or still optional review by other City bodies including ARB. As far as Mayor Holman's amendment which was accepted, I guess I'm okay with it. If an

TRANSCRIPT

applicant did already want to spend a lot of money on doing all the detailed plans and thought that that was the best way to make their pitch, I guess this doesn't preclude them from doing that. This is, I think, actually useful the more I think about this. This is useful because it suggests to them maybe don't waste too much time on a project until you've gotten our review, if you're planning on getting our review. I think that's a good addition. Thank you, Mayor Holman, for that.

Mayor Holman: You're welcome. Vice Mayor Schmid.

Vice Mayor Schmid: We're looking at the impact of words. 18.79.10(A) is purpose, defining the purpose. I wondered if it's gotten us too narrow a focus. To focus on purpose, scope, conceptual design rather than the architectural drawings. I know the City Attorney's mentioned several times that these preliminary hearings are a wonderful time to look at the general impact on things. I wonder if it would be helpful to put between "scope" and "conceptual" the term "impacts."

Mayor Holman: If you want the maker of the amendment to comment on that, I wouldn't accept or wouldn't think it would be a good—not my job to accept it. I wouldn't approve that because you're looking at concepts. You don't know about impacts until you actually do the full-blown plans and do the environmental analysis. Then it would certainly not be preliminary. I should ask the maker of the motion. Council Member Scharff?

Council Member Scharff: I defer to our Mayor.

Ms. Stump: Council Members, I would just point out that there is a catch-all there, "and other similar matters," which is intended to allow you some breadth in terms of the questions you wish to ask and the comments you wish to make in this process.

Vice Mayor Schmid: Where is that?

Ms. Stump: After the words "conceptual design," it says "and other similar matters."

Mr. Lait: I'll also add to your point. Item B ..

Council Member Schmid: Yes, I see it in Item B. I want "A" to be consistent with "B." That's why it has been picked out in "A" to say that it's intended to focus. Those are pretty strong words. It would impact how you treat "B." If those words weren't quite so strong in "A," that would be fine.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Holman: Can I suggest that, as I read this—it's why purpose statements are very important. As I read this, "B" is to focus public and environmental review of development projects on the issues of great significance to the community. That says to me—it's like if you're proposing, let's just say, a PC that is three times zoning allowance. I'm just making this up. It's an opportunity for the Council to say, "We have concerns about traffic impacts, parking impacts," that sort of thing. We're not going to analyze them or have the data at this point. That's why I'm concerned about any addition of the word "impacts" in "A." This is, again, conceptual. It's preliminary. Just one—I almost never, ever disagree with City Attorney. However, in the amendment, it says "conceptual designs and other similar matters." Again, we're at the concept stage. We're not looking at impacts other than as are referenced in "B."

Mayor Stump: I was trying to provide a big tent for all views. If you wish to stand outside in the rain, there might be nothing I can do for you.

Mayor Holman: One of us is standing in the rain. Vice Mayor Schmid, are you complete or satisfied?

Vice Mayor Schmid: I'm a little unsatisfied, but if there is no ...

Council Member Scharff: Do you feel like you're in the rain?

Vice Mayor Schmid: ... second to this, I will move on.

AMENDMENT: Vice Mayor Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion, "impacts" after "scope."

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Mayor Holman: I have no other lights by Council Members. It seems as though we should give some form of direction to Staff to come back with—I guess this would be an amendment to give direction to Staff. Council Member Burt, would you care to provide language to Staff as an amendment, since you raised the issue, for—that would be ...

Council Member Burt: I'm just wondering whether we're going to be able to have this come back as a second reading in that way, if it's conceptual.

Ms. Stump: Again, these are voluntary processes. All you're doing—you're not regulating or adding any requirement to anyone. You're adding another voluntary process.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Burt: The amendment would be to direct Staff to return at the second reading with revised language to Section D3 clarifying that applicants will have the option to have a conceptual prescreening before the Council in addition to an architectural prescreening before the ARB.

Ms. Stump: Yes, that's clear. Thank you.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff, are you good with that?

Council Member Scharff: Yes, that's fine. I'm good with that.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss, is that fine with you? Staff is finding that clear?

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, "direct Staff to return at the second reading with revised language to Municipal Code Section 18.79.030 (d)(3), 'that applicants have the option to have a conceptual prescreening in addition to an architectural prescreening.'"

Mayor Holman: Seeing no other lights, what we have before us is a motion to adopt an ordinance to implement changes to the development project preliminary review procedures by amending Title 18, Zoning, of the Palo Alto Municipal Code. Incorporated into the motion is the preliminary review is intended to focus on purpose, scope, conceptual design and other similar matters and is not intended to involve review of complete drawings and documentation. Additionally, to direct Staff to return at the second reading with revised language to Section D3 on page 3 of the ordinance perhaps that applicants have the option to have a conceptual prescreening in addition to an architectural prescreening. With that, vote on the board please. That passes unanimously. Thank you, Council Members.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0

11. Recommendation to Adopt a Healthy Cities, Healthy Communities Resolution to Define and Support the 2015 Council Priority Healthy Cities, Healthy Communities.

Mayor Holman: With that then, we move then to Item Number 11, recommendation to adopt a Healthy Cities, Healthy Communities Resolution to define and support the 2015 Council Priority Healthy Cities, Healthy Communities. We have some Staff here to make presentation and some of

TRANSCRIPT

the public members who are here to comment or support. Rob, will you be kicking it off?

Rob de Geus, Community Services Director: I am.

Mayor Holman: Thank you.

Mr. de Geus: Good evening, Mayor Holman, Council Members. Rob de Geus, Community Services Department. I'm joined here by Lacey Kortsen. She's the Senior Community Services Manager, oversees the Mitchell Park Community Center, our teen programs, is our health guru in our department. She's going to help me with some of the slides here. Staff brings a Resolution to the Council this evening in support of the Council Priority Healthy Cities Healthy Communities. The Resolution is aspirational. It's comprehensive. It encourages healthy, social, cultural and physical environments; environments that promote and support health, well-being, creative expression for ourselves, our families and our communities. The Staff presentation will give a brief background on Healthy Cities Healthy Communities movement, a brief summary of the current practices that already exist in support of this Priority. We'll talk about the gathering and input of a diverse stakeholder community group, and finally we'll go over the Resolution. What is Healthy Cities? It really began in Europe, out of the World Health Organization in 1986. It was based on the concept that the social, economic and physical environment is key to the health of residents. It takes a broad view of health, employs a cross-section of human endeavors to achieve improved health status and community quality of life. The movement has spread to more than 3,000 communities in over 50 countries. The Mayor likes this quote, so we included it here. Healthy Community initiatives are modern illustrations of Alexis de Tocqueville's 1831 observations of what made America unique and prosperous. It's associated life, the way citizens come together to engage in meaningful work for the benefit of the community. Put another way, a healthy community is one in which all systems work well and work together and in which all citizens enjoy a quality of life. Any time we take on a new initiative or the Council has a new Priority that impacts the community at large, we engage the community in a conversation from the beginning. To that end, in the spring we put an invitation out to the community, business leaders, nonprofit partners, School District, residents and asked that they join the City Staff and the Mayor and Council Member Kniss to discuss how we might strengthen the community through this new Council Priority Healthy Cities Healthy Communities. We called the group together, and we met six or seven times since spring. This is a list of organizations and affiliations where we got the most traction in

TRANSCRIPT

terms of people showing up for these Healthy City meetings. It was open to all that were interested. When the Council first selected the Healthy Cities, Healthy Communities Priority at their Retreat, I and I think many others intuitively supported the concept. I thought this is a good thing. As then time passed and we reflected on that Retreat and the Priority, it was clear to me that there wasn't a lot of direction really there. It was a nice idea, but what did it really mean for the community and for the City of Palo Alto? It was helpful to engage citizens and business leaders and residents in what it meant to them. We had some rich conversation over the spring and early summer. What we found, several things. One, this is a very, very broad topic. Arguably, almost anything we do as a City organization can be framed in some way to impact this Priority. The citizens and business leaders that met with us were interested in discussing what Healthy Cities and Healthy Communities meant to them, their organizations. We discussed the relationship between health and happiness, chronic health issues, homelessness, the built environment, the arts, simple acts of kindness and civility and its relationship to a healthy community. I think it's fair to say these early meetings definitely were a storming phase of a group, very interesting conversation, sharing of perspectives and learning from one another. At this point, we could have come back to the Council. In reflection, it probably could have been a good idea to do that at that time but, as we said, we were storming with the community and I wasn't really sure what we would bring back at that time honestly. We felt like we should keep going, keep working, see if we can get some structure and present something to Council that they can respond to and react to. We moved on, and we began to try and define where are we today with respect to Healthy Cities Healthy Communities. I'm going to ask Lacee to talk a little bit about the recreation programs, and then I'll carry on.

Lacee Kortsen, Community Services Manager: We actually have done quite a bit in Palo Alto. You all live here, and so you kind of benefit from all the great things that we have available to our residents. The little pie chart that you see on the right, it's an example of number of programs that we offer in each of those categories every season, so that's four seasons a year. Fitness, aquatics, middle school athletics, sports programs, open space offers a variety a free programs to entice people to take advantage of all the open space. We have a golf course and, of course, our gorgeous parks. All things that encourage a healthy community. In addition, we also have a variety of programs that encourage people to explore the creative expression, another element to health that's very important. We have the performing arts. Children's Theatre kind of takes the cake in that one. I hope you've all been to a production or two from the Children's Theatre. It's

TRANSCRIPT

fantastic. Visual arts. The Palo Alto Art Center kind of owns this space. The Friday Night at the Art Center is one of my favorites. They also have family days, ceramics, exhibitions. Also, we have the Junior Museum and Zoo. In addition to the animal exhibits, they have several educational components to those programs. Very kind of comprehensive look at health that we're offering currently from the City.

Mr. de Geus: Sorry. The built environment is another area, of course, that's tremendously important. We obviously involved the Planning and Community Environment Staff in this. You had a Study Session this evening on bike safety and the Bike and Pedestrian Plan. Making a lot of progress there, bike boulevards and these types of things. Next slide. It was fair to say after we got to this point that the City of Palo Alto actually is very, very fortunate. This is probably not a surprise to the Council. We've invested in health in all sorts of ways over many, many years. I think there's just a lot to be proud of here. Yet, we were still at a point of what do we do with this Priority, Healthy Cities Healthy Communities. We started to take a look at other communities, other cities. What are some best practices that cities have had here? We looked, obviously, at the World Health Organization that had a lot of resources and material. We looked at the Michelle Obama Let's Move campaign, which is another sort of related. There's a number of these. We looked at one called Healthy Eating Active Living which was more local out of the League of California Cities. I found this one pretty interesting. It was a Resolution essentially. By the way, most of these other city efforts seem to form around some type of Resolution that the city council or community would adopt and pass. The League of California had a similar one; it was called Healthy Eating Active Living. It had three pillars around land use, healthy eating and employee wellness. As we discussed this, we this group, this framework looked very promising, but it wasn't fully reflective of what we were hearing from the community. We continued to adapt it. In fact, we met with the folks from League of California Cities. They came and visited with us. They encouraged adaptation and to make it your own as a community. Approximately 180 cities in California have adopted a Resolution related to this, and they're all a little different based on the specific community interests from where they are. As we looked at what we could do here, we kept the three pillars of the environment and access to healthy food and healthy workforce, and we added a fourth section called healthy culture. We think this was more reflective of our community. It was more relevant. It was local. It certainly was also bold and comprehensive as a Resolution. That brings us to the Resolution. The first section is called healthy culture. It addresses elements of health that support social and emotional, mental health. Healthy culture encourages expression of

TRANSCRIPT

creativity, supports an environment of inclusivity and kindness and ultimately creates a connection between health and happiness. I'm not going to read the whole Resolution, but you see in there things like support creativity through visual and performing arts and digital arts; create opportunities for healthy aging and aging in place; seek solutions; promote awareness and compassion for the unhoused, as a couple of examples. Here's some pictures of different things that we do in our community. Again, just reflective of the investment that we already have in health and a healthy culture. Healthy environment is the next section in the Resolution related to planning and prioritizing capital projects that increase opportunities for walking and biking and other forms of physical activity. It very much already exists in the existing Comprehensive Plan. This Resolution affirms that commitment and builds upon it. Some of the items in this section include support and protect and connect us to the natural environment and cultural resources and address walking and biking connectivity between residential neighborhoods and schools and parks and recreational resources, as examples. There's a couple more pictures of the City of Palo Alto and our built environment. Third is healthy food access. This is promoting access to healthy foods. There's a very specific and real correlation between more access to healthy foods to more healthy choices. This part of the Resolution includes seek opportunities for increased access to healthy foods including prioritizing affordable, healthy food retail, include health and well-being, goals and policies related to access to healthy food in the Comprehensive Plan. A couple of pictures of our farmers markets around our community. Finally, healthy workplace is the fourth leg of the Resolution. The FY '16 budget has some funding that the Council already approved to support this initiative. Encourage walking and biking and using the stairs. Support emotional and mental health. Some of the things that our People Strategy and Operations Department—Kathy Shen who's here can talk a little more about it if you have questions—a walking club that's begun on Tuesdays, yoga and mindfulness programs that are starting up here at City Hall. That's one thing that's well on the way. I would add that this Resolution or this section of the Resolution really supports healthy workplace not only for our City organization, but we could also be a role model for other organizations in the City. There's a picture here. A few pictures. I think the one that I'd like to point out is just the bottom one there. The idea that we have employees, employees that take care of themselves, that eat well, that exercise. They're more productive. They're more engaged, have less absenteeism, generally more creative. It's a good business decision, I think, to do that. Almost finished here. Thank you for your patience. As we looked at this pretty comprehensive draft Resolution,

TRANSCRIPT

we also realistically understand that there are limited resources and a lot of competing interests and needs that the City have and the City Staff have. We discussed what we might do in the first year. A few of the items here that you see were selected, about seven of them that we think are very doable and not a great impact to the general fund but can have a real important impact. One of them, the first one I mention here, is the create a welcome packet for new residents that orients families, individuals to health and wellness opportunities in Palo Alto. We're currently updating the Comprehensive Plan, so it's very timely to be thinking about how we can promote health as we update that important plan. Advance Bike and Pedestrian Plan projects; we heard about that earlier this evening. Implement City employee health and wellness initiative. Again, Kathy Shen is here, can speak to that a little bit if you'd like to hear about that. We also discussed as a group the idea of bringing businesses together and sharing best practices for employee wellness programs. We've got some really innovative businesses in this community doing some really interesting work around employee health and wellness, and what can we learn from one another. Partnering. We would like to partner with the Chamber of Commerce to put a form around that. One of the biggest things that we actually were able to do was in partnership with the local Palo Alto Family Y and Lucille Packard Children's Hospital put on a health fair that promotes health and well-being. In fact, we have Jade Chao here for the Board from the Palo Alto Family Y that I invited just to say a couple of words about that health fair. I'm not sure if any of the Council Members were able to attend. Jade.

Jade Chao: Thank you. I'd just like to thank the Council Members and the Mayor for giving me the opportunity to speak on behalf of the 2015 Community Health Fair. As the chair of the planning committee, I want to thank the City, the Stanford Health Care, the adult hospital as well as Lucille Packard Children's Hospital and the YMCA. They were cosponsors of this event. New this year, we engaged our very talented youth, our Gunn and Paly High School students who introduced and moderated the Stanford physician, nursing and nutritionist teams who were speakers at the health fair. I had asked Sandra Su who is a friend of mine and a City resident, but also a pediatric nurse, over the summer if she would train a group of high school students to be moderators. The students were very poised, very deliberate, well prepared and very impressive. They did a great job at the health fair. This was one of the interesting ways we were engaging the youth in this community. Also new this year, we invited the Palo Alto nonprofits. Over 30 nonprofits came and experimented with an open house which was very successful. Over the lunch hours, they were able to stand

TRANSCRIPT

up and speak about the mission of their nonprofits as an opportunity to showcase to the public what services they provided. This was something that probably they would not otherwise have the opportunity to do due to the limited resources. I would now like to read the list of nonprofits who came and were at the nonprofit open house. Abilities United, Adolescent Counseling Service, All Care Plus, Bay Area Cancer Connection, Breathe California, Cardiac Therapy Foundation, CASP Artist Lessa Bouchard, CASP Artist Paloma (inaudible), City Fire, City Open Space, City Police, City Recreation Services, City Water Quality Control Plant, Concerned.com, Deborah's Palm, Healthy Transportation, Junior League, Palo Alto Mid-Peninsula, LGBTQ Youth Space, Mobile Arts Platform, Palo Alto Art Center, Palo Alto Family YMCA, Project Safety Net, Rinconada Masters Program, Stanford Adult Hospital, Stanford Lucille Packard Children's Hospital, Whole Foods, womensv.org, YES for Schools, Youth Community Service and Zero Waste. On a forward-going basis, we would like to see this event be an annual event here in Palo Alto. We have also spoken to our YMCA affiliates in other Bay Area cities that a similar model might be adopted by other cities with two or three major sponsors. The local community hospital is for sure an important sponsor, the YMCA Board or the local nonprofits. Here are the numbers from the health fair. We had 30 nonprofits, six pairs of student moderators, male/female, eight presenters from Stanford Adult Cardiac Therapy Foundation and Stanford Children's Hospitals, 700 participants, maybe 1,000 if the bed bugs didn't also join us at the library that weekend causing the closure of Mitchell Park Library, five planning meetings and one site tour, over 200 hours of volunteer hours by the planning committee and the students. Did I mention the Gunn High School jazz band played for us during lunch? We had a great time at this event, and we thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. De Geus: Thank you, Jade. It really was a terrific event. It's what, I think, will progress this Healthy City Healthy Communities initiative, really through partnership and collaboration because the City organization has only so many resources and Staff and access. Maybe the best thing we can do, I think, is actually bring the community together and see how we might be able to work together to advance this important Priority the Council has selected. That concludes the Staff presentation. Be glad to answer questions. I know, Council Member Scharff, you sent a number of questions forward earlier today. I think some of them may have been answered throughout the presentation, but not all of them. I'm happy to follow up on them as you will.

James Keene, City Manager: Mayor?

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Holman: City Manager.

Mr. Keene: Thank you, Rob and the team. Let me just sort of, from my perspective on this. I think when the Staff began to work on this initiative and invited a cross-section of community members to a meeting and asked the Mayor to help kick that off, I was at that first meeting. It was sort of a diffuse group of people and lots of wide-ranging interests and how to kind of sort of strike a chord for a starting point for a policy directive on Healthy Cities and Healthy Communities. As I was listening to Rob sort of talk about it, just sort of work through this, in actuality we made a lot of progress. I came to the conclusion when I was looking at this that even the Resolution itself has a lot more detail to it in some cases than many of the other comparative Resolutions. In some cases, it could look that we moved beyond sort of value statements to implementation strategies or issues which is why I felt it was really important that we look at referring this to a Committee for more in-depth discussion just because even a lot of the verbs that we actually used have a directive aspect to it, I think, that warrants. I think it was well intentioned to try to be impactful, but I do think that this is probably a challenge, as I re-reread it again here tonight, for the Council to be in a—I mean, there's a lot there, is the issue. I would sort of put a strong footnote on the fact that it goes to committee. I know, Council Member Scharff, some of the questions were there could be fiscal implications to some of these, how does that affect budget or the Finance Committee, and those kinds of things. I think all of those are things that you may want to comment on. I do think we want to acknowledge that we recognize that—I think there was one other one of the items that got into some degree of specificity, but not close to what ours are. The others were a bit more general. With that, I'll turn it back over to the Council.

Mayor Holman: If I could take a moment here. Council Member Kniss, I'll give you the same opportunity. I think one of Council Member Scharff's questions was this didn't follow the normal course. I think, Rob, you've described pretty clearly how and why it didn't follow the normal course of going to Policy and Services first. It's like what would go to Policy and Services. I had some discomfort with that, but at the same time I also felt like the direction that we were following made a lot of sense. It gave something to take to Policy and Services, to provide some kind of direction and some kind of meat to talk about. A couple of other things is that you said early on that this is aspirational. Maybe that ought to be more strongly stated in the Resolution. It's aspirational; this isn't like a dictate that we're going to do everyone of these things. At the same time, many of the things that are in the Resolution, we already do. The other thing that we agreed as

TRANSCRIPT

a group, Council Member Kniss and the stakeholders too, not that the City is going to do all of this. The City is going to set example and partner with members of the community to do some of these things. The City can't do it all. This isn't setting a framework for "the City does a lot, and what else can we do, and how much more can we do, and we're going to do it all." That's just simply not possible. This is, again, setting an example, setting a framework. The other thing is just like our Urban Forest Master Plan, just like our Parks Master Plan, personally I see this as being something that would travel along with the Comprehensive Plan, because there's things in this Resolution that do refer to things that I would think we would want to put in the Comprehensive Plan. Something that, I think, merits stating is while the League of Cities has its own Healthy City—what do you call it? Not Proclamation, but the other one, the Healthy City program. The City of Palo Alto actually—because we're a leader in so many things, they're actually looking to us to lead and thinking that we can actually refine on what they're doing and provide even better example for them. They're looking to us to see how we go here. Council Member Kniss, did you have any comments to make about the process? Then, John Kelley who was on the stakeholder group is here to also speak to us.

Council Member Kniss: Do you want to have John speak first? If not, I'll jump in.

Mayor Holman: Why don't you go ahead, and then we'll go to John.

Council Member Kniss: I think first and foremost we came from a very different operative level. Healthy Cities and Healthy Communities not only exists at the League level, but it exists in many different cities. Some of the Resolutions are here. Beyond that, I felt comfortable with this. We're not setting a precedent. Many other cities have done this; they've done it across the country. One of the things we did throughout this is acknowledge that we are already a pretty healthy and pretty fortunate City. Many cities struggle to have fresh food available, to have a farmers market, to have something like that, that actually allows easy access to food like that. San Jose has worked hard to make that happen, to have those food markets close by. We have easy physical exercise. It's not going to snow here this winter. We hope it'll rain. We don't have snow; we're not running on ice. We have really a very conducive atmosphere. Beyond that, we have a very supportive community, and we have a community that's evolved a lot since the '70s when people thought that runners were rather a peculiar type and why would you do that anyway. Our biking has increased. Any number of things that we looked at indicate that we are a healthy community. I think

TRANSCRIPT

one of the things that came out of this was to acknowledge how much we have going for us right away, and then that we need to move even further with that. As this said, to define and support this Priority that we have. As Karen reminded us at the last meeting, this is a three-year Priority; it is not simply a one-year Priority. This one that will go on and, I think, acknowledges importance eventually also of including it in the Comp Plan. Many cities now have a health component or a healthy city component in their plan which is one that I would really like to see in that as well. Thanks. I think we've had a phenomenal turnout at the meetings, and we've had very healthy food that we've offered at the meetings as well. We've really stayed within the, I think, the assignment that we had given ourselves in January as a Priority for this year.

Mayor Holman: Thank you. John Kelley, thank you very much for coming this evening. As I mentioned, you're one of the stakeholders. Thank you for your participation.

John Kelley: It's been a pleasure. It's been a real honor to participate in the stakeholder group. It sounds like the key issue you're going to decide tonight is whether you're going to adopt the proposed Resolution or refer it to a Committee. I guess I'd like to just speak to that directly. Both Mayor Holman and Council Member Kniss had talked about the interconnection between this proposed Resolution and other policies, plans, initiatives that the City's undertaking. I would urge you to adopt this Resolution tonight. I think it's an excellent Resolution. I think that the work that the Committee did in adding something that really made the form Resolution that was available from the League of Cities more robust, particularly by including the culture section. Just dealing with really basic things, about how we interact with one another on the street, how we interact with one another as individuals, promoting kindness, promoting courtesy. Those are things that are really fundamental Palo Alto values. I'd also like to speak to the question about whether it's even necessary to refer this to a Committee. There were a lot of diverse viewpoints on the stakeholder group. As the City Manager said, the proposed Resolution—I think the words were there's a lot there. I totally agree with that. I think there is a lot there. The reason you should adopt this tonight is to put that before the other groups, agencies, bodies, referring entities such as the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Comprehensive Plan and let them know what this group has been thinking about in terms of health. That will better inform their deliberations. Perhaps the most important thing I can tell you, however, is that this proposed Resolution is unique in my experience in Palo Alto. I don't know how many of us there were on the stakeholder group; there were quite a

TRANSCRIPT

few. As far as I know, we never took a single vote; we reached the decisions by total and complete consensus. I'll just footnote I missed one meeting but, as far as I know, everything was done by consensus. I think that is extraordinary and virtually unheard of. The fact that this proposed Resolution comes back to the Council after you said Healthy Cities Healthy Communities was a Priority for the entire community for this year, that this proposed Resolution was reached essentially with unanimity, as a consensus by this diverse group shows to me that this proposed Resolution reflects not only important but deeply held, common values that reflect what Palo Alto's all about. I would urge you to adopt it tonight. Thank you.

Mayor Holman: Thank you, and thank you for coming, John. There are a couple of other members of the working group here, or stakeholder group here too. Council Member Scharff, you had your light on.

Council Member Scharff: I did. First of all, I'd like to say that I think there's some great work that was done here. There's a lot of stuff in here that's great. I was pleased to hear you, Rob, say that it was aspirational. I actually could support passing this tonight if we made it aspirational. I think things we need to do, for instance, instead of saying "making every effort to," which as a lawyer you'd never write in a contract "making every effort to." You'd never even write "best efforts." The standard is way too high. I would propose that if we added something along—I don't really care what the language is, but something with the idea that it's aspirational. For instance, healthy food (inaudible) and making—healthy food and "striving to" as opposed to "making every effort to." If we said "striving to," then I think we've put it as aspirational. I think what Mr. Kelley said, other Boards and Commissions could look at this and say, "This is sort of one of those things that we looked at doing, that we think is aspirational, that we'd like to move in that direction," as opposed as to being very directive and saying, "We're going to do that, and we're going to spend whatever it takes. We're going to do whatever it takes." That's really what "making every effort" means. Then I think we just need to go through and soften some of this. For instance, I'll just use one example. If we say "set nutrition standards for vending machines located in City-owned or leased locations and for food ...

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff, could I ask like when you're—I think it'll help all of us to track if you would say what section and what number as you make comments.

Council Member Scharff: Sure. The first part when I was talking about in my comments when we talked about—I said "striving to," that's under every

TRANSCRIPT

section where it says Section 3 or Section 4 or Section 1 or Section 2 in the first paragraph. I was just looking at, as an example, it's Section 4, Item Number 4. When you say "set nutritional standards for vending machines located in City-owned or leased locations and for food offered at City events, City-sponsored meetings, served at City facilities and City concessions," the way I would read that is you probably wouldn't be able to serve soda, you might not be able to serve chocolate, you might not be able to serve cookies. I think that's very—what's the word? Directive. I actually printed out for everyone other cities' responses to this. If you look at Mountain View's, for instance, I actually thought Mountain View's was better. I thought it said "make available healthy food service and vending choices." It's less directional. I think we'd all like to have healthy choices, but I don't want to tell people, for instance, you can't have a City function and serve soda. Maybe we'd get there, but that would be a Policy and Services discussion with some input from employees, input from other people. What I'd like to see us do is either refer this to Policy and Services or pass this tonight, but then just soften the language, which isn't that hard. Rather than say, for instance in Item Number 6 under "4," healthy workplace, adopt ethics standards and adopt policies that support diversity. That implies that we don't have those policies. I am assuming we do have those policies. If we think we need to adopt more policies, again I would view that as going to Policy and Services or possibly be within the City Manager's purview where you bring that. I think we should say things like, "support ethics standards" and "support policies that support diversity." I think there's a couple of those things. If we want to refer it to Policy and Services, I think we could do that. I think the negative to doing that is that there are so many items on here frankly, that Policy and Services could spend an entire year going through all of these. I actually think the better practice would be to soften this, make it more aspirational, take out the directive words. Where it says "adopt," put in things like "support." Then I think we could adopt that tonight. They could come back to us on Consent, having rewritten it in a less directional, more aspirational way. Then we wouldn't have to go through the whole Policy and Services. That's what I would personally suggest to my colleagues, that we do that. For instance, I probably wouldn't say "prioritize." That would be in healthy environment, Section 2. Prioritize capital improvement projects that increase opportunities for health and well-being. I personally think we need to prioritize the Public Safety Building. You might be able to argue that that promotes well-being and all that, but then again what doesn't? I think you might want to say "support capital improvement projects that increase opportunities." I just wanted to throw

TRANSCRIPT

that out to everyone. I think those are the two ways we could go on it. I would like to see us make that decision and move forward.

Mr. Keene: Madam Mayor, may I just interject? Thank you, Council Member Scharff. I would just offer that if the desire would be to try to get some Council input tonight, I would think you probably wouldn't be in a position really to act on it as much as let us mine it and quickly take it and just come back and bring it back to you reworked with those changes. We certainly catch the drive already of these comments. It depends upon what the rest of you want to say. If you want to do that rather than referring it to Policy and Services, you don't want to wordsmith this to the detail you do on other motions tonight. You might want to do what Council Member Scharff did, identify some key places and words. When we look at all of those, we'd know how to kind of rework this. We could bring it back very quickly, I mean, within the next—I mean, week after this agenda. I think we could very quickly turn this around for you.

Council Member Scharff: That's what I would support doing. I guess the question is I'd like to make a motion that we do that.

Mayor Holman: Do you want to hear from other colleagues first?

Council Member Scharff: Sure, I don't mind.

Mayor Holman: Let's just do a quick round here, just a couple of minutes apiece, if we could, and see what the thoughts are of other Council Members. If we need to go back more, then we can do that. Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: I don't need to talk much, because I think between Council Member Scharff and the City Manager, they said it sort of pretty much exactly. It sounds right. A lot of good work here. I think what it needs is an edit. Policy and Services is probably the wrong place; Staff is the right place, if that makes sense. Council Member Scharff got sort of all the ones that I had, except the part about mandating grocery stores. I think we want to be careful with that one too.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss, you've already spoken. Did you have something you wanted to throw in here?

Council Member Kniss: I do. Actually I won't vote against the motion. I think there's some real merit if Policy and Services has time this year to actually refer it. Tom and I have had a bit of a side conversation. He said

TRANSCRIPT

he had no idea that we were actually doing this. I'm not sure that the rest of the Council has known how often we've met or how intense the discussions have been. It may be that going to Policy and Services may add some more to this without having to either wordsmith it tonight or comment on it tonight. Again, it depends. It would be nice to get it done by the end of the year. I don't know how Policy and Services looks for their agenda. Let's hear what others have to say. I wouldn't have any hesitancy to refer it.

Mayor Holman: Just an interjection. From what the conversation was this morning at pre-Council, the Policy and Services agendas are quite full. That's just a point of information. It's not to try to influence.

Council Member Kniss: No, but I think that's important. If it's jammed 'til the end of the year, I think it's important that we also pay attention to the workload, because that's one more work for the Staff. If that's the case, then I would support making the comments we're going to make tonight, and then sending it back to Jim and—Council Member Scharff, did you offer to work on this? He's on Finance.

Mayor Holman: Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: Again, thank you for the work and the presentation. I agree with the content and the purposes. There's a ton of good stuff in there. It seems to build on a lot of things we're already doing, which makes a lot of sense. I agree with Council Member Scharff's ideas to soften it legally. I do have concerns around process. Like Council Member Kniss said, I had no idea this was happening. I'd like to have been aware. I don't think it was in any status report or the City Manager's monthly report. Mayor Holman mentioned the Parks Master Plan, but that seemed to be a very different process to me. I just went on the website and searched for meetings for the Healthy City Committee; there's nothing. You search for the Parks Master Plan, you get a ton of hits. I'm concerned about the process. Also, we just got the report. I think Staff's been really good about getting us reports ten days ahead of time. I'd like to see us continue to do that. No criticism of the actual report; I just think if we don't get it in time, we should move it to a different meeting. Again, reading the ordinance itself with the softening, I would support it. I don't think it needs to go to Policy and Services. I also don't think it needs a lot of additional funding. It seems almost like sustainability in that it's built into our budget in a lot of places. We heard about the Bike Plan earlier today. There's a lot of money there that applies to the Healthy Cities. I just want to say I do object to the

TRANSCRIPT

process though, and I'd like it to be more transparent, and it needs to be up on the City website.

Mayor Holman: You did hear my comments earlier. Was this was not on the—I guess, maybe it's more the City Clerk. I thought this was on the Council's calendar. These meetings, I thought, were on the Council's calendar and on the City website, I thought.

Council Member DuBois: I don't think they were, but they certainly weren't on the public events calendar or anything. It's not clear how you picked the members for this Committee.

Mayor Holman: Staff would have to answer that one. Council Member Burt.

Council Member Burt: I do share Council Member DuBois' comments. One, I think that the product appears to be good and constructive and valuable. I also share concerns about the process by which we got here. I'm glad to hear that there was broad consensus within this ad hoc committee. We appear to have had an ad hoc committee of the Council and a community committee that the Council really didn't know diddly about. That's really not how we normally would do things. It doesn't mean that the product was bad as a result of that. It does create questions. Whether we go to Policy and Services or not, I do disagree that we could do this on the fly tonight in some meaningful way. It would somehow take the Policy and Services Committee a year or so to do their normal review of this; I don't think that's the case. We've gone through things in pretty rapid order this year that had a lot of depth to them at Policy and Services. That would be our normal function as a Council, to review this. If it doesn't need a lot of work, it'll go faster at Policy and Services. I'd also like to say that, as I was thinking about this in the context of how does it fit in what we have as our Priorities. When we adopted it as a Council Priority, I struggled with calling it a Priority because it seems like something that will ultimately be one of our core values, which we're going to be taking up under Policy and Services shortly. I ended up coming around to treating it under our definition of a Priority, something that would be an extra-focus over a three-year period, because that's what it would really take to get this kicked off and integrated. Then it becomes a core value once we've lifted it off the ground. I'm fine with treating it that way, but I'm struck that it also has some similarity to, say, sustainability which, I think, will be another one of our core values. Like sustainability, it's essentially something that's essentially an overlay to a lot of things that we do, including our Comprehensive Plan. I think that's also one of the ways in which Policy and Services may give some recommended

TRANSCRIPT

guidance to how this would be then integrated with the Comp Plan discussions. I think it belongs in that vein. Because it's new, we're trying to sort that through. If there are fiscal impacts, then we should flag those. If they're significant, we'd refer them to the Finance Committee. If they don't appear to be significant, kind of standalone or identifiable impacts, then we wouldn't need to. There was a letter at places from Art Liberman that raised an issue. I don't agree with kind of all the implications of what he had to say, but I do think this is a concept that should be integrated with land use and zoning, and how do we help assure that we've done those with an adequate consideration of the health of the community. We're already taking certain measures to address some of his concerns. This is at a conceptual level. As a value that then informs creations of policies. I think it belongs there within our land use and zoning considerations as well. Those are my thoughts. I think, as a result, I would favor that it go to Policy and Services. As I said, I don't see that as a protracted measure. I see it as one discussion item, and then it would come back to the Council in the way that we normally do it. We hear Council input, giving us guidance, and then we flesh it out in a deeper discussion at Policy and Services. It returns to Council reflecting both the guidance and trying to flesh that out.

Mayor Holman: I think City Clerk had looked up something.

Beth Minor, City Clerk: Yeah. We had put several of the meetings on the Council events calendar for the Healthy Cities meetings.

Mayor Holman: Again, we do acknowledge, Staff did too, that this didn't follow the normal course and tried to explain why. I understand Council Members' comments. Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: I'll just essentially second the comments by Council Members DuBois and Burt. Although, I can flip a coin about whether it goes to Policy and Services or just goes back to Staff to come back to Council. I think Council Member Burt has made a good case for going to Policy and Services. On the other hand, the extra Staff time required to send it to Policy and Services, I guess that's probably the strongest case against it. We're talking about a long-range Priority here for the City. I don't see an absolute need for it to get done this calendar year. I understand the desire to do so. I certainly respect all of the work that people have put in. It would be a nice cap on the year's worth of work to have it done before the end of the calendar year. I fully appreciate that. As far as Policy and Services' schedule goes, we do have a lot on our agenda, but I think we could probably squeeze this in sometime in the next few

TRANSCRIPT

months, probably early in the next year if not this year. Like I said, I could flip a coin.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Berman.

Council Member Berman: I agree with a lot of the comments that my colleagues have made. First off, thank you to the community group. I don't know who else here was on that. When I looked down the list of folks and groups and organizations that were represented, it was no surprise to me the high quality of the work. It's not a surprise that there was pretty much unanimous agreement in the direction. It was such a great group. I was surprised to see some of the names on there, because I know they're so involved in so many other initiatives in town. Just another example of our residents stepping up. Because of that, though, it's so substantive and meaty that it's kind of hard for us to digest without any context. It's great that some meetings were on the calendar. Without knowing what the group is, it's hard to figure out what events to go to and what meetings not to go to. I would be okay with—this is an unorthodox process, but I would be okay with passing it tonight similar to what Council Member Scharff said about softening it. Then essentially referring it to Policy and Services after it's passed for implementation. If it is softened, it makes it more vague and makes it more aspirational and leaves a lot of the meat to still be put on the bones of how we'd implement it. That conversation could happen at Policy and Services. I don't know if I'm trying to have my cake and eat it too, but that could be a way to kind of achieve both goals. On the whole, I think it's a great idea. I was happy to support the goal my first year on Council when it didn't succeed. I was happy to support it this year when it did succeed. I think it's great work; it's just that we have to make sure that we do our due diligence also as we go around adopting things.

Mayor Holman: Vice Mayor Schmid.

Vice Mayor Schmid: I want to second the notion that it's a very impressive stakeholder group you put together to help with us. I think what you've come out with is reflective of the wide diversity of perspectives that you got from them. I guess it leads to a fundamental issue of is this aspirational where we're trying to say here's a whole range of things that we want to be involved in and take into account. At the end, do we start setting priorities of these are the two, three, four things that we ought to really put our resources into and either improve or continue to move forward on. I guess that leads me to say maybe it does make sense for the Staff to hear from the Council tonight to do a redraft and come back, and then have the

TRANSCRIPT

Council act on referring it if they feel comfortable with it. Just a couple of points going through. I was very impressed with the health fair reaching out to the community, offering some very valuable information, resources, ideas and getting a nice response from the community. I can see this as an annual event of embedding itself in the community, of my concerns this year are different than they were two or three years ago. In the fair, there's a source of information, of references, of referrals that I can use, I can catch up with. I think the health fair, if I had to set a priority, is certainly one that jumps out. The other base notion that comes across is information. The health fair is one source of information, but I think you talked of other ways, websites and other ways of doing trials with employees, with businesses, but using that as an information base that can be distributed through the community in a variety of formats. I think using information is a good underlying goal to have. I like the comments that were made about design. It could have a big impact as we think through zoning, building, how we think about a healthy community, not just walking and biking, but actually living and gathering places and meeting places. Things like that are a part of the design of our community. One element that seemed to be underemphasized when you think about a healthy city, most people in the community can take care of themselves with good information, but the most vulnerable are with us. Housing, mental health, abuse, issues like that, that it seems as a healthy community that certainly should be one of our priorities whether it be a budget priority or to just make sure on the calendar, in our Comp Plan is a referral to those who are most vulnerable in our community. Look forward to continuing the good work and next year's health fair.

Mayor Holman: Thank you, colleagues, for your comments and to Vice Mayor's last comments. Under healthy culture, Number 5 says improve access—these are striving to. I appreciate Council Member Scharff's comments in that regard. Improve access and awareness to mental health support and education. Number 6 says seek solutions, promote awareness and compassion for the unhoused. One thing that has sort of been alluded to in a number of comments by colleagues this evening is under health environment, Number 7, incorporate people-friendly design into buildings and spaces such as human-scale, tree-shaded pedestrian passageways, gathering places that demonstrate favorable impacts on resident and employee health and quality of life. I think that one is a bold statement. It is something that we strive for in our Comprehensive Plan and in our Zoning Code. I think having the guidance of that one here would be really integral. The Resolution doesn't try to accomplish everything, but it does try to fill some gaps in what we currently do. I think, Council Member Scharff to

TRANSCRIPT

reference you again, by making it aspirational is really important and remember what I mentioned earlier is that the League of Cities is actually looking to Palo Alto to set a new model and an enhanced model in this regard. Council Member Wolbach. Should I give it back to you, Rob? Do you have any other comments having heard Council Member comments?

Mr. de Geus: I just appreciate the comments. Sort of a learning lesson here, I think. Needed to check back in with Council a little earlier along the way. I think that's really good feedback. It's sometimes hard to find the right balance of trying to move things along and do work with the Staff and the community in balance with checking in with Council and Committees. I sometimes always get that exactly right. I've learned a lot from it.

Mr. Keene: I have a comment, Madam Mayor. There were a couple of next steps that were talked about. I think it would be a little bit awkward to actually move it tonight with the idea that it would be then subsequently modified, just because that—I mean, I do think it would be easier if you want to go on that track to just ask us to come back very quickly with an edited version. I think we can get certainly 90 percent of the way there with where the drift is. A lot of it just has to do with the nature of the kind of active verbs that are used in front of these things that just make it subject to what it means. I still think you can keep almost everything that is there and the aspirational piece if you just leave more room for the implementation discussion that would follow. I would just make that suggestion if you want to go down that route rather than referring it to the Committee. I think once you did adopt it even tonight, then going back to change it could be misconstrued by folks and stuff. That's my thinking.

Mayor Holman: Thank you. I have lights by Council Member Wolbach and Council Member Scharff.

Council Member Wolbach: Actually something else stood out to me as I was reviewing this. One thing that was discussed before our Retreat and at our Retreat was the idea of highlighting social services, particularly for four of the most at-risk groups, kind of riffing off of what Vice Mayor Schmid was referring to. The four groups that we identified at that point were the unhoused, seniors, youth and the disabled. There are references to aging in place and education, but the only one of those four groups that is explicitly called out in this right now is the unhoused. At this point, I think I'd like to move actually that we do refer this to Policy and Services. I would like to give it a run-through P&S just to do that touch-up work. I think it shouldn't take a terribly long time to do. Also, I just want to say I wasn't sure if I was

TRANSCRIPT

very clear earlier. Really great work, again. Although a few of us, I think, have expressed concerns about how the process went, I want to make sure that this doesn't come across as an attack or criticism of the Staff. This also has to do with how we're communicating among the Council. We had the idea of essentially setting up an ad hoc committee. It's just an opportunity for us all to learn lessons. At least for myself, I'm not trying to place any blame. I'm just saying where do we learn lessons from this going forward. I'll move that we refer this to P&S.

Council Member Burt: I'll second it.

MOTION: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer the Resolution supporting Healthy Cities and Healthy Communities to the Policy and Services Committee.

Mayor Holman: Do you need to speak any further to your motion?

Council Member Wolbach: I do not.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Burt.

Council Member Burt: I'd just say, one, if we attempted to go through the wordsmithing tonight, we'd spend considerably more time on it. I don't think we would have that sort of agreement yet. We could direct it to Staff to have them do the wordsmithing for us. I think this is actually not just wordsmithing. There are certain policy-related refinements that would come about. That's the normal role that we use Policy and Services for. I think it'll add value and return to us pretty promptly. Those are the primary reasons that I support it. I also think that it will be important for us to give guidance in recommendations to the Council on how this gets integrated, in particular within the Comp Plan discussions. That's something we haven't had a chance to really vet yet. I think that'll be important. It will be a way that this begins to have even deeper, enduring impact on not only community values, but the policies and programs that we have.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff.

Council Member Scharff: I'd like to make a substitute motion that Staff edits this, taking into account Council feedback, making it more aspirational and less directive, and comes back to Council with it, at which point we can make the discussion about whether or not it should go to Policy and Services.

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Schmid: Second.

Mayor Holman: Second by Vice Mayor Schmid.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Schmid to direct Staff to return with a revised Resolution incorporating revisions from Council to soften the language to be more aspirational.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff, do you care to speak to your substitute?

Council Member Scharff: Yes. I mean, I noticed that every week we're sending something to Policy and Services. I think it would be good to come back with this, make it aspirational, look at it. I don't think it would be a lot of work for Staff to do that. I think it's a lot more work to send it to Policy and Services. I think it would be a lot easier to do that. To have Council then look at it, take the broad outlines of it, pass it, and then we can send it to Policy and Services for implementation or for how we integrate this, those kind of things. I think that's a much better approach.

Mayor Holman: Vice Mayor Schmid, speak to your second.

Vice Mayor Schmid: Just to support the comments of the City Manager who said that, one, for Staff efficiency and, two, for ability to come back to the full Council quickly makes sense with this.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss.

Council Member Kniss: I think I played my hand out before. I prefer it going to Policy. I think there's another reason. I'd like some buy-in from those of you who weren't involved in it. I think that would make a difference. Also, it gives the public another chance to come and talk about it. We've kind of shortened up the process tonight. We're not used to shortening our process, believe me. I think overall this is actually a better idea. I know that Marc had suggested we pass it and then send it to Policy. I think that gets muddled. I'd just as soon as this point that we do what we would normally do, send it to Policy and Services, have that group become—you don't know what I said? It's all on record. I think this will make more sense to the public. They'll have a chance to come and talk about it some more. I also think that this is such an important aspect of what we do, this Healthy Cities, this Healthy Communities, that it's really important that we vet it as much as possible. I am supporting the motion.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Holman: Council Member DuBois, are you coming up with some pocket legislation over there?

Council Member DuBois: (inaudible)

Mayor Holman: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: I agree with Council Member Kniss. I think in its current format, we can't pass it tonight. It's too prescriptive in its current format. I think if Policy and Services wants it, then they should get a shot at it. Then the question is should we have the Staff bake it a little bit more before it goes to Policy and Services. That's an interesting question, and I'm still thinking about it.

Mayor Holman: City Manager.

Mr. Keene: I already told Rob if it goes to Policy and Services we're going to still give you a redline version that (inaudible) get 50 percent of the way there.

Mayor Holman: I don't have any other lights, but I have a question. Given that Policy and Services' agendas are full as was discussed this morning—this is maybe a question for City Manager or City Clerk. I'll get right to you, Pat.

Council Member Burt: As Policy and Services Chair (inaudible).

Mayor Holman: My question—you can pile in on this too. I just wanted—I think it would be really great if we could get it to Policy and Services and back to Council to approve before the end of the year. Council Member Burt.

Council Member Burt: As we have discussed our recent agendas, we actually—tomorrow is a light one. We've been willing to have extra meetings if needed. Up until now, they weren't needed. The Committee's been open to that. If that's what would be required to get it back, I think that's a good objective. I think we'd like to see it return to Council this year as well and be willing to do what it takes to do that.

Mayor Holman: My question then—I can't tell you how much I appreciate the motion by Council Member Scharff and Vice Mayor Schmid because I'm so enthused by this. At the same time, as I mentioned earlier, I've been a little uncomfortable, Staff know this, with the process that we for good

TRANSCRIPT

reason chose to pursue to try to get more information to whether it was Policy and Services or the Council to make some decisions. That said, I think Council Member Kniss made some very good points about why this might go to Policy and Services. We certainly don't want to disenfranchise any Council Members or have any Council Members feeling like they weren't engaged and employed in this process. A couple of questions for Staff, I guess, and maybe comments for Policy and Services. Understanding this is aspirational, my concern about it going without more clarity from Council Members is if it's going to be more general and more aspirational, I would hate to see the words like support, promote, prioritize or address just become limp noodles. I have a little concern about that. This is aspirational. It's not like throwing chewing gum on a wall. This has purpose to it, has meat to it. I guess that's my concern. City Manager, did you have a comment?

Mr. Keene: I do actually think that it's easy to strike the right balance in the language. That is separate from whether or not all of the policy framework—if it goes too far or is incomplete, that is a different issue. We can work on the language.

Mayor Holman: I guess my final comment to Policy and Services Committee is while this may seem to be kind of a long Resolution, it is trying to like cover the gaps and fill the gaps where maybe we don't do as good a job as maybe we could. With that, the motion—I'm sorry. The amendment that's on the floor ...

Male: Substitute.

Mayor Holman: The substitute motion as seconded by Council Member Scharff and made by—excuse me—made by Council Member Scharff and seconded by Council Member Schmid is to direct Staff to return with a revised Resolution incorporating revisions from Council to soften the language to be more aspirational. Vote on the board on the substitute please. That fails on a 7-2 vote, Council Members Scharff and Filseth voting yes.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED: 2-7 Filseth, Scharff yes

Mayor Holman: We return now to the original motion which is a motion by Council Member Wolbach, seconded by Council Member Burt, to refer the Resolution supporting Healthy Cities and Healthy Communities to the Policy and Services Committee. That passes unanimously.

TRANSCRIPT

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

Mayor Holman: Based on the comments by Council Member Burt as Chair of Policy and Services and Staff, it sounds like this can return to the Council before the end of the year for adoption. Is that correct, City Manager?

Mr. Keene: Pardon me?

Mayor Holman: Based on the comments by Council Member Burt and Staff, it sounds like this can make it to Policy and Services and back to Council for approval yet this year.

Mr. Keene: All right, we'll do our part on the Staff.

Mayor Holman: Thank you very much. Thank you to the members of the public who came, who were members of the stakeholder group especially. With that, we move to Item Number 12. I should share this. Council Member Wolbach's comment about getting this back before the end of the year was Council Member Wolbach said that's aspirational.

12. Council Direction on Selection of Voting Delegate for the National League of Cities Annual Business Meeting on Saturday, November 7, 2015.

Mayor Holman: Item Number 12, then we move to Council direction on selection of voting delegate for the National League of Cities Annual Business Meeting on Saturday, November 7, 2015.

Council Member Kniss: I would move approving Karen Holman as our Mayor voting Saturday afternoon in Nashville with her two votes.

Council Member Scharff: Second.

Male: Second.

Mayor Holman: Motion by Council Member Kniss, second by Council Member Scharff, I think was first, to designate the Mayor as the voting delegate for the National League of Cities Annual Business Meeting.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to designate Mayor Holman as the Voting Delegate for the National League of Cities (NLC) Annual Business Meeting.

Mayor Holman: Typically we have alternates as well. Council Member.

TRANSCRIPT

Male: (inaudible) Kniss as well.

Council Member DuBois: Second that.

Mayor Holman: Amendment offered to make Council Member Kniss the alternate and ...

Male: (inaudible)

Mayor Holman: Council Member Kniss, do you accept that amendment?

Council Member Kniss: I accept.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff, as seconder of the motion?

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, "and Council Member Kniss as an Alternate Voting Delegate" after "Voting Delegate."

Mayor Holman: I don't see any lights. What we have in front of us is that moved by Kniss and seconded by Council Member Scharff to designate the Mayor and Council Member Kniss as voting—wait a minute—Mayor as voting delegate and Council Member Kniss as alternate voting delegate—if the City Clerk can correct that—for the National League of Cities Annual Business Meeting. Now it's good. Vote on the board please. That passes unanimously.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0

Inter-Governmental Legislative Affairs

None.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Mayor Holman: With that then, do we have any Council Member Comments, Questions, Announcements? Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: I just wanted to say on Make a Difference Day I worked on the duck pond. Some really great kids and some adults. I think the Kiwanis Club has been doing this for ten years or more. A lot of great work. I just want to say to Council Members, if you want to clean up some crap in Palo Alto, the duck pond is a great place to do it.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Holman: I really appreciate Council Member DuBois spending the day out there. I really do appreciate it. It meant a lot to a lot of people. Council Member Kniss.

Council Member Kniss: If no one has noticed, Tom has a big band aid on his thumb because he said he's not used to manual labor. Beyond that though, if anybody knows who won the float contest at Paly, I'd love to know that. We never heard the end of it. The floats were absolutely terrific.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: On Saturday, I attended the No Fly Day event at San Francisco airport, which was a rally by people in the Bay Area around airplane noise, coordinated with similar events at several other cities around the United States. I would estimate there were between 100 and 200 people there from all over the south Bay with elected officials from Portola Valley and, I believe, Santa Cruz.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: I just wanted to say this past weekend in my neighborhood on Saturday there was a boy, I think, probably about six years old or so who was lost and wasn't able to find his way home, couldn't say where he lived. A few neighbors came together, hung out with him, called the Palo Alto Police Department. A couple of officers came out, and shortly thereafter his dad found him. His dad was out on his bike and found him. I just wanted to mention that the way the neighbors, some children and some adults, helped out was great. Also, I wanted to give a shout-out to Officers Marcus Barbour and also Officer Eric Figueroa who both, I think, did a great job responding to what could have been a tough situation. They helped make sure everybody was calm and comfortable. I think they handled the situation very well.

Mayor Holman: Thank you for that. I'm sure City Manager Keene will relay those comments.

Closed Session

Mayor Holman: With that, we have an Item 13 which is conference with City Attorney, anticipated litigation, authority Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2), subject charges for Stanford fire protection services. I need a motion from Council Members to go into Closed Session or not.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Scharff: So moved.

Vice Mayor Schmid: Second.

Council Member Berman: Second.

Mayor Holman: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Schmid, to go into Closed Session.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Schmid to go into Closed Session.

Mayor Holman: I see no lights. Vote on the board please. Council Member Kniss, would you care to vote on that one?

Council Member Kniss: (inaudible)

Mayor Holman: Any moment now, that will pass unanimously. We will be going into Closed Session. Thank you.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

Council went into Closed Session at 9:55 P.M.

Council Member DuBois advised he would not be participating in this Agenda Item due to his wife's employment at Stanford University. He left the meeting at 9:55 P.M.

13. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY- ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Authority - Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2)
Subject - Charges for Stanford Fire Protection Services.

Council returned from Closed Session at 11:37 P.M.

Mayor Holman announced no reportable action.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 P.M.