



CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS ARE CABLECAST LIVE ON GOVERNMENT ACCESS CHANNEL 26
AND BROADCAST ON KZSU, 90.1 FM

Special Meeting
December 06, 2010

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Conference Room at 6:06 p.m.

Present: Burt, Espinosa, Holman, Klein, Price, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd, Yeh

Absent: Price

CLOSED SESSION

1. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY -- EXISTING LITIGATION
Subject: *Janet Pierce v. City of Palo Alto, et al.*; Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-09-CV-145764
Subject Authority: Government Code section 54956.9(a)

The City Council reconvened from the Closed Session at 6:33 p.m. and Mayor Burt advised no reportable action.

STUDY SESSION

2. Presentation on Housing Activities by the Housing Trust of Santa Clara County.

Jessica Garcia-Kohl, Director of Development for the Santa Clara County Housing Trust, presented an overview of the Trust's activities and programs, particularly as they apply to Palo Alto. She indicated the Housing Trust provided assistance to first-time homebuyers and to seniors, single-parent households, and others of very-low or extremely-low income households. The Trust had received \$800,000 from the City of Palo Alto and had invested almost \$2.9 million in affordable housing projects in the City. Most recently, the Housing Trust had provided funding for the Treehouse affordable housing project by Palo Alto Housing Corporation. The project just began construction. She noted the Housing Trust receives approximately 50 percent of its funds from public agencies and the remaining 50 percent from

12/06/10

corporations, although the corporate financing had been lagging. She indicated the Trust looked forward to continue working productively with the City of Palo Alto.

City Manager, James Keene announced that Staff requested Agenda Item No. 11 be pulled to be heard at the December 13, 2010 meeting.

3. Fire Resources, Services and Utilization Study.

Stephen Brezler, Systems Planning/Tri-Data Division and Thomas Wieczorek, ICMA Consulting provided an overview of the work the firms are completing related to the Palo Alto Fire Department Resources, Services and Utilization Study. The consultants provided an update on the work completed to date including the study methodology; how data was extracted from the City's computer aided dispatch (CAD) system; interviews with city staff, elected officials, city, police and fire administration; initial observations; and the timeline for completion of the balance of the study. The City Council directed staff and the consultants to complete the study in time for presentation in late January – early February 2011. Staff was also directed to look into the possibility of the consultants completing the EMS Master Plan study whose consultant was terminated in November 2010 by the Fire Department for noncompliance with the contract provisions.

CITY MANAGERS COMMENTS

City Manager, James Keene spoke regarding the OPOWER Energy Report included in the Utility bills that provided comparative data of energy usage in the neighborhood as an energy-efficiency incentive. He noted the Greer Park dedication ceremony would be held on December 11th; the new section of the park was renamed in honor of Jean and Charles Scott and the fall exhibit closure of the Palo Alto Art Center was on December 12th.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Mayor Burt announced in an effort to plan the meeting accordingly he respectfully asked all speaker card requests be submitted during the Oral Communications section.

Mark Petersen-Perez spoke regarding his Police Department complaint.

Mike Francois spoke regarding Stanford being in the Orange Bowl on January 3, 2011 and noted the conflict with the City Council meeting scheduled for that night. He spoke regarding the safety data material regarding contaminated water.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Council Member Holman suggested changes to the minutes of October 25, 2010, as follows: page 15, after 6th paragraph- include that Ms. Caporgno confirmed and acknowledged the above statements, and on page 20 at the top of the page, the paragraph should read, "Ms. Caporgno stated that the demolition would not have a significant impact due to.....", these changes were provided to the City Clerk.

MOTION: Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to approve the minutes of October 25, 2010 as amended and November 1, 2010.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Burt advised that Agenda Item No. 11 was pulled earlier by Staff and would be agendized for the December 13, 2011 Council meeting.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Yeh to pull Agenda Item No. 20 to become Agenda Item No. 20B

MOTION: Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to pull Agenda Item No. 18 to become Agenda Item No. 20C.

William Ross spoke regarding Agenda Item No. 7. He mentioned the Staff Report did not indicate the California Avenue resurfacing was not included in the funding and a traffic analysis was part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis and necessary for a lane reduction. He encouraged Council to not continue with the project until all of the issues had been resolved.

Vita Gorgunova spoke regarding Agenda Item No. 9. She stated the Director's Individual Review Approval application was being appealed by neighbors, who indicated the plans needed to be reviewed by them prior to the application being turned in. She requested the City uphold their policies and to not side with the neighbors who are in disagreement with their Individual Review Approval application.

Nancy Rogers-Zegaria spoke regarding Agenda Item No. 9. She stated she was not opposed to changes, although she felt the architecture vernacular and City's structural guidelines for the neighborhood should be maintained. She asked the City not to change regulations for a one-time event.

Andrew May spoke regarding Agenda Item No. 10. He stated the size of the project was based on a utility easement that was not listed on the deed or the County records. He asked to pull this item because it was based on the calculable building size that included an easement that should not have been included. They were not given information on the utility easement and neither the deed nor the County records showed the easement. He questioned why they had to give up 30 feet of easement and the adjacent neighbor was asked to give up only 20 feet.

Cy Ashley Webb, Palo Alto spoke regarding Agenda Item No. 14. She thanked Senior Assistant City Attorney, Grant Kolling for his efforts in the approval of the Support Agreement with the Friends of the Palo Alto Children's Theatre. She said due to his efforts, no child will be required to pay a participation fee in school plays and teens would be able to continue Saturday productions and maintain an 80-year tradition that benefited Palo Alto. She said the \$35,000 represented a fraction of the Friends' annual support to the institution to help the Theatre's general revenue approaching \$250,000.

Robert Moss, Palo Alto spoke regarding Agenda Item No. 15. He said enforcement and penalty needed to be added to Section 5. It was unclear what the perspective tenant was supposed to see and what the penalties were if tenants were not given the documents or if documents were incorrect. The Staff report noted the Planning Director would generate some type of proposal if the property owner failed to comply. He said Section 7 should not exclude the City from liability if an individual became ill due to the project being built without the normal required vapor barriers in prohibition of vapor intrusion. The water district had approved the project but failed to comply with normal practices, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Regulations, and public health and safety requirements. A vapor survey should be completed inside the residential units before an occupancy permit be given to see whether Trichloroethylene (TCE) was present. The property should be isolated from ground water by installing vapor barriers, if TCE was present, and an active vapor intrusion prevention device to avoid risking lives of occupants. He urged the Council to pull and readdress the item.

Director of Planning and Community Environment, Curtis Williams said the two lots Mr. May was referring to showed different right-of-ways on the property with contention of which applied. Neither were Individual Review (IR) issues but the City was trying to resolve the problem. It appeared the dedicated easement for right-of-way purposes on the appellant's property was not the same additional 10 feet on the applicant's property. There were

three lots in a row with the same situation. He said the City would continue to research the issue and try to make that determination. The City would help Mr. May if there was a problem. The City had informed the applicant that any problems would need to be changed before submittal of a building permit.

Mayor Burt clarified tonight's action would not inhibit the City from making changes if corrections needed to be made.

Mr. Williams said that was correct.

Council Member Holman asked Staff to respond to the two issues the public raised regarding Sections 5 and 7 of Agenda Item No. 15.

Mr. Williams said the harmful vapors would be monitored with a template and recordation prior to building occupancy and would become part of the Conditions of Approval in the Architectural Review. He said there was no enforcement mechanism. If complaints resulted due to non-notification of a problem, Staff felt it should be self-enforcing and there would be serious liability problems if existing environmental issues were not disclosed. Staff's thought was to have a template in place at the building permit stage. He said vapor monitoring was not part of the permit approval process.

Council Member Holman asked about the legal protection issue.

Acting City Attorney, Don Larkin said the action the Council took was a legislative rezoning and the Council would have full legislative immunity.

MOTION: Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to approve Agenda Item Nos. 4-10, 12-17, 19, 20A.

4. Approval of Amendment Number 5 to the Management Agreement with Brad Lozares for Golf Professional Services at 1875 Embarcadero Road, Extending the Term for 28 Months to April 30, 2013.
5. Annual Public Review of Compliance of Development Agreement With Stanford University for the Sand Hill Road Corridor Projects.
6. Resolution 9117 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Authorizing the Filing of an Application for Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding," and Committing the Necessary Non-Federal Match and Stating the Assurance to Complete the Project for Street Rehabilitation on Channing Avenue, Lytton Avenue, and Homer Avenue.

7. Resolution 9118 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Authorizing the Filing of an Application for the Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and/or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Funding for the California Avenue Transit Hub Corridor Project," and Committing the Necessary Non-Federal Match and Stating the Assurance to Complete the Project.
8. Resolution 9119 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Authorizing the Filing of an Application for the Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and/or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Funding for the Palo Alto Safe Routes to Schools Project," and Committing the Necessary Non-Federal Match and Stating the Assurance to Complete the Project.
9. Appeal of the Director's Individual Review Approval of an Addition to an Existing Single Family Residence at 559 Everett Avenue.
10. Appeal of the Director's Individual Review Approval of New Single Family Residence at 2615 Cowper Street.
- ~~11. Approval of the Agreement for the Transfer of Renewable Energy Certificates Associated With Project Capacity and Energy of Geothermal Generating Project Number 3 to the Turlock Irrigation District.~~
12. Resolution 9120 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Summarily Vacating a 5-foot Future Street Easement at 3708 Laguna Avenue."
13. Resolution 9121 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Summarily Vacating a Pipeline Easement at 4140 Old Adobe Road."
14. Approval of a Support Agreement With the Friends of the Palo Alto Children's Theatre.
15. 2nd Reading Approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Adoption of an Ordinance 5105 Amending the Zoning Map to Change the Zoning Designation for 305 Grant Avenue, 2640 and 2650 Birch Street and 306 and 320 Sheridan Avenue From RM-40 Multi Family to the Pedestrian and Transit Oriented Development (PTOD) Combining District. *(First reading on November 22, 2010 - Passed 9-0)*

16. Resolution 9122 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending the Conflict of Interest Code for Designated City Officers and Employees as Required by the Political Reform Act and Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission," and Repealing Resolution No. 8886.
17. Resolution 9123 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving Amendment Number 1 to the Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the State of California for Maintenance of State Highways in the City of Palo Alto," and Approval of Two Contracts Related to the El Camino Real/Stanford Avenue Streetscape and Intersection Improvements Project (CIP PL-07002): (1) Construction Management Contract with Ghirardelli Associates, for a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$150,000 and (2) Amendment No. 1 Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. to add \$78,700 for Design Support Services for a Total Not to Exceed the Amount of \$293,500.
- ~~18. Approval of a Contract with California Land Management (CLM) in The Amount of \$110,053 for the First Year of Service for Park Ranger Patrol Services in Palo Alto's Urban Parks, Refuse Area, Byxbee Park and Baylands Nature Preserve.~~
19. Approval of a Wastewater Treatment Enterprise Fund Contract With TMAD Taylor & Gaines Corporate in a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$131,587 for Design of Power Monitoring and Standby Generators Replacement Project at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant - Capital Improvement Program Project WQ-80021.
- ~~20. Approval of Contract With KPA Group, Inc., in the Amount of \$125,888 for Design Services for the Municipal Services Center Improvements Project - Capital Improvement Project PF-05002.~~
- 20A. Recommendation from High Speed Rail (HSR) Committee to Approve Three Letters Regarding High Speed Rail.

MOTION PASSED for Agenda Items No. 4-10, 12-17, 19, 20A: 9-0

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS

- 20B. (Former No. 20) Approval of Contract With KPA Group, Inc., in the Amount of \$125,888 for Design Services for the Municipal Services Center Improvements Project - Capital Improvement Project PF-05002.

Council Member Klein said the reason he pulled the item was because he had concerns the item would preclude the City from making other changes to the Municipal Services Center (MSC). He said due to land shortage in the community he asked if the buildings could be reconfigured at the MSC site to develop additional land for other usage such as an automobile dealership and if the City would be spending money that would inhibit the City from freeing up land. The City of Mountain View had their municipal service center in 2-story buildings and would this be a possibility for the City. He recommended the City Manager provide a report to ensure certain options were not being precluded.

City Manager, Jim Keene said the item was a design contract and could be delayed for awhile without putting the City at a disadvantage. The MSC building dated back to 1965. He said it was feasible to come back to the Council with a report on alternatives options during the first meeting in February.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to continue this item to a date uncertain.

Council Member Schmid asked if this was being looked at by the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Committee (IBRC).

Mr. Keene said the IBRC scope was wide-ranged and would want to provide the Council with possibilities in the near-term.

Council Member Schmid suggested working with the IBRC in moving forward.

Mr. Keene said the first step would be to get more information and have the IBRC review the possibilities.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

20C. (Former No. 18) Approval of a Contract with California Land Management (CLM) in The Amount of \$110,053 for the First Year of Service for Park Ranger Patrol Services in Palo Alto's Urban Parks, Refuse Area, Byxbee Park and Baylands Nature Preserve.

Council Member Shepherd asked Staff to clarify how C-Way Janitorial Service worked with the expanded California Land Management (CLM).

Director of Community Services, Greg Betts said CLM was responsible for cleaning the bathrooms at Rinconada Park and Mitchell Park during the day on the weekends. The City contracted with C-Way Janitorial Service, which maintained other City facilities, to do heavy cleaning of the bathrooms during the rest of the week such as mop floors and hosing the facilities. The CLM Rangers were responsible for restocking the restrooms with paper products, remove trash, and keeping the bathrooms clean during the day.

Council Member Shepherd asked if C-Way was a janitorial service as opposed to a Parks and Recreational function.

Mr. Betts said that was correct.

Council Member Shepherd asked what the change was.

Mr. Betts said there was no change to the CLM agreement. The City had an agreement with CLM to patrol and provide maintenance service at Rinconada Park and Mitchell Park on weekends since 1983. A number of City parks had automated timers that unlocked bathroom doors at 8 A.M. Services were provided by the park rangers during the day and the doors would be locked at sunset.

MOTION: Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to: 1) approve and authorize the Mayor to execute the contract with California Land Management (CLM) in the amount of \$110,053 for the first (partial) year of services for ranger patrol services in Palo Alto's urban parks, Refuse Area, Byxbee Park and the Baylands Nature Preserve for the period beginning November 1, 2010 and ending October 31, 2011; 2) authorize the City Manager or his designee to exercise the option to renew the aforementioned contract with CLM for the subsequent years, provided CLM is responsive to the City's needs and the quality of CLM's services are acceptable during the first term of the contract (and/or other conditions which will determine the City's willingness to renew the contract).

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

ACTION ITEMS

21. Review and Acceptance of R.A. Wiedemann & Associates, Inc. Airport Business Plan; Adoption of Budget Amendment Ordinance 5106 to Fund Transition of Palo Alto Airport control from the County to the City; and Responses to the Finance Committee's Motion on Information and Action Items from October 19, 2010 Meeting.

Council Member Schmid said the Finance Committee heard the background material on October 19, 2010, with R.A. Wiedemann and Associates regarding a Business Plan and an analysis for options. The County wanted to terminate the lease in 2017 and the City was exploring the option of early termination. The Federal Aviation Association (FAA) did not want out. There was an agreement with the FAA who had made improvements to the facility and required a 20-year notice before service could be withdrawn and could become complicated if the City did not want to do a takeover for the County. The long-term economic outlook for the airport was good due to the Fixed Based Operators (FBO) subleases and was a good deal for the leaseholders. Through renegotiations City revenues could increase when the County and the current FBO subleases expired. An economic struggle was anticipated between the present time and the expiration date of the leases. The Business Plan indicated there would be sufficient funds to run the airport after that time. The Finance Committee had a number of questions that fell into three categories: 1) environment issues which needed more study, 2) legal issues to get expert outside legal advise to review the FAA obligation, requirements for revenue generation, relationship of the City to spend funds before the takeover and compensation, and 3) economic implications and considerations regarding rent, understanding future leases, and Staff's time in making a decision and whether the City would be compensated for the costs. There was a 6-year period for compensation on expenditures and the leases would expire in 7 years.

Director of Administrative Services, Lalo Perez said discussion of the item was a follow-up to Council's direction to pursue takeover of the Palo Alto Airport operations from the County. He introduced Randal Wiedemann of R.A. Wiedemann & Associates who would be providing a presentation on what was discussed at the Finance Committee meeting on October 19, 2010.

Randal Wiedemann, R.A. Wiedemann & Associates said the lease agreement with Santa Clara County would be ending in 2017 along with two Fixed Based Operators (FBO) and major subleases. The City considered ending the agreement prior to 2017 and a Business Plan and an analysis was completed to determine financial viability and options. The County's current management structure was budgeted for 2.6 full-time staff with business hours at 74 hours per week. The airport was small in size with a 2,400 foot runway and filled to its capacity with aircrafts. Landside facilities were the revenue base for the airport and consisted of 85 FBO-owned hangars, 355 County-owned tie-downs, 86 FBO-controlled tie-downs and 250 vehicle parking spaces. Most of the County's revenues were from the tie-down rentals and FBOs subleased to specialty aviation service operators, businesses, flying schools and services. The County had a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of \$3.7 million through 2013 for runway and

pavement maintenance, taxiway modifications, and complying with FAA regulations. Most of the funding was from Federal and State monies. The baseline financial forecast reflected that the City's cost to run the airport was about the same as the County's. Most of the revenues came from aircraft storage and FBO leases. Facilities' fees and fuel flowage fees generated less. The operating expenses and aviation services was the actual cost of operating the airport. Long-term forecast showed that the airport property would revert to the City in 2017 when the agreement and leases expired and the City would essentially become a landlord. The total net revenues projection through 2018 was \$699,577 and \$630,678 through 2037. The Common Operational options were: 1) to continue the County Operation which would require lease renegotiations, 2) the City Operation would retain an airport manager and set up an enterprise fund, 3) joint FBO and City Operation would have FBO provide management personnel and the City would pay normal costs, and 4) Third Party Management would be where the third party operated the airport entirely. The financial performance of each option showed the Baseline City Management Option was the most expensive but in the long-term would be well above the break-even point. The City Plus FBO Management Option was left with a clean slate since two FBO currently existed through 2017. The City Plus Third Party Management Option was promising in the long-term. The FAA guidelines stated that money could not be made off the airport and the airport had to remain an airport for 20 years and required the FAA's permission to close. The two recommended options for the City to pursue were the City Operation and Third Party Management. The Finance Committee recommended looking into FBO's and City Operation which was the highest revenue producer.

Council Member Price referred to Staff report 431:10, page 2 that noted "Only under dire economic conditions such as a sharp increase in gas prices or a severe decline in infrastructure, would the airport face significant financial challenges." She said in projecting out to 2037, what choices did people make in owning an airplane with the high increases in fuel.

Mr. Wiedemann said the study took into account fuel prices increasing to \$6 to \$7 per gallon. There would be a decline not only in ownership but activity across the county. He said the local income level was much higher than other parts of the country and aviation would be supported in a robust way. The airport would be a viable transportation option relatively equal to everything else.

Council Member Price referred to page 5 of the Staff report, and asked Staff to comment on the statement "considerable in-house staff time will be required to move City's control of the airport".

Mr. Perez said the City had no prior experience in operating an airport and felt the need to bring in in-house expertise to relieve Staff from the burden and to gain the required experience in running an airport.

City Manager, James Keene said it was a new transition and wanted the Council to recognize the need for flexibility on both the Staff side and in Council's expectation in trying to advance the schedule prior to 2017.

Council Member Holman referred to the Long Term Baseline Forecast and raised concerns regarding the decrease in total revenues and the increase in operating expenses between the year 2018 and 2037.

Mr. Wiedemann said it was due to reinvestments in the cost-share of facilities. The study was conservative on the revenue side and robust on the expense side and the City may do better than what was reflected. The significant decline was in the last 5 years. A surplus of over a \$600,000 range was a good sign for aviation. He said 95 percent of airports do not make money and were subsidized.

Council Member Holman asked how many pilots and businesses currently utilize the airport.

Mr. Wiedmann said a survey showed approximately 25 percent of those who responded were pilots who resided in Palo Alto. The number was unknown on the ones that did not respond. A census could be taken from the tail numbers of the airplane to see where they were registered.

Council Member Holman asked how stable that population was.

Mr. Wiedmann said it had been stable over the past 10 years.

Council Member Holman said hazardous materials were a big concern and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would reflect the findings. She asked if there was an opportunity to reutilize any of the land at the end of the 20-year cycle such as open space.

Mr. Wiedemann asked for the entire airport.

Council Member Holman said for any part.

Mr. Wiedemann said if the land was not required for aeronautical use, the FAA could consider a release of the land. He said a realistic guess was the FAA would not release any part of the property due to its small size and filled to its capacity with aircrafts.

Council Member Holman asked Staff if an Enterprise Fund needed to be established in moving forward.

Mr. Perez said yes and was prepared to do so with the Council's direction.

Council Member Holman said there would be no challenges to disbanding the Enterprise Fund if the City chose not to move forward.

Mr. Perez said that was correct. He clarified the City could be in a position to advance the funds and have a level of expenditures up to the authorized \$300,000. There could be the likelihood of the Council having a different take or option if Staff came back with additional information which could lead to waiting until 2017 and face the possibility of not being able to recover the funds.

Council Member Schmid referred to the Long Term Baseline Forecasts which reflected an increase of \$1 million in operating revenues from 2017 to 2018.

Mr. Wiedemann said the \$1 million was from whoever takes over the FBO leases. The leases currently did not generate revenue to the City or the County. Their combined revenues would go toward the City at the time of takeover.

Council Member Schmid asked if the FBO's were overcharging and was it realistic.

Mr. Wiedemann said there was a demand for the facilities and people were paying the fees.

Council Member Schmid said the total revenues was not being spent on the airport and asked if they accumulated each year.

Mr. Wiedemann said yes. He said if revenues were consistently generated above and beyond the cost of operating a facility, adjustments would be made to lower the fees to avoid the increase from happening.

Mayor Burt asked if there was an opportunity to build in to the Enterprise Fund land lease rates.

Senior City Attorney, Grant Kolling said in reviewing the FAA regulations it appeared there was room for optimism to obtain rent payable to the General Fund. The regulation seemed to suggest that but felt it was an issue he needed to get clarified by an outside Council.

Mr. Wiedemann said there was an issue on the horizon of airports receiving and accumulating royalties for over 20 years which were above and beyond their needs. A provision needed to be made for such cases which the FAA has not thought about.

Council Member Schmid asked what percentage of airports charged rent for the land.

Mr. Wiedemann said it was not referred to as rent but as a Franchise Fee or Administrative Fee in Enterprise Funds and could range from 5.5 to 5.8 percent of gross revenues.

Council Member Schmid asked why the County wanted to terminate the lease.

Mr. Wiedemann said he was not sure why the County wanted to terminate the lease.

Council Member Klein said in 2006 the County Board of Supervisors voted to not renew the lease when it expired in 2017 and had conversations with the City of what would occur in the 11-year interim. He said Mayor Judy Kleinberg appointed the Palo Alto Airport Working Group (PAAWG) and he was the Council's representative. It had 15 to 20 members and consisted of Planning Commissioner Pat Burt, along with airport users, concerned citizens, East Palo Alto (EPA) representatives, and the City's Real Estate Manager who produced a report. The group met with County officials and Supervisor Liz Kniss, who was instrumental in calling the meetings together. There were conversations of when and how the City could takeover the airport. The Board of Supervisors took the action due to their staff's recommendation. They have not changed their minds. Supervisor Kniss was the only remaining supervisor in office and the four new people may want to take a different position but have not. He said for the moment the County's official position was they want out and understood they had to fill their obligations under the lease and would terminate in 2017. He did not know their reason for termination. The County operated two other airports. The decision to terminate had been an ongoing process for the past five years and that the City should view the issue in that context.

Mr. Perez said he believed since the FBO's subleases had a trigger date there was an opportunity for the City to explore further as to what could be done between Palo Alto's early take over and when leases expired in 2017. Staff proposed to use the additional funds to explore with R.A. Wiedemann &

Associates, Inc., and with legal to come back with a range of what could be done.

Council Member Schmid said it sounded risky since the City was asking the FBO's for money.

Mayor Burt asked about an option to extend the FBO's leases with the City's early takeover for exchange of higher revenues which was not addressed in the report.

Mr. Perez said that was on option and Staff should present to the Council a menu of potential options.

Mayor Burt said there was another potential revenue stream not discussed in the report. He said the Airport Working Group identified an increase demand for hangar space and hangars were strong money makers. The agreement with the Airport Working Group and environmental representatives was if the hangars could be reconfigured to add space without altering the visual impact that it could be a potential revenue stream.

Mr. Wiedemann said that option was built into the full build out model to give an idea what the revenue would be. It was not included in the presentation because he was informed it was not a viable option to review at the present time.

Mayor Burt asked if it was not a viable option or not an option the City should be counting on under a conservative pro forma.

Mr. Wiedemann said that was absolutely the case.

Mayor Burt said viable was different.

Mr. Wiedemann said it was something you could not count on.

Mayor Burt said it was something that was not used in this pro forma.

Mr. Wiedemann said right, that was correct.

Mayor Burt asked what the revenue incremental increase on the revenue was.

Mr. Wiedemann said it was about \$20 million but included paying all capital cost for putting in the hangars.

Mayor Burt asked if it was \$20 million net over what period.

Mr. Wiedemann said it was net over 20 years.

Mayor Burt asked if it was a million dollars additional income per year from the additional hangars.

Mr. Wiedemann said no, it was the net total.

Mayor Burt asked if Mr. Wiedemann was referring to net or gross.

Mr. Wiedemann said he was talking about net.

Mayor Burt asked if it was \$20 million net over 20 years.

Mr. Wiedemann said yes.

Mayor Burt asked if it included or excluded paying for the capital investment.

Mr. Wiedemann said it was included.

Mayor Burt said that was \$1 million per year.

Council Member Shepherd asked if the administrative fee of 5.5 to 5.8 percent would go into the General Fund as the lease back component and would change the pro forma for the City Plus FBO Management option.

Mr. Perez said yes.

Council Member Shepherd asked if the County was paying rent to the City when the lease was established in 1967.

Mr. Wiedemann said he thought it was \$1.00 per year.

Council Member Shepherd asked if there had been a capital cost assessment.

Mr. Wiedemann said there was a \$3.7 million Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for 2010 to 2013 to cover runway, pavement maintenance, and taxiway modifications.

Mr. Perez said a County staff member spoke at the Finance Committee meeting in October and stated the County would be submitting an

application in early Spring for an FAA grant which would cover 95 percent of the cost. He said by signing off on the application the City would be obligated for another 20 years.

Council Member Shepherd asked if the City would need to incur the cost if the takeover happened in the timeframe the City was looking at or would everything be finished.

Mr. Wiedemann said most likely it would be finished. He said the FAA grant was \$3.5 million with a \$200,000 local share which the State of California would pay a matching portion.

Council Member Scharff asked if there were other local cities that run airports.

Mr. Wiedemann said some of the other cities were the Cities of San Carlos, Half Moon Bay, San Martin and Hayward.

Council Member Scharff asked what models were used, how they were doing and was there an airport study completed.

Mr. Wiedemann said he did not do a study on those.

Mr. Perez said Staff had researched some of the municipal airports but was not comprehensive. He said 95 percent were run in-house but had to be put into perspective in terms of current economic conditions, changes and staffing. He said the timeline was aggressive and the Finance Committee requested to move this item forward as quickly as possible. The timeline noted what needed to be done, but did not necessarily mean they would be completed. Staff was focusing to complete the Environmental Report. He asked that the following go on record and wanted the Council to be aware prior to moving forward that the current budget request was for immediate needs. There will be long-term needs such as staffing, legal and other undetermined needs at this time.

Mayor Burt asked if it was accurate to say the more aggressive the timeline the more apprehension there was on Staff demands.

Mr. Perez said not knowing what lies ahead Staff would want to go out and recruit for a staff member or consultant to lead the process and report back to the Council. Discussions needed to take place with multiple parties and would need to occur quickly.

Mayor Burt said that did not address his question.

Mr. Keene said Mayor Burt's statement was true.

Mayor Burt asked if the other expenses would be compensated if the City took over.

Mr. Perez said that was correct and would expect payment from the airport fund.

David Creemer, Palo Alto Chairman of Joint Community Relations Committee (JCRC) for the Palo Alto Airport. He said his group was enthusiastic to help the City in any possible way. He addressed Council Member Scharff's question regarding existing operations and governance mechanism of other airports in local communities. He said the JCRC had investigated operating governance models and wanted to present their findings to Staff. He addressed Council Member Schmid's concerns regarding bringing money back to the City. He said he was not an attorney but found dual uses for facilities was allowed. Terminals could have public meeting rooms. He hoped solar panels could be installed on the roofs of the hangars and aircraft covers and could sell back power to the City as a savings. Council Member Price asked about gasoline. He said the light craft industry was no different from the automotive industry. There was a lot of research on prototypes of electric, hydrogen powered aircrafts as well as diesel aircrafts of which there were several at the airport. He encouraged the City and the Council to provide jobs and get the group working to make the airport a success.

Ralph Britton, President of the Palo Alto Airport Association, reiterated on the payback. He advised the City to make arrangements on monies spent in advance and getting reimbursed within the six year period. He spoke of the maintenance issue at the airport and said the County did have a plan but never seemed to materialize. No maintenance or upgrades on runways had been done since PAAWG was established. He said the number of operations at the Palo Alto airport exceeded the total number of Reid-Hillview and South County airports combined. The San Carlos airport had a net profit of \$1 million a year. He said monies made at the Palo Alto airport could go towards improving the facilities that were very rundown. The terminal building was built 30 years ago and in the protection zone.

Herb Borock, Palo Alto, stated concern with the financial burden being on the General Fund. He clarified the airport's profits would be returned to the General Fund although if the airport runs at a loss the General Fund would need to supply the difference. The City's approved budgets continually cut services to the public due to the cuts in the General Fund therefore

supplying financial aide to the airport would add unnecessary strain that would only negatively impact the community in the long run.

Harry Hirschman, Palo Alto, stated the airport was a great asset although the County had allowed its upkeep to be neglected since 2006. He was in support of Palo Alto taking over the airport operations.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to: 1) approve Finance Committee's acceptance of the R.A. Wiedemann & Associates, Inc. Airport Business Plan, 2) upon acceptance of the plan, approve creation of a new Airport Enterprise Fund, 3) authorize the BAO for \$300,000 to facilitate the transition of Palo Alto airport control from Santa Clara County to the City, 4) authorize Staff to utilize the remaining funds of \$14,100 in CIP AS-09000 for additional transition work by R.A. Wiedemann & Associates, 5) authorize Staff to form an Airport Commission, and 6) authorize the City Attorney to seek outside legal counsel to maximize the fees we charge if/when we take control of the airport so that the General Fund receives the maximum allowable under the law.

Council Member Klein stated the question on the airport was not whether but when. Palo Alto will regain control of the airport in the year 2017 under existing policy. He noted the County had no incentives to improve the airport as Palo Alto did and there was a need to expend funds in order to bring the airport up to where it belonged on grounds upkeep and general maintenance. He clarified the longer the airport remained under the control of the County the more work would need to be undertaken at a higher cost. He noted the Federal Aviation Association (FAA) paid 90 percent for all required capital improvements and the cost of the control tower.

Council Member Scharff asked whether the Motion included moving forward expeditiously with the Phase II Environmental Report.

Council Member Klein stated he had not included the environmental report although he requested to incorporate it into the Motion.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER authorize Staff to move forward expeditiously with Phase II of the Environmental Impact Report on the airport.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to include the estimated legal expense of \$50,000 in the BAO.

Council Member Scharff asked whether it was possible to add into the Motion that Staff would endeavor to move forward with the timeline set forth in Staff Report 431:10.

Council Member Klein stated he accepted the addition of the timeline to the Motion.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to include that Staff would endeavor to move forward with the timeline set forth in Staff Report 431:10.

Council Member Shepherd asked for clarification that the Phase II environmental report was equal to the phase to hazardous materials analysis.

Mr. Perez stated that was correct.

Interim Director of Public Works, Mike Sartor stated the Phase II site investigation would be based on the Phase I environmental assessment.

Council Member Schmid stated he supported the Motion. He asked Staff to report on a semi-annual basis on the airport expenditures and an assessment of the market value for the evaluation of a tie-down spot or a hangar.

Mr. Perez stated it was the intent of Staff to return to Council with the timeline as laid out in the Staff Report.

Council Member Holman asked for clarification on the section of the Motion maximizing the General Fund. Would that include an analysis on how the City would be reimbursed for the initial funding for the studies being undertaken.

Council Member Klein stated there was a full expectation there would be repayment for the funds expended. His direction in the Motion was to maximize the return from the revenues that could be generated by the airport.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to have Staff endeavor to insure that the City gets reimbursed for our expenditures.

Council Member Holman asked whether the environmental analysis would include costs for any necessary clean-up.

Mr. Sartor stated no, this would be the first round of groundwater and soil sampling. If contamination was found then there would be recommendations to complete a remedial investigation feasibility study phase where clean-up goals and costs would be identified.

Mayor Burt stated if there were remediation's required typically it was the lessee who was obligated to remediate.

Mr. Sartor stated that was correct.

Council Member Yeh asked whether there was an operational organization claiming home for the Airport Commission.

Mr. Keene clarified there were a number of factors at play that would define the location for the Airport Commission and at the present time it was too soon to make the determination.

Mayor Burt stated Staff requesting a Commission was premature at this stage of the process. He felt the decision had not been made by Council whether the need was for a Commission or an advisory group that would report to Staff.

AMENDMENT: Mayor Burt moved, seconded by Council Member XXXX to have Staff return the next time this subject was discussed as to whether a Commission or Advisory Group would be the most appropriate citizen advisory group method.

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO LACK OF SECOND

Council Member Klein stated the take over of the airport was inevitable. He stated it had taken five years to achieve what has been completed to date and felt a timeline was necessary to have a focal point to move forward.

Council Member Yeh stated the airport was a business and would be run as such. A Commission had conflict of interests that could prevent the appropriate types of community members needed to provide the necessary advice to Council. Therefore he felt a Citizens Advisory Group would be more beneficial.

AMENDMENT: Mayor Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman that Staff to return the next time this subject was discussed to advice on different forms of citizen advisory groups.

Vice Mayor Espinosa stated it was his understanding other municipalities had gone through similar processes where Commissions had been established without similar conflicts.

Mr. Wiedemann stated there were cities going through the same situation. He stated he would supply Staff with the examples of solutions that applied to the situation.

Mayor Burt clarified he was not opposed to the creation of a Commission he merely felt it was premature.

Mr. Keene stated there was nothing to preclude a policy advisory group from morphing into a Commission.

Council Member Holman stated she supported the Amendment.

Council Member Klein stated he felt the only persons with legal conflicts of interest were the fixed base operators.

AMENDMENT PASSED: 5-4 Espinosa, Klein, Scharff, Shepherd no

MOTION AS AMENDED RESTATED: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to: 1) approve Finance Committee's acceptance of the R.A. Wiedemann & Associates, Inc. Airport Business Plan, 2) upon acceptance of the plan, approve creation of a new Airport Enterprise Fund, 3) and authorize the BAO for \$300,000 to facilitate the transition of Palo Alto airport control from Santa Clara County to the City, 4) authorize Staff to utilize the remaining funds of \$14,100 in CIP AS-09000 for additional transition work by R.A. Wiedemann & Associates, 5) authorize Staff to form an Airport Commission, and 6) authorize the City Attorney to seek outside legal advise to maximize the fees we charge if/when we take control of the airport so that the General Fund receives the maximum allowable under the law, 6) authorize Staff to move forward expeditiously with Phase II of the Environmental Impact Report on the airport, 7) include the estimated legal expense of \$50,000 in the BAO, 8) have Staff endeavor to insure that the City gets reimbursed for our expenditures, and 9) Staff to return the next time this subject is discussed to advise on different forms of advisory groups.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

22. Public Hearing: Consider Adopting a Resolution 9124 Adopting New Electric Utility Rate Schedule for Net Surplus Electricity Compensation (E-NSE-1) to be Effective January 1, 2011, and to Consider Adopting a

Resolution to Amend Utility Rule and Regulation 29, Governing Net Energy Metering Service and Interconnection.

Director of Utilities, Valerie Fong gave a brief overview of Assembly Bill 920.

Public hearing opened and closed without public comment at 11:02 p.m.

MOTION: Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to: 1) adopt a Resolution adopting Net Surplus Electricity Compensation Rate Schedule (E-NSE-1), to become effective January 2, 2011, and 2) adopt a Resolution amending Utility Rule and Regulation 29 to become effective January 1, 2011.

Council Member Schmid stated his understanding was the cost of the program was estimated to be \$327,000 and the City was providing a monetary compensation of approximately \$458. He asked how the reimbursement was calculated for the eleven customers receiving it.

Ms. Fong stated the reimbursement amount was based on the recommended rate. She clarified, over the twelve month period, what their net surplus generation would be at the recommended rate.

Council Member Schmid asked whether there were further necessary billing system changes in order to calculate the annual reimbursements.

Ms. Fong stated the configuration of the current system did not permit the Utilities Department to track the surplus in the manner the bill required.

Council Member Schmid stated the eleven customers in question had their surplus energy tracked.

Ms. Fong stated Staff manually calculated the surplus.

Council Member Schmid asked why the current system could not be maintained until a larger number of customers was reached.

Senior Resource Manager, Ipek Connelly stated the calculation Staff completed was not necessarily that of billing quality. Staff researched billing systems and polled the current customers and in order to maintain accuracy in billing, and proper credits applied it was a more in depth system.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member XXXX to continue with the current process of calculations on an ad hoc practical basis until we reach a total of \$10,000.

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND

Mr. Keene asked whether Staff had provided an anticipated cost for the alternative.

Ms. Connelly stated in order to implement the work around it would take 150 to 200 hours of Staff time.

Ms. Fong noted there would be Staff time involved in training no matter which system was chosen. None of which would require the request of additional budget funding.

Council Member Schmid stated his goal was to minimize the use of internal Staff for an amount this small.

Ms. Connelly stated the idea was to minimize incorrect billing statements or the handling of customer inquiries that may force the Utilities Department to increase the amount of Staff time used. She indicated the goal was to keep Staff time down while using the workaround.

Mr. Keene stated estimating 100 hours of Staff time at a rate of \$100 per hour for a cost of \$10,000 seemed to be an investment amount which after a year or two the City would have caught up with the ad hoc approach.

Council Member Yeh asked if this was a one time Staff time investment and had there been outreach to other utilities that had moved forward with this type of system.

Ms. Fong stated Staff had checked in with a few other utilities and found they may not be meeting the intent of Assembly Bill 920.

Council Member Klein stated he felt spending a disproportionate amount of funding to set-up a system where the pay out is a small amount is not right. He stated if there was a need to spend a significant amount of funds for an Assembly Bill the legislature should be contacted.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER TO authorize Staff to create a billing system to handle this so that time spent does not exceed \$10,000 of staff time.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

23. Update on the Design of the Main Library Improvements (PE 11000) and Staff Recommendation to Temporarily Relocate the Main Library to the Arts Center Auditorium, Option No. 1, During Construction of Main Library.

City Manager, James Keene stated the action being requested was for Council to give direction to Staff on what direction to proceed with the temporary library relocation for the Main library.

Council Member Scharff stated in the interest of time he requested the PowerPoint presentation be limited to the main points.

Mayor Burt stated Council Member Holman had a conflict with the Roth Building and indicated the discussion matter needed to be separated into two portions.

Dawn Merkes, Group 4 Architecture, gave a brief update to all of the Library projects. The Mitchell Park and Downtown Libraries were under construction and the Main Library was in design phase.

Acting Library Director, Ned Himmel stated Staff was reviewing the shelving and collection issues for the Main Library and would make recommendations to the Library Advisory Commission (LAC) in January 2011. Due to building costs being lower, there were funds available in the bond to look for a temporary facility for the Main Library which was not in the original plans.

Council Member Shepherd asked if there were improvements made to the Art Center auditorium, would the upgrades stay once the Main Library returned to its original site.

Interim Public Works Director, Mike Sartor stated yes.

Council Member Shepherd asked whether the upgrades to the Art Center auditorium included the restrooms.

Mr. Himmel stated no, the restroom upgrades were a portion of the Art Center restoration.

Council Member Schmid stated the temporary facility was approximately one tenth the size of the Main Library and would house about one tenth of the collection. He suggested utilizing the excess Staff from the Main Library to extend the hours of the newly opened Downtown and Mitchell Park libraries.

Mr. Himmel stated Staff would look into the option of extended hours. He explained the Main Library would only be closed for one year and some Staff was slated to go to Mitchell Park in anticipation of the increased usage.

Beth Bunnenberg, Palo Alto, gave a brief history of the archived historic collection housed at the Main Library.

Robert Moss, Library Advisory Commissioner, stated the LAC discussed the reconfiguration of the Main Library. He stated there was a consensus among the Commissioners that the Art Center was the most convenient and flexible location to temporarily house the Main Library even though the space was limited.

Enid Pearson, Palo Alto, felt the Art Center was a suitable location to house the temporary facility. She mentioned the Link+ System and shared her concern with the system temporarily being moved to the Mitchell Park Library for fear it would not return to Main once the remodel was completed.

Elaine Meyer, Palo Alto, shared her concerns with the collection reduction of the Main Library.

MOTION: Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Price to accept Option 1 to provide a small temporary Main Library in the Arts Center Auditorium during construction at Main Library, and direct Staff to return to Council with appropriate modifications to the Library Bond design and construction management contracts for approval by Council.

Council Member Shepherd stated several reasons for her support of the Art Center being the temporary home of the Main Library, there was available parking, the convenience of the location and the costs were all acceptable scenarios.

Council Member Price stated the Art Center auditorium was one of the City's assets and the proposed improvements by the use of the library would be greatly welcomed.

Vice Mayor Espinosa stated he supported the Motion. He asked whether moving the historic records to the Roth Building was an appropriate discussion given the agenda that was publicized.

Acting City Attorney, Don Larkin stated it was not agendaized and therefore a discussion could not take place. He stated Staff could decide whether the item would be returning to Council.

Mr. Himmel stated there was an extensive amount of research that needed to be completed including legalities regarding the ownership of the Roth Building and what would happen to the collection in the event something happened to the Roth Building.

Council Member Scharff stated he supported the Motion. He agreed there could be an experimental period of extended hours for the library system and use the year to determine whether there were better or more utilized hours.

Council Member Price asked for clarification on the bond funds remaining since the construction costs and the cost for the temporary location was lower than anticipated.

Mr. Himmel stated not all of the bonds had been sold as of yet. He stated depending on the costs, they either would not sell the remainder of the bonds or would only sell a portion.

Council Member Holman stated she supported the Motion. She asked whether Council Member Scharff was making a Motion in respect to the library Staff.

Council Member Scharff stated he had agreed with Council Member Schmid's comments in hopes he would make a Motion.

Mr. Keene stated if there was a Motion to be made he requested it be a general Motion reflecting the general Council directive desired for Staff to look into regarding excess library Staff.

Mayor Burt stated there were interesting concepts to extended hours and an array of ideas could stem from them. He had concern over providing a service to the community temporarily then taking it away. He noted the hours did not correlate to the uses of the library.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

MOTION: Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to direct Staff to agendaize for a future meeting a discussion on how to better utilize library staff to increase library hours.

Council Member Klein called a point of order noting the item was not agendaized and therefore was not appropriate for discussion.

Mr. Larkin clarified if there was a Motion to agendize an item for a future meeting the Motion could be heard.

Council Member Schmid noted the Motion was directly related to the Main Library reconstruction.

Council Member Shepherd asked if Council could refer the item to the LAC. She stated there had been staffing issues with the library system discussed during previous LAC meetings therefore noting the shift or expansion of hours and staff may not be an easy one.

Mr. Larkin stated the appropriate action would be for the Motion to state a future discussion for Council and at that point Council could refer the matter to the LAC for discussion.

Council Member Price stated her understanding was the exploration of expanding the service delivery models and not expanding the hours which had labor costs associated with it.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

24. Recommendation from High Speed Rail (HSR) Committee to Approve One Letter Regarding High Speed Rail.

Council Member Klein stated the Committee requested the full Council consider the letter because a number of the members had voiced concerns which was why this letter was not on Consent as were the other three.

Mayor Burt stated Mayor Nagel from Burlingame and he had authored the letter in response to a specific request and recommendations by Congresswomen Eshoo and Speier, that the peninsula cities attempt to determine their common vision regarding the High Speed Rail (HSR). The purpose of this letter is to help align the different cities and was intended to be a draft that as many cities as possible would align themselves with.

Council Member Price requested to modify point number 2 which ended with "must be grounded in reality" which she would like to read "must be grounded in verifiable data".

Mayor Burt stated if there were nonsubstantial alterations being requested by Council they could be authorized to be made as a follow-up to a meeting. The letter could be adopted in principle and allow for improved wordsmithing from Council Members subsequent to the meeting.

Council Member Schmid stated point number 5 discussed alternatives which had been included and previously excluded. He noted in point number 4 the discussion was regarding restoration of the alignment which were included items only. He stated point number 5 was a bolder statement which appeared diminished by point number 4.

Mayor Burt stated he understands the suggestion although explained point number 4 included the items which most Peninsula cities had focused on. Therefore point number 4 essentially was the starting point for consensus most cities, while point number 5 had been added to express the other items desired by Peninsula cities.

Council Member Schmid felt leaving point number 4 in the letter was giving acceptance to the Alternatives Analysis. He wanted the letter to be clear that the Peninsula cities did not accept the Alternatives Analysis in any way.

MOTION: Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to approve the letter to be sent by the Peninsula cities to the Governor, Legislature and the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA).

Council Member Shepherd stated her support for the letter and felt strength could be gained by Peninsula cities joining together in brining their struggle to the legislature.

Council Member Holman stated concern with the phrase "restoration of the alignments that our City prefers most" in point number 4. She stated she was uncertain as to how best to address the wording although she noted the language "our City prefers most" was troubling.

Mayor Burt stated the Motion was to leave the letter open and he suggested she submit preferred replacement language changes subsequent to the meeting as long as they were consistent with the intent of the letter.

Council Member Schmid asked who the language changes should be submitted to.

Mayor Burt stated the changes should be submitted to Deputy City Manager, Steve Emslie.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Price reported that the Silicon Valley Leadership Group was having a Caltrain summit meeting on Friday, January 21, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at Stanford University.

Mayor Burt advised that he is on the planning committee for that meeting and will provide further information when it is available. He also reported that he and Len Materman, Executive Director of the San Francisquito Joint Powers Authority went to Washington, DC this past week. They had 4 meetings with various agencies to discuss the San Francisquito Creek project.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 12:20 a.m.