

Special Meeting  
October 1, 2007

STUDY SESSION .....	3
1. Overview and Update on Request for Proposal for a New Solid Waste and Recycling Collection and Processing Agreement.....	3
ORAL COMMUNICATIONS .....	3
SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY .....	3
2. Proclamation Commending the Service of Avenidas Village .....	3
CONSENT CALENDAR.....	3
3. Approval of an Amended and Restated Stewardship Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and Acterra in the Amount of \$50,000 for Initial Year Services for the Enid W. Pearson Arastradero Preserve.....	4
4. Approval of a Purchase Order with Systems Technology Associates (STA) in the Amount of \$452,110 for Computer Hardware and Related Operating System Software for the SAP Upgrade.....	4
5. Approval of a Wastewater Treatment Enterprise Fund Contract with Pacific Infrastructure Corporation in the Amount of \$377,000 for the Emergency Replacement of Secondary Clarifier No. 2 at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant; and Approval of Ordinance 4969 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending the Budget for the Fiscal Year 2007-08 to Provide an Additional Appropriation of \$414,700 to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) WQ-80021, Plant Equipment Replacement, for the Regional Water Quality Control Plant".	4
6. Resolution 8757 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Section 1901 of the Merit System Rules and Regulations Regarding a Memorandum of Agreement for Represented Hourly Employees (SEIU Hourly Unit)" and Resolution 8758 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Adopting a	

Compensation Plan for Represented Hourly Employees (SEIU Hourly Unit) and Rescinding Resolution 8576" .....	4
7. Resolution 8759 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Adopting a Compensation Plan for Limited Hourly Employees and Rescinding Resolution No. 8577" .....	4
7A. Approval of Appointment of Assistant City Clerk .....	4
REPORTS OF OFFICIALS.....	5
8. Approval of a Budget Amendment Ordinance for \$275,000 to Increase Mitchell Park Library and Community Center, Capital Improvement Program Project PE-04012; Approval of Amendment One to Contract C07122215 with Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc. in an Additional Amount of \$275,000 and Total Amount Not to Exceed \$1,555,400 for Both Design Options of the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center, Capital Improvement Program PE004012; Update on Focus Groups and Project Outreach Efforts (Library, Community Center, and Public Safety Building); and Referral to Policy & Services Committee for Consideration of Changes to the City's Facility Naming Policy for Major Capital Campaigns/Contributions .....	5
COUNCIL COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES .....	18
CLOSED SESSION .....	18
9 .....	18
10. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR.....	18
11. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR.....	19
12. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY-POTENTIAL/ANTICIPATED LITIGATION ..	19
ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 11:25 p.m. ....	19

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:04 p.m.

Present: Barton, Cordell, Drekmeier (arrived 6:05 p.m.), Klein, Kleinberg, Mossar, Morton

Absent: Beecham, Kishimoto

### STUDY SESSION

1. Overview and Update on Request for Proposal for a New Solid Waste and Recycling Collection and Processing Agreement

Public Works staff provided an overview of the upcoming procurement process for the new solid waste and recycling contract; highlighted key policy issues relating to the new contract, and presented the challenges, options and preliminary approach to the key RFP components related to services, facilities and the agreement.

### **No action required.**

Emily Renzel, 1056 Forest Avenue, spoke regarding the Geng Road site and stated a portion of it was on parkland.

### ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Jeff Traum, 1040 Ramona Street, spoke regarding the opening of the Heritage Park Play Area on Sunday, September 23, 2007 and he thanked everyone involved.

Mark Petersen-Perez spoke regarding police policies and procedures.

### SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

2. Proclamation Commending the Service of Avenidas Village

### CONSENT CALENDAR

Council Member Drekmeier stated he would not participate in Item No. 3 due to a conflict of interest because he is a Board Member of Acterra.

**MOTION:** Council Member Morton moved, seconded by Barton, to approve Consent Calendar Items 3 through 7A.

3. Approval of an Amended and Restated Stewardship Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and Acterra in the Amount of \$50,000 for Initial Year Services for the Enid W. Pearson Arastradero Preserve
4. Approval of a Purchase Order with Systems Technology Associates (STA) in the Amount of \$452,110 for Computer Hardware and Related Operating System Software for the SAP Upgrade
5. Approval of a Wastewater Treatment Enterprise Fund Contract with Pacific Infrastructure Corporation in the Amount of \$377,000 for the Emergency Replacement of Secondary Clarifier No. 2 at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant; and Approval of Ordinance 4969 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending the Budget for the Fiscal Year 2007-08 to Provide an Additional Appropriation of \$414,700 to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) WQ-80021, Plant Equipment Replacement, for the Regional Water Quality Control Plant"
6. Resolution 8757 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Section 1901 of the Merit System Rules and Regulations Regarding a Memorandum of Agreement for Represented Hourly Employees (SEIU Hourly Unit)" and Resolution 8758 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Adopting a Compensation Plan for Represented Hourly Employees (SEIU Hourly Unit) and Rescinding Resolution 8576"
7. Resolution 8759 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Adopting a Compensation Plan for Limited Hourly Employees and Rescinding Resolution No. 8577"
- 7A. Approval of Appointment of Assistant City Clerk

**MOTION PASSED** for Item 3, 6-0 Drekmeier not participating, Beecham, Kishimoto absent.

**MOTION PASSED** for Items 4 – 7A, 7-0 Beecham, Kishimoto absent.

City Clerk Donna Rogers introduced the new Assistant City Clerk, Beth Minor, who was approved at tonight's meeting to begin work on October 15, 2007.

Beth Minor thanked Ms. Rogers for the opportunity and said she looked forward to a long career with the City of Palo Alto.

Adolfo Riedl, SEIU, 891 Marshall Street, Redwood City, spoke regarding agenda Item No. 6. There were approximately 70 hourly employees and approximately 235 employees who were not protected under the contract.

There should be parity because services to the City would be affected. He urged the Council to consider extending modest benefits to all temporary employees in the City.

#### REPORTS OF OFFICIALS

8. Approval of a Budget Amendment Ordinance for \$275,000 to Increase Mitchell Park Library and Community Center, Capital Improvement Program Project PE-04012; Approval of Amendment One to Contract C07122215 with Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc. in an Additional Amount of \$275,000 and Total Amount Not to Exceed \$1,555,400 for Both Design Options of the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center, Capital Improvement Program PE004012; Update on Focus Groups and Project Outreach Efforts (Library, Community Center, and Public Safety Building); and Referral to Policy & Services Committee for Consideration of Changes to the City's Facility Naming Policy for Major Capital Campaigns/Contributions

Vice Mayor Klein stated the item had three parts: 1) hearing from the City's architects and planners with respect to the design of the projects; 2) hearing from the focus group and project outreach efforts; and 3) a potential referral to the Policy and Services Committee (P&S) for consideration of changes to the City's facility naming policy for major capital campaigns.

Assistant City Manager Emily Harrison said there would be a lengthy discussion on the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center, and the Main and Downtown Libraries. The focus groups and the second half of the presentation would be looking at the facility needs from a broad perspective.

Dawn Merkes, Group 4 Architects, gave an update on the project schedule and an overview on the Mitchell Park Library, the Main Library and the Downtown Library. Follow-up meetings were scheduled in October and in January with the Boards and Commissions.

Council Member Morton said he had concerns about a phased option and asked whether Ms. Merkes had a bias from an architect's point of view.

Ms. Merkes said the Community Center suited the courtyard scheme in terms of circulation, expansion of program space, and indoor/outdoor use. It was much more straightforward with a single entry into the facility.

Council Member Morton asked how the Downtown Library would be extended.

Ms. Merkes said the Downtown Library's Technical Service's wall would be moved.

Council Member Morton asked whether the external space remained the same.

Ms. Merkes said there was no addition, but Technical Services would have a small expansion in order to accommodate the expanded Mitchell Park.

Council Member Morton said there was concern about the Main Library's historical standing. He asked whether the group rooms were add-ons.

Ms. Merkes said transparent boxes under the existing eaves were being considered. The group study rooms would be enclosed glass boxes to maintain the transparency and connection to the exterior, with very little impact on the historic building.

Council Member Drekmeier said he liked the rooftop garden and the solar roof and wondered if there was a reason why more of the roof space could not be utilized for green projects.

Ms. Merkes said there was an opportunity to use photovoltaics.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether the rooftop usable garden space could be used in conjunction with the café.

Ms. Merkes said community gardens were valued in Palo Alto and it was an opportunity to incorporate them in recreation programming as well as training for gardening classes.

Council Member Mossar expressed concern that once Technical Services was moved to the Downtown Library, it was part of a plan to close the Downtown Library.

Library Director Diane Jennings said that was a concern among community members but the Technical Services at Downtown Library was designed so that it could easily be converted back to public space if the decision was to move it to Mitchell Park Library.

City Manager Frank Benest asked if there was a policy commitment by the Council to remove Technical Services at some point from the Downtown Library or was it designed so it could be done as an option in the future.

Ms. Jennings said she believed it was the latter.

Council Member Mossar said she understood the intention of the Council was to restore the public space at the Downtown Library. She questioned in order to minimize the amount of administrative space at the Downtown Library, which Option should occur at Mitchell Park.

Ms. Merkes said it can be either Option A or Option B with the program expanded to include Technical Services.

Vice Mayor Klein said the building would be built to LEED silver standard but he questioned the cost increase if it were built to the LEED gold standard.

Ms. Merkes said she would return with that information but estimated it would be an additional 3 to 4 percent. The schematic design would be prepared in January or February and the costs would be determined at that time.

Vice Mayor Klein said if the single Option B was selected how long would Mitchell Park Library be closed.

Ms. Merkes advised the single phase Option B would be located in the parking lot and, therefore, the existing libraries may be able to stay operational with limited parking.

Council Member Morton questioned the difference regarding what would be left of Technical Services at the Downtown Library and what would be installed at Mitchell Park Library.

Ms. Merkes advised approximately one third of the Downtown Library building would be left for public use.

Kathy Page, Library Consultant, said functionally there would not be that much difference between where it would be in the Downtown Library and where it would be in the new Mitchell Park Library. There would be an impact on the direct public services part of the Downtown branch.

Council Member Morton stated he believes Technical Services should be an integral part of Mitchell Park Library since that is the site with the most demand.

Council Member Kleinberg stated Technical Services does not need to be accessible to the public and could be below ground with skylights.

Ms. Merkes advised all of the options show Technical Services at Mitchell Park, which is a 51,000 square foot program. If Technical Services was removed from Mitchell Park, it would be approximately a 47,000 square foot program. If Technical Services remains at the Downtown Library, it removes the opportunity for public space.

Council Member Mossar stated the agenda item for this meeting did not include the Downtown and Main libraries and, therefore, Council should not discuss anything other than the Mitchell Park Library.

City Attorney Gary Baum said he was not familiar with this matter and that the only way there could be a more extensive discussion of Downtown or Main libraries would be if they were included in the noticed Capital Project.

Ms. Merkes advised that both options for the Downtown Library were included through the schematic design stage.

Council Member Mossar noted for years there have been many people with serious concerns about the Downtown Library and, therefore, she wanted to make sure this discussion was noticed.

Assistant City Manager Harrison agreed with Council Member Mossar.

Council Member Mossar stated Council is being asked to approve a Budget Amendment Ordinance (BAO) to continue design, which means that continuing design on Downtown Library Option 2 is a very significant policy change.

Vice Mayor Klein said the agenda item was to include a BAO that only affects the design work for the proposed Mitchell Park Library and Community Center and it would not include anything with respect to the other libraries. Inevitably, one would impact the other.

Ms. Harrison agreed and said the budget already accommodated what is being done in terms of design for the other two facilities. The BAO relates only to Mitchell Park and being able to keep two design options progressing.

Vice Mayor Klein said there would probably be 15 or 20 hours of discussion at the City Council level before something goes on the ballot if that is what is decided.

Council Member Morton questioned if there would there be significant savings if the project is not phased.



Ms. Harrison stated a number of efforts were going on in parallel to prepare all of these facilities measures. In addition to the design work being done with library facilities, there is the comment phase for the public safety building EIR. Financing for these projects must be determined. The community focus groups outcome was fairly consistent with the outcomes from the initial polling.

Richard Bernard, Fairbanks, Maslen, Mullen and Associates, reported the focus groups were held on August 30. One group consisted of 11 women and another group consisted of 10 men. The groups included a mix of voters of various ages, educational levels, and political parties. The earlier survey of 600 random voters had a margin of error plus or minus 4 percent. Key findings were as follows: a) the public wants detailed information about each potential bond measure and had concerns about whether the bond funds would be used efficiently; b) an educational campaign is necessary to inform people; c) an emergency communication center was seen as the most important use of public safety bond dollars; d) additional space for collections and youth services were participants' highest priorities for a library bond; and e) participants were anxious about changes to the community in Palo Alto but saw few pressing problems. The February survey noted that 93 percent of the electorate said they rate the quality of life in the City as excellent or good. Participants had heard almost nothing about the Blue Ribbon Task Force or the Library Advisory Commission. Participants had a level of concern about what they perceived as inefficiency, divisiveness and a lack of responsiveness in City government. A majority of participants supported a \$50 million bond for a new Mitchell Park Library, Community Center and improvements to the other libraries. A majority would not be sufficient, as a two thirds majority would be required. The highest ranked issues were completing a series of improvements to all Palo Alto branch libraries, providing a safe place for children and youth to go after school, and providing after-school programs such as homework tutoring. The cost factor is clearly a sensitive one. However, in the surveys we found higher support around the \$45-50 million range than the lower figures, suggesting that with greater education there could be the appropriate support for some of these programs. Most participants supported a \$50 million bond for a new public safety building and emergency operation center (EOC). Again, it didn't reach the two thirds plus level of support needed. Those who had read something about public safety facilities generally saw the potential bond as necessary. Some of the elements with the highest support of the 13 elements tested in the focus groups: a) to ensure rapid response in an emergency; b) upgrade the communications center 9-1-1 dispatchers to improve emergency response for police, fire and paramedics; c) provide safety and privacy for crime victims and witnesses; d) build separate interview rooms for victims and suspects and create separate space

to hold adult and juvenile suspects. Some people thought that City government had adequate resources and should simply reallocate existing dollars. Some also questioned the total amount of each bond indicating the \$50 million seemed like an exorbitant amount to pay to construct a building. Participants said that placing the library and the public safety measure on the same ballot might make them less likely to support each measure. The presence of the school finance measure on the same ballot might also reduce support. A number of voters said the schools should have higher funding priorities.

Jessica Reynolds of the Lew Edwards Group works in tandem with the Fairbanks firm to help cities think about, and move forward, with very important decisions. The community perspectives revealed the feasibility for either a general obligation bond for public safety facility or a library/community center in 2008 may be viable. There may be more potential growth and support for a public safety facility if there is more education. People who visited the current public safety facility were able to talk about that experience and see the need. There definitely was issues heard with all of the libraries and there was an interest in improvements to all the branch libraries in the system. The greatest potential for success would be to implement a sequenced election approach. Significant education and awareness and community engagement must be built over the next several months. A potential finance measure could be evaluated at the end of that process. There was a significant level of distrust and cynicism about City government, which was higher than other communities surveyed. Residents want to hear personal, individual stories and see photos that highlight and exemplify the need and they need detailed information of the expenditure plans including side-by-side cost comparisons. There was concern about how much the library would cost versus how much a public safety building would cost. Based on review of the initial research, the strategic recommendations are to launch a proactive citizen-engaged public education program to talk about the needs, show the schematics, discuss what that means for all the different projects, engage the community in a real dialogue with participation, and build awareness of the needs and define what is at stake.

Council Member Cordell asked how the people were selected for the focus groups.

Mr. Bernard said a focus group facility was used, which has a list of voters. In this case, the groups were separated into men and women so that there was a sense of being comfortable in being free to talk.

Council Member Cordell asked if the responses from the people supported the results of the earlier survey and if there were glaring differences between the two surveys.

Ms. Reynolds said there were not glaring differences. However, in the focus groups there were more in depth discussions regarding the public safety building.

Council Member Cordell questioned the distrust and cynicism of government in Palo Alto.

Ms. Reynolds said a couple of participants in the focus group mentioned they received the impression when they viewed Council meetings that the decision was already made. A majority of the folks in the room expressed agreement with that comment. She said she felt there was a lack of awareness based on the lack of understanding of need to some extent. She is aware that Palo Alto has produced voluminous materials on the need for these projects.

Mr. Bernard said this is not necessarily unique to the Palo Alto community. The public have very busy lives, which suggests the need for a lengthy or prolonged educational campaign. The voter pool is extremely educated and focused on a lot of things.

Ms. Reynolds stated in communities like Palo Alto 12-18 months of community education and involvement is recommended.

Mr. Bernard said the focus groups indicated the more information they receive the more it would strengthen support for the measure.

Ms. Reynolds suggested a speaker's bureau, community meetings, house coffees, various mailings to the population at large and other opinion leaders, to educate and inform the public. These communications are interactive, which would provide an opportunity for not only giving the information but responding to questions.

Council Member Cordell questioned which measure should go first given the responses from the earlier survey and focus groups.

Ms. Reynolds noted before that decision could be made there must be communication with the community about the basic needs level. Both projects have pluses and minuses. There is more awareness and support existing for the library. At this point, it would be ill advised to make that

determination until the residents of Palo Alto are more educated about priorities and needs.

Mr. Bernard said there are several new issues that need to be examined since the February survey such as the Childrens' Library improvements.

Vice Mayor Klein said it is likely the School District would put a bond issue on the June 2008 ballot. He understood from the staff recommendation that the City could put a bond issue on the November 2008 ballot for one of the two issues being studied. The second measure would most likely not occur until November 2009.

Mr. Bernard noted that it is impossible to know the effect of the bond measures.

Vice Mayor Klein stated if one or both of the private campaigns for the public safety building and libraries raise a significant amount of money, what would that do to the chances of either or both of them being approved.

Ms. Reynolds advised although it has not been tested specifically, other communities have found that it can be a positive message.

Mr. Bernard reminded the Council there were only 21 people in the focus groups but there was clearly a focus on why \$50 million was needed.

Vice Mayor Klein requested the demographic data of the focus groups.

Mr. Bernard said it would be provided.

Council Member Kleinberg asked whether the focus groups were made up of public who have voted in the last three elections.

Mr. Bernard advised the history for the last eight elections is generally reviewed and at least three of the last four general or primary elections.

Council Member Kleinberg stated she is confused because there are many inconsistencies. In the considerations for the public safety bond it stated there was a general lack of urgency but they also said an improved EOC was needed. One of the last things heard was that if there were a choice between the libraries that could improve spaces for children and a public safety facility, the leaning was toward the library and spaces for children. But in the list of the things most important to residents, three out of the five bullet points were about the public safety and the last two were about the library.

Ms. Reynolds said the educational and programming space for children was a priority among the things for the libraries.

Council Member Kleinberg noted regarding the important elements of the library bond the lowest score was for homework and study areas for students.

Ms. Reynolds noted it is not that providing homework and study areas are not important, but providing a safe place for children to go to after school is more appealing. It is not about the space. It is about providing the service.

Mr. Bernard said if you plan to put it on a ballot, it would be necessary to test out the way every one of those 75 words resonates with the voters in the ballot title and summary. Sometimes, the slight change of one word means a difference in support of 10 percent.

Ms. Reynolds said providing more after-school programs is a service versus providing the space for the service, which is where the difference lies.

Mr. Bernard advised the same thing was done in both groups where we started with one measure. We worked through the individual items and then went to the second measure and went through the individual items.

Council Member Kleinberg asked about the potential for bias in the group depending on which measure was discussed first.

Mr. Bernard said in the February survey, the library measure did a little bit better than the public safety measure.

Council Member Kleinberg questioned the format of the focus groups.

Mr. Bernard said the moderator structured the meeting but also allowed considerable room for people to offer opinions. The moderator would never allow an incorrect fact without correcting it.

Council Member Drekmeier suggested a poll to ask just the people who said no if they would support the measure if 25 percent of the funding was coming from private sources. If they said no again, then ask what if 50 percent was coming from private sources.

Mr. Bernard agreed that would not be problematic.

Council Member Drekmeier said that would be helpful for the people who are trying to raise the private money to state the polling indicates if a certain amount can be raised the bond measure would pass.

Mr. Bernard advised another vote is taken at the beginning and end of the focus group meeting to determine if the information and discussion swayed their votes. The more education they had and the more messages they heard, the stronger the support was.

Council Member Drekmeier asked if support dropped for the public safety facility when they heard the price tag.

Mr. Bernard said in both cases the support dropped when the group heard the cost estimates. It picked up again after they heard some of the reasons. Initial support for the library improvements was 64 percent. After cost information, it dropped to 51 percent but then moved up again to 65 after more information was received. After oppositional arguments, it went to 62 percent. In the case of the public safety building, it started at 57 percent and dropped to 48 percent; a drop of 9 percent versus a drop of 13 percent. Statistically it is about the same drop. After positive arguments, it went up to 55 percent. Even then, 55 percent would not be two thirds majority.

Council Member Barton commented we are in situation in which we want things and we do not necessarily want to pay for them. This is the culture in which we live. Is it better to go out to the public and say, the public elected us to make decisions, this is the decision we think is the best and here is why.

Mr. Bernard said research suggests this should be framed in a package.

Ms. Reynolds said one of the things to consider in making the decision to move forward on one option versus another would be to engage the public in that decision. From a political standpoint, the research and the focus groups show that to over-communicate information and give choices is not wrong.

Council Member Barton said when you speak of this being a package, it has always made sense to go to voters with a package of bond measures at the same time and state this is what the community needs even, potentially, the school bond at the same time with some kind of a joint effort. The community must understand the global issue. Yet, the advice is to spread these out.

Mr. Bernard said different constituencies in the City have different interests and priorities. That was seen with the focus groups and tested in the

survey. It was found there was not support for a \$95 million bond. If you are struggling with the \$50 million per project, plus the \$95 million, plus the school bond that might be astronomical. Current evidence suggests you would be open to failure.

Council Member Mossar said that answer sounds like saying whoever gets to the ballot first gets it and everybody else is in jeopardy.

Ms. Reynolds said when a project is sequenced it allows the City to build a track record with residents to raise comfort level for a second project. It has not been our experience that means the second one is doomed.

Mr. Bernard stated he liked the idea of sequencing. Over time, the cost increases, energy prices are drastically increasing. He noted he would be very cautious to promise a certain bond amount at this point.

Council Member Mossar asked when the 12-month minimum period would begin to educate the public.

Mr. Bernard said the City had sufficient information and educating the public could begin at this meeting with either project.

Council Member Mossar asked Ms. Reynolds if she was aware of arguments regarding options taking place right up to voting on the last Library Bond measure.

Ms. Reynolds said she was aware and engaging with the public now could eliminate last minute negative discussions.

Council Member Morton stated there were two competing documents. One of the schedules showed if both were together there would be a little push from the public-safety building and a lot from the library. Initially, the consensus was that there was not much competition between the two projects. It appears the School District is not asking for additional funding but to replace the tax already in effect. Therefore, property tax would not increase, it just would not decrease. If Palo Alto puts a library and/or a library and public-safety building measure on the ballot at the same time, could that be seen as a family and kids enrichment bond and is it doable.

Mr. Bernard said it could go either way. When ballot measures are tested it appears that renewals do better. The alternative would be to package the School bond and the City bond together as enrichment for children in general.

Council Member Morton said that could be done with the library, but it would be a little more difficult for the public safety building. What could be taken from tonight in order to move forward. He questioned the gender separation in the focus groups and asked if there was a difference in conclusion in the gender groups.

Ms. Reynolds responded the women were more in favor of the public-safety building and men were more for libraries.

Vice Mayor Klein reminded the Council of the two items before them tonight: 1) approval of a budget amendment ordinance for \$275,000 to proceed with both options at Mitchell Park; and 2) potential referral to Policy and Services for consideration of changes to our facility naming policy to aid in the fund raising program.

Council Member Cordell requested that comments from the public be taken on what needs to be voted on tonight.

Jim Schmidt, 244 Forest Avenue, spoke on behalf of the Friends of the Library, regarding the Mitchell Park plan by recommending a new face on Middlefield Road. The number of parking spaces be closely studied as the number currently indicated seems to be inadequate. They supported the space for technical services since it is one of the biggest and busiest libraries in the City. The Friends' Group strongly urges two propositions on the ballot.

Judith Wasserman, 751 Southamptton, recommended the unphased version because it is a much better product, it will cost a lot more if only from the double start up not to mention the increase in costs, and the chances it may never happen in Phase 2 are high.

Alison Cormack, 3487 Ross Road, said the outreach portion was important the key to reducing expenses for the individual voter is for private financial donations. She urged Council to vote for Option B for Mitchell Park.

Pat Markevitch, 231 Emerson, spoke on behalf of the Parks & Recreation Commission, which is 100 percent in support of Option B, the combined one phase building.

Susie Thom, LAC Member, 753 Maplewood Place, Member of Library Advisory Commission, said she supports Option B because of a better design and it provides better efficiency of space for the Library and Community Center. The site plan for Option B puts the two-story Library on the street scape leaving the one-story Community Center overlooking Mitchell Park.



The economy of cost in both designing and building the facilities at the same time would result since the longer building of the Center is postponed, the higher the cost.

Robert Moss, 4010 Orme Street, said he urged Council to recommit that the purpose is not just to improve Mitchell Park Library but to make it possible to expand the use of the Downtown Library.

Herb Borock, P.O. Box 632, stated technical services needs to be moved to Mitchell Park. He recommended that both measures should be placed on the ballot at the same time.

Elaine Meyer, 609 Kingsley Avenue, urged Council to not reduce space in the Downtown Library and not to include in the plan to increase technical services downtown.

Paul Mitchell, P.O. Box 213, advised the item be presented as a concept making it affordable for everyone.

Jean Wilcox, 4005 Sutherland Drive, said she was not in favor of moving technical services to Mitchell Park as it would add more square footage and many additional offices as well as the possibility of underground parking. She suggested technical staff remain where they are or return to Main Library. Another option would be to relocate technical services to the police building after they relocate.

Megan Swezey Fogarty, 2421 Bryant Street, said she was in support for design on Option B to save money. One phase design would be an improvement to the Downtown and Main Libraries.

**MOTION:** Council Member Barton moved, seconded by Morton, to adopt Option B (two-story joint single-phase Library (Eastside) and Community Center) with Technical Services at Mitchell Park, and to Refer to the Policy & Services Committee consideration of changes to the City's Naming City-Owned Land and Facilities policy with regards to major capital campaigns/contributions.

Council Member Barton said he based his motion on a better layout for the Library and the Community Center in a more appropriate location on Middlefield Road. It would be closer to the Park with more room for the Library and the oak trees with better use of the courtyard as a Community Center. Option B would be the cheaper option in the long-run. The LAC and PARC and the community unanimously selected Option B. He felt it was the

right selection and Council should proceed and begin tomorrow in selling the package.

Council Member Morton said with Option B the Downtown Library will become a full library again.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7-0 Beecham, Kishimoto absent.

#### COUNCIL COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES

Council Member Mossar reported she recently attended the National League of Cities Energy Environment and Natural Resources Steering Committee in Spokane, Washington.

Council Member Drekmeier noted he attended the San Francisquito Creek JPA meeting in Council Member Mossar's absence. Unfortunately, the \$700,000 Federal matching funds anticipated had not been included in the budget.

Council Member Morton stated he attended the County Airport Land Use Commission meeting and the key issue discussed was the height limitation for the fly area around airports. The City of San Jose objects to height limits around San Jose International Airport.

The Council Adjourned to closed session at 10:22 p.m.

#### CLOSED SESSION

9. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR  
Agency Designated Representative: City Manager and His Designees Pursuant to Merit Rules and Regulations (Frank Benest, Emily Harrison, Carl Yeats, Lalo Perez, Russ Carlsen, Lynne Johnson, Sandra Blanch, Donald Larkin, Dennis Burns and Darrell Murray)  
Employee Organization: Palo Alto Peace Officers' Association  
Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6(a)
10. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR  
Agency Designated Representative: City Manager and his designees pursuant to Merit Rules and Regulations (Frank Benest, Emily Harrison, Russ Carlsen, Carl Yeats, Lalo Perez, Nick Marinaro, Sandra Blanch, Donald Larkin, Cara Silver)  
Employee Organization: Palo Alto Fire Chiefs' Association  
Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6(a)
11. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR  
Authority: Government Code Section 54956.8

Property: Los Altos Treatment Plant located at 1237 and 1275 N. San Antonio Avenue, City of Los Altos, County of Santa Clara, CA 94303-4312; Parcel Number 116-01-013  
Negotiating Party: City of Los Altos, Robert Cole and Ron D. Packard  
City Negotiator: LaDoris Cordell, John Barton, Cara Silver, Carl Yeats, Lalo Perez, Glenn Roberts  
Subject of Potential Negotiations: Price and Terms of Payment

12. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY-POTENTIAL/ANTICIPATED LITIGATION  
Subject: Written claim for damages against the City of Palo Alto by Sebastian Lefebvre  
Authority: Government Code Sections 54956.9(b)(1) & (b)(3)(C)

**City Attorney Gary Baum stated no reportable action was taken on Items 10, 11 and 12.**

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

---

City Clerk

---

Mayor

NOTE: Sense minutes (synopsis) are prepared in accordance with Palo Alto Municipal Code Sections 2.04.180(a) and (b). The City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are made solely for the purpose of facilitating the preparation of the minutes of the meetings. City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are recycled 90 days from the date of the meeting. The tapes are available for members of the public to listen to during regular office hours.