Special Meeting November 17, 2014

Study	y Session1	10
1.	Update on Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit Project1	10
Agen	da Changes, Additions and Deletions1	16
City N	Manager Comments1	17
Oral (Communications1	18
Minut	tes Approval1	19
Conse	ent Calendar1	19
2.	Resolution 9469 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving and Authorizing the Execution of the State of California Department of Community Services and Development October 2014 - April 2017 Direct Payment Program Agreement No. 14Y-1419 Governing the City of Palo Alto Utilities Department's Administration of Home Energy Assistance Program Funds"	19
3.	Approval of a Construction Contract with G. Bortolotto & Co. Inc., Contractors in the Amount of \$333,824, for the Mitchell Park Parking Lot Project (CIP PE-09003)1	19
4.	Approval of a Contract with Trafficware in the Amount of \$2,139,005 for the Palo Alto Traffic Signal Upgrade Project and Approval of Budget Amendment Ordinance 5284 entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto in the Amount of \$915,603 to Transfer Funds from the Citywide Traffic Impact Fee Program to the CIP Program for the Project."	19
5.	Council Appointed Officers Committee Recommendation to Select Recruiting Firm for City Clerk Recruitment	20
6.	Approval of a Utilities Enterprise Fund Contract with Jana Corporation In the Amount of \$107,768 for a Risk Assessment Study of Piping Material in the City's Natural Gas Distribution System, Capital Improvement Program GS-11002, Gas System Improvement	20

7.	Approval of Institute of Museum and Library Services Grant of \$88,010 to Palo Alto Art Center for a Collaborative Project Between the Palo Alto Art Center and the Junior Museum and Zoo			
8.	Resolution 9470 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Authorizing the City Manager to Sign a Memorandum of Understanding on Behalf of the City of Palo Alto, for a Grant of Funds for the State Homeland Security Grant Program State Homeland Security Grant for FY 2013."			
9.	Comprehensive Plan Update: Discussion of the Scope and Schedule of the Planning Process, Including Concurrent Zoning Changes (An initial discussion on this item took place on November 3, 2014 and was expected to continue on November 17, 2014. Staff requests that the item be continued to December 15, 2014)			
Action Items				
10.	Approval of Third Amendment to the Lease Between the Palo Alto Unified School District and the City of Palo Alto at the Cubberley Community Center			
11.	Adoption of an Ordinance Repealing the Prohibition on Human Habitation of Vehicles (Ordinance No. 5206, Codified as Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 9.06.010)			
12.	Approval of the Proposed Grocery Store Tenant (College Terrace Market) Within PC 5069 (College Terrace Centre) Based on the Finding that the Proposed Grocery Tenant Would Likely be Comparable in Quality of Products and Services as JJ&F as it Existed and Operated on December 7, 2009 at 2180 El Camino Real			
13.	Review of City Hall Remodel Project (Continued From November 10, 2014)			
14.	Policy Discussion on Whether to Conduct a Closed Session Prior to an Open Session to Discuss the 2014-2015 Management & Professional Compensation Plan; Possible Referral to Policy & Services Regarding Closed/Open Session Practice for Compensation Matters			
Coun	cil Member Questions, Comments And Announcements135			
AD10	URNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 P.M			

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 5:16 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt arrived @ 5:46 P.M., Klein arrived @ 5:21 P.M,

Kniss, Price, Scharff, Schmid arrived @t 5:46 P.M., Shepherd

Absent: Holman

Study Session

1. Update on Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit Project.

Mayor Shepherd advised that the Council held a Study Session in 2012 regarding Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). In 2013, the City submitted comments regarding the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) scoping report and supported the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) preferred option. VTA was considering dedicated lanes to Embarcadero Road. The Council would receive VTA's report regarding options so that Staff could prepare a letter commenting on the VTA Draft EIR. The Staff Report indicated comments were due by December 15, 2015; however, the correct date was January 14, 2015.

Council Member Price, Council Representative to VTA Board of Directors, introduced John Ristow and Steve Fisher.

Jaime Rodriguez, Transportation Manager, noted the Draft EIR was released approximately two weeks prior to the meeting. Staff requested feedback in order to develop a comment letter for approval by the Council and submission to VTA.

John Ristow, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Administration Director of Planning and Program Development, reported the overall project extended from the Palo Alto Transit Center to the SAP Arena near Diridon Station. The proposed alternatives were composed of varying lengths of dedicated lane. On El Camino Real, VTA proposed repurposing two of the six lanes of travel for BRT. After the comment period, VTA staff would present a preferred alternative to the VTA Board of Directors. VTA staff expected to certify the Final EIR in the late summer of 2015. The intent of the project was to provide a fast, frequent, and reliable BRT system. The corridor had the highest ridership for VTA buses. VTA wished to improve the transit option for the corridor, because of the investments made by cities and private development.

The first roadway configuration featured a painted median busway and stations similar to rail stations with level boarding and all fare payment systems. The mixed flow configuration would have bulbout stations in the Number 3 (outside) lane. While the investment amount was significant, operating costs would be less expensive with extended dedicated lanes. VTA performed a comprehensive review of 82 traffic intersections within the corridor and 165 traffic intersections outside the corridor to determine traffic flow. VTA's traffic demand model forecast ridership and future traffic levels. The traffic demand model included input from the City's General Plan land uses and all current and future roadway and transit networks. The traffic analysis was reviewed in terms of traffic delay and impacts to all 240 intersections. Currently, a bus could travel from Palo Alto to Diridon Station in approximately 85 minutes. In a dedicated travel lane, a bus could travel the entire corridor in 48 minutes. Implementing a dedicated travel lane would result in a 3.7-minute impact to vehicular traffic. A portion of travel trips displaced by a dedicated lane would move to the bus, convert to a different travel mode, or disperse to other streets. In some instances, traffic dispersion to other streets would be small. If the dedicated lane option was chosen, VTA staff would work with City Staff to determine whether to implement on-street parking or a dedicated bike lane. A dedicated bus lane would require signalizing or closing some left-turn lanes. Both options would require some tree removal; however, all trees would be replaced in-kind. VTA staff would work with City Staff to mitigate traffic impacts to intersections; and the project would pay for improvements. scheduled a number of public meetings in various cities and would visit almost all city councils as well. VTA staff wanted feedback from cities along the corridor.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether Staff would present a comment letter to the Council on December 15 rather than December 8, 2014.

Mr. Rodriguez indicated Staff would likely return to the Council by December 15, 2014.

Mayor Shepherd noted VTA's mailing address for individuals to provide their comments directly to VTA.

Vice Mayor Kniss recalled that El Camino Real was a state highway.

Mr. Ristow concurred.

Vice Mayor Kniss inquired about the City's influence over a state highway.

Mr. Ristow explained that the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) had final approval of any improvements made to El Camino Real. VTA was working with Caltrans and held a co-op agreement with Caltrans.

Vice Mayor Kniss reported the City was not the governing board for El Camino Real and, regardless of City comments, Caltrans would make the final decision.

Mr. Ristow added that VTA, as the implementing agency, would decide which alternative it would propose to Caltrans.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, stated the travel time for buses would be competitive with vehicular traffic if the dedicated lane option was chosen. In other cities across the country, BRT that was time competitive with vehicular traffic achieved ridership greater than the amount forecast. She urged the Council to consider the benefits of making the bus time competitive with vehicular traffic.

Herb Borock believed the EIR should compare demographics of prior surveys that indicated the typical bus rider did not own a car. Most traffic along El Camino Real originated outside the City. Analysis of the dedicated bus lanes should include vehicular traffic turning right and crossing dedicated bus lanes. He questioned the purpose of locating traffic signals along Alma Street.

Vanessa Warheit preferred the dedicated lane option and strongly encouraged the addition of bicycle lanes.

Council Member Price assumed mitigations would occur mainly under the dedicated lane scenario.

Mr. Ristow answered yes.

Council Member Price asked if mitigations would be needed under the mixed flow option.

Mr. Ristow responded no.

Council Member Price inquired whether the features of BRT buses would be similar to existing express buses.

Mr. Ristow explained that express buses were designed for longer trips; therefore, BRT buses would be similar to regular buses with interior and exterior bike racks.

Council Member Price inquired about the feasibility and cost of implementing a mixed flow option and then moving toward a dedicated lane option.

Mr. Ristow indicated the cost would include removal of the outside bulb-outs and construction of the interior median busway. Moving from a mixed flow option to a dedicated lane option was possible; however, funds would be expended twice for the same type of project.

Council Member Scharff asked if dedicated lanes would extend beyond Embarcadero Road.

Mr. Ristow replied no.

Council Member Scharff understood VTA had agreed not to extend dedicated lanes into Palo Alto.

Mr. Ristow advised that the City of Mountain View requested VTA study dedicated lanes further into Mountain View and into Palo Alto; therefore, VTA added the alternative.

Council Member Scharff inquired about the real impact of BRT on traffic in Palo Alto.

Mr. Rodriguez reported initial analysis indicated significant impacts to vehicle traffic at intersections crossing Alma Street.

Council Member Scharff believed extending BRT to Palo Alto would not be beneficial.

Mr. Ristow indicated VTA could do nothing or one of the two options. Ridership and effectiveness of a bus in a dedicated lane was important.

Council Member Scharff stated the presentation did not demonstrate the impacts of dedicated lanes to the various locations.

Mr. Ristow explained that he summarized much of the material in the interest of time.

Council Member Scharff remarked that VTA had not provided the City with adequate time or information to review the impacts of dedicated lanes through Palo Alto.

Mr. Ristow reported VTA staff would provide clarification and answer City Staff questions regarding specific details. Information regarding level of service, traffic delay, and traffic impact and diversion was contained in the EIR.

Mayor Shepherd clarified that Staff would prepare the comment letter so that could be measured. The following year, the Council could then evaluate that.

Council Member Scharff asked if Staff would focus on the negative impacts of the various options in the comment letter. City policy prohibited new traffic lights on Alma Street, which seemed to be the primary mitigation for dedicated bus lanes. He questioned whether VTA could include new traffic lights as mitigations when it was against City policy.

Mr. Rodriguez understood the EIR covered many of the points raised by Council Member Scharff. Staff would provide a summary of those concerns in detail. Dedicated lanes into Palo Alto would result in significant impacts. City Staff would discuss larger impacts along Alma Street with VTA staff.

Council Member Klein suggested discussion of the current item end at 6:15. In furtherance of that, he did not comment.

Council Member Berman noted the dedicated lane options removed parking spaces and trees and increased travel time for cars, all of which were unpopular with Palo Alto residents. He requested Staff review all data points in the EIR, particularly level of service.

Mayor Shepherd asked how traffic information would align with the City's outdated traffic models and how they would be influenced by the EIR.

Mr. Rodriguez utilized the same traffic forecast model utilized by VTA. The Council had an influential position into whatever happened with the project, because the City had a representative on the VTA Board. In addition, the City had permitting authority for construction of the project within Palo Alto.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether the data points were the change, which the Council could interpret when updating the Comprehensive Plan. She asked if the City could impose the parking in-lieu fee for the loss of parking spaces as a result of the dedicated lane option.

Mr. Rodriguez explained that the parking in-lieu fee did not apply outside the Downtown District.

Mayor Shepherd assumed growth formulas were taken from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). She requested Staff comment regarding Alma Street mitigations, alignment with the Bicycle Master Plan, impacts to traffic along El Camino Real, and noise impacts and other similar items.

Council Member Burt recalled that in the prior discussion the Council received information regarding the number of cars removed from the road as a result of BRT and the number of vehicles displaced by reduction in capacity.

Mr. Ristow had summarized the results of VTA's analysis of traffic impacts from a dedicated bus lane. That information was contained within the EIR.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the net amount between the number of cars removed from the road and the decreased amount of capacity on El Camino Real was readily available.

Mr. Ristow indicated it was contained in the EIR.

Mr. Rodriguez had not extracted relevant data from the EIR. That information would be presented along with the comment letter.

Council Member Burt asked if Staff had an analysis of the degree of loss of level of service.

Mr. Rodriguez had not compared the prior analysis with the new analysis. He would provide that information with the comment letter.

Council Member Burt asked if Staff would analyze the different levels of numbers of trains per hour and impacts that would occur on roadway level of service degradation in conjunction with dedicated lanes.

Mr. Rodriguez could perform that analysis.

Council Member Burt inquired when Staff would return with the comment letter.

Mr. Rodriguez answered most likely January 12, 2015.

Mayor Shepherd reiterated that the comment deadline was January 14, 2015.

Council Member Burt remarked that Staff would not have much time to revise the comment letter according to Council comments on January 12.

Mayor Shepherd advised that the draft comment letter would be provided in the Council packet released approximately ten days prior to the meeting.

Council Member Burt asked if alternatives would include such items as other means to improve ridership.

Mayor Shepherd requested comments be limited to the EIR.

Council Member Burt explained that he was requesting an alternatives analysis.

Mr. Ristow reported fare scenarios were not evaluated in the EIR. The City could include that in a comment letter.

Council Member Burt wanted alternative means to increase ridership embedded in the alternatives analysis.

Mayor Shepherd reiterated that Staff would present the comment letter to the Council on January 12, 2015. The letter would be released approximately ten days prior to the meeting.

Mr. Rodriguez concurred.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Mayor Shepherd recalled the confusion over Vice Mayor Kniss' telephonic attendance at the prior week's Council meeting. At that meeting, she requested the Acting City Clerk review the past use of telephonic attendance and report the circumstances under which Council Members attended meetings by telephone. In 2007, the Council updated the telephonic attendance policy to discourage attendance by telephone and for use only under extraordinary circumstances. Since 2007, five Council Members had utilized telephonic attendance ten times. It was not clear whether those ten telephonic appearances were the result of emergencies. She suggested the Council consider review of the policy prior to the approval of the City Council Procedures and Protocols Handbook in 2015. New information regarding Agenda Item Number 12 was not available for dissemination in the official materials delivered to the Council the prior week. As this was not a planning application, it did not violate Procedure 3.4. She suggested the Agenda Item be continued to December 12, 2014 in order to provide public notice. In addition, continuing the item would allow the Council to consider comments from the neighborhood meeting scheduled for November 19, 2014.

MOTION: Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Kniss to postpone Agenda Item Number 12 - Approval of the Proposed Grocery Store Tenant (College Terrace Market) Within PC 5069 (College Terrace Centre) Based on the Finding that the Proposed Grocery Tenant Would Likely be Comparable in Quality of Products and Services as JJ&F as it Existed and Operated on December 7, 2009 at 2180 El Camino Real, to December 1, 2014.

Council Member Schmid inquired about public comments for the item.

Mayor Shepherd would allow public comment at the current meeting and again on December 1, 2014.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Holman absent

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether the Council wished to take a dinner break.

Council Member Klein suggested the Council take a break immediately.

Vice Mayor Kniss concurred.

Council took a break from 6:19 P.M. to 6:39 P.M.

City Manager Comments

James Keene, City Manager, announced on November 29, 2014 the Fourth Annual Holiday Tree Lighting would occur. Members of the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) Stakeholder Committee hosted a community meeting on November 15, 2014 to discuss the RPP proposal. A second meeting was scheduled for November 19, 2014. The County of Santa Clara would host a community outreach meeting for the Expressway Study 2040 on November 19, 2014. Palo Alto Fire Department, Santa Clara County Department of Public Health, Santa Clara County Emergency Medical Services Agency, Stanford Hospital, and local, state, and federal agencies reviewed, trained, and updated guidelines to meet the Ebola virus risk. City Staff conducted community outreach meetings related to the Bicycle Plan implementation projects; the next meeting was planned for November 18, 2014. November 13, 2014, local officials and industry leaders commemorated the completion of a new landfill gas-to-energy project in San Joaquin County. A pilot project along El Camino Real involved the installation of solar photovoltaic modules to test the potential for generation of renewable energy. Staff invited Council Members and Council Members-elect to submit three Priorities for 2015. The follow-up discussion of the Comprehensive Plan would be re-noticed for the Council's December 8, 2014 meeting.

Mayor Shepherd clarified that discussion of the Comprehensive Plan was continued from the current meeting to allow Council Member Holman to participate.

Oral Communications

Pete Quiroz recalled the 2010 gas explosion in San Bruno. City Utility employees were disappointed and concerned by a recent management decision to contract gas work to outside contractors. He did not believe these contractors were experienced or skilled in working with natural gas.

Lynn Krug supported Mr. Quiroz's comments and hoped the Council would follow-up on his comments.

Winter Dellenbach invited the public to the Annual Holiday Posada at Buena Vista Mobile Home Park on December 6, 2014.

Terry Holzemer was displeased with the Council's appointments to the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC), Architectural Review Board (ARB), and the Historic Resources Board (HRB) on November 10, 2014. The appointees supported-development, when Palo Alto residents wanted less development.

Brian Anuskwicz indicated the ARB should replace its subjective findings and suggested guidelines with a solid base of rules, regulations, and building standards. A defined review process would allow City Staff to present project applications to the ARB with a standard of review applicable to all applicants.

Cybele Laviuolo-Bhushan viewed Buena Vista Mobile Home Park as the one location with real diversity. The property should not be rezoned.

Suzanne Keen felt the Council did not follow the will of the voters regarding development. Commission and Board members should be diverse.

Bob Moss was disappointed by Council appointments to the PTC and ARB. Residents demonstrated their desire for compatible projects through the Maybell vote and the November election. Mr. Keller was the best informed member of the PTC.

Sea Reddy wanted someone to assist with recounting the votes from the election.

Aram James questioned whether residentialist candidates would include the unhoused members of the community. He suggested residents displeased with Board and Commission appointments attend Board and Commission meetings to express their opinions. He agreed with Council Member Klein's comments about losing an issue.

Minutes Approval

MOTION: Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to approve the minutes of September 8, 2014.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Kniss absent

Consent Calendar

Cybele Laviuolo-Bhushan spoke regarding Agenda Item Number 8. She understood the need for emergency preparedness; however, she did not know what a fusion center was or why the agreement was proposed.

Herb Borock spoke regarding Agenda Item Number 9. He requested the discussion be continued to January 2015 so that new Council Members could participate in the discussion.

James Keene, City Manager, advised that Item Number 9 could be moved from December 15 to December 8, 2014 without removing it from the Consent Calendar.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported a Motion and vote were not needed to change the date for Item Number 9. The City Manager provided a new and updated public notice that the discussion would occur at the earlier time.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-9, with modifying the date of Agenda Item Number 9 from December 15 to December 8, 2014.

- 2. Resolution 9469 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving and Authorizing the Execution of the State of California Department of Community Services and Development October 2014 April 2017 Direct Payment Program Agreement No. 14Y-1419 Governing the City of Palo Alto Utilities Department's Administration of Home Energy Assistance Program Funds".
- 3. Approval of a Construction Contract with G. Bortolotto & Co. Inc., Contractors in the Amount of \$333,824, for the Mitchell Park Parking Lot Project (CIP PE-09003).
- 4. Approval of a Contract with Trafficware in the Amount of \$2,139,005 for the Palo Alto Traffic Signal Upgrade Project and Approval of <u>Budget Amendment Ordinance 5284</u> entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto in the Amount of \$915,603 to Transfer Funds from the Citywide Traffic Impact Fee Program to the CIP Program for the Project."

- 5. Council Appointed Officers Committee Recommendation to Select Recruiting Firm for City Clerk Recruitment.
- 6. Approval of a Utilities Enterprise Fund Contract with Jana Corporation In the Amount of \$107,768 for a Risk Assessment Study of Piping Material in the City's Natural Gas Distribution System, Capital Improvement Program GS-11002, Gas System Improvement.
- 7. Approval of Institute of Museum and Library Services Grant of \$88,010 to Palo Alto Art Center for a Collaborative Project Between the Palo Alto Art Center and the Junior Museum and Zoo.
- 8. Resolution 9470 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Authorizing the City Manager to Sign a Memorandum of Understanding on Behalf of the City of Palo Alto, for a Grant of Funds for the State Homeland Security Grant Program State Homeland Security Grant for FY 2013."
- 9. Comprehensive Plan Update: Discussion of the Scope and Schedule of the Planning Process, Including Concurrent Zoning Changes (An initial discussion on this item took place on November 3, 2014 and was expected to continue on November 17, 2014. Staff requests that the item be continued to December 15, 2014).

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Holman absent

Action Items

10. Approval of Third Amendment to the Lease Between the Palo Alto Unified School District and the City of Palo Alto at the Cubberley Community Center.

James Keene, City Manager, urged the Council to approve the lease amendment. He met with Superintendent Max McGee and negotiated a lease that was responsive to the Council's directions issued in February 2014. The terms of the lease amendment eliminated the Covenant Not to Develop; converted the annual payment into an infrastructure fund for maintenance and capital projects at Cubberley; would expire in five years; required the City and Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) create a Master Plan to guide long-term planning; included a 3 percent annual adjustment towards the remaining portions of the agreement; and shared the risk of potentially losing Foothill College as a tenant.

Mayor Shepherd reiterated that Agenda Item Number 12 was deferred to December 1, 2014.

Joe Hirsch was excited by the lease and hoped the Council endorsed it. Without space at Cubberley, the Cardiac Therapy Foundation could no longer operate. Cardiac Therapy Foundation looked forward to renewing its lease at Cubberley Community Center.

Gary Smith appreciated the City negotiating the lease amendment as he participated in ballroom dancing at Cubberley.

Stephanie Munoz repeated her suggestion that the Council develop rental housing for teachers at Cubberley. Organizations currently located at Cubberley could be located on the ground-floor of an apartment building.

Sea Reddy suggested the Council first repair the roads around Cubberley and maintain rental rates at the current level while making necessary repairs to the buildings.

Council Member Schmid believed schools were the most important element for the City's long-term health and was delighted by the City and PAUSD's efforts to move toward that future. Funds would now be dedicated for capital projects on the site. For the next five years, programs could continue to operate at Cubberley.

MOTION: Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to approve Staff recommendation to authorize the Mayor to sign the Third Amendment to the Lease between the City of Palo Alto and Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD)/(District) in substantially the form as contained in Attachment A, extending the Cubberley Community Center (CCC) lease for an additional five years and updating the financial terms to permit additional City investment in the aging infrastructure of the Cubberley Community Center (CCC).

Council Member Klein was pleased the City had reached an agreement with PAUSD. The lease amendment deleted the Covenant Not to Develop; created funds for maintenance and capital projects; and shared the loss of revenue that could occur when Foothill College moved to its new campus. The most important aspect for the community was continuation of the many programs at Cubberley for the next five years. The Staff Report stated the 35-acre site was the last major plot of publicly owned land in the City proper, which was not true.

Council Member Berman felt the lease amendment was a good resolution to the current phase of community discussion. The exciting discussion of the future and vision for Cubberley could begin. He questioned language regarding use of space for City purposes and paying the appropriate rent to PAUSD.

Mr. Keene indicated the language did not match exactly with language in the lease. The City would be sharing in the proportionate loss.

Council Member Berman was excited to move forward with Cubberley.

Vice Mayor Kniss advised that Cubberley Community Center was an extraordinary asset in need of a facelift. Foothill College moving out of Cubberley would be a major revenue loss for the City. One important area of Cubberley was the playing fields as they were well used. Perhaps another business entity in the community could take advantage of the space occupied by Foothill College after it vacated the premises.

Council Member Scharff believed dedicated funds for infrastructure was a major accomplishment. The agreement provided a framework which would hopefully end with a Master Plan that could be supported by the entire community. The City should keep in mind the importance of Cubberley as a community center and develop guiding principles for a Master Plan.

Council Member Price was particularly interested in joint planning for the site. Joint planning allowed for creativity and community engagement. Cubberley would continue to be a tremendous asset and would serve many generations in the future.

Mayor Shepherd indicated the City was fortunate in that PAUSD did not sell all its unused school sites several years ago. She was grateful the City would have funds to repair and renovate the facilities.

Mr. Keene thanked City Staff for negotiating with PAUSD superintendent and staff.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Holman absent

11. Adoption of an Ordinance Repealing the Prohibition on Human Habitation of Vehicles (Ordinance No. 5206, Codified as Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 9.06.010).

Mayor Shepherd reported Staff requested Council action on an Ordinance in 2011; however, the Council directed Staff to reach out to the faith community to identify partners for solutions. In 2013, the Council passed an Ordinance prohibiting human habitation of vehicles and directed Staff to stay enforcement of the Ordinance for six months. In response to litigation against the City of Los Angeles in December 2013, the Council again delayed enforcement of the Ordinance.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, advised that the Council directed Staff to return with the Ordinance. The Ordinance was enacted but never enforced. The Council had to make a decision regarding the Ordinance and its future. It was essentially a policy question for the Council. Staff expected a legal challenge to any vehicle-type Ordinance that was retained after the court's decision. She and the City Manager recommended the Ordinance be repealed. Should the Council wish to retain some regulation, the Council should direct Staff to return shortly with an Ordinance carefully tailored to the court's guidance.

James Keene, City Manager, reiterated that he and the City Attorney recommended repeal of the Ordinance.

Winter Dellenbach hoped the Ordinance was repealed and not revised. Lack of housing was an economic issue. If the Council wished to revise the Ordinance, it should consider an approach that provided sustainable assistance.

Cybele Laviuolo-Bhushan did not believe an Ordinance in any form was necessary. She requested the Council repeal the Ordinance.

George Mills, Friends of Palo Alto, reported discrimination based on housing status was prohibited. The Ordinance concerned homelessness, not vehicle dwelling.

Diane Guinta urged the Council to repeal the Ordinance. The Ordinance opposed the character of the City. Should problems recur, they could be addressed by the Police Department.

Oliver Terry was homeless, a student at Foothill College, and working with the Downtown Streets Team to locate housing. He did not want a criminal record for being homeless.

Diane Jones explained that a vehicle was a good alternative when you were too poor to afford a rental. She would lose her disability income if she were convicted under the Ordinance, and her son would not be able to attend college with a conviction.

Sea Reddy recommended the Council be proactive in trying to solve homelessness. The community was also responsible for creating a solution.

Stephanie Munoz stated the Council had the right to determine where a vehicle could or could not park. Car dwellers should be allowed to park at Cubberley or in City parking garages.

Wayne Douglass supported repeal of the Ordinance.

Aram James encouraged the Council to repeal the Vehicle Habitation Ordinance. The court decision mentioned some of the constitutional violations that could be raised in a legal challenge to the Ordinance.

Edie Keating supported repeal of the Ordinance. In the prior 11 months, Palo Alto had not become a magnet for car dwellers. Perhaps the Council could limit vehicle size much as it limited home size.

Barbara Goodwin referred to the homeless program in Santa Barbara and suggested Council Members explore it.

Lois Salo indicated repeal of the Ordinance was constitutionally correct.

Council Member Berman inquired whether the likelihood of a lawsuit was high if the Council directed Staff to begin enforcing the Ordinance.

Ms. Stump reported a legal team indicated its willingness to challenge the Ordinance in the latter months of 2013. A legal challenge was likely if the Council directed enforcement of the Ordinance.

Council Member Berman asked if the first move by plaintiffs would be to obtain an injunction to prevent enforcement of the Ordinance during the course of a legal proceeding.

Ms. Stump advised that the legal team indicated they would do that.

Council Member Berman believed the options were enforce the Ordinance and face a lawsuit or repeal the Ordinance. One good result of the Ordinance was the discussion regarding homeless issues. Many of the concerns that led to the adoption of the Ordinance had been ameliorated through other means.

MOTION: Council Member Berman moved, seconded by Council Member Price to adopt an ordinance repealing the prohibition on Vehicle Habitation (Ordinance No. 5206, codified at Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 9.06.010), enforcement of which has been continuously stayed since its adoption in August 2013, while continuing to monitor conditions and impacts on residents.

Council Member Price concurred with Council Member Berman. Given comments from Staff and the community, repealing the Ordinance was the correct and compassionate action. The lack of services for the homeless remained. She asked if comments directing Staff to explore alternative programs and services would be germane at the current time.

Ms. Stump reported comments requesting an item return on a future Agenda was appropriate. It was not proper for the Council to take action on another topic, because the Agenda Item was narrowly described.

Council Member Price wished to direct Staff to identify additional programs serving the homeless including the Santa Barbara program and other city and/or nonprofit partnerships that had been successful in other communities.

Ms. Stump indicated that direction should be placed on a future Council Agenda so that notice could be provided to the public.

Council Member Price requested Staff address her comments at a future meeting.

Ms. Stump advised that the Council could consider whether it wished to set that as a future Agenda Item.

Mr. Keene explained that Staff would place an item on a future Agenda, at which time the Council would decide whether to act on the item. Staff would not perform any research on the issue until the Council directed them to do so.

Council Member Berman requested Council Member Price make her comments under the topic of Council Member Questions, Comments, and Announcements. At that time, he would support her proposal.

Council Member Price wanted the Council to take some action that had meaning and generated positive outcomes.

Council Member Schmid recalled that the Council approved an expenditure of \$250,000 regarding homelessness. He understood those funds would be matched by County of Santa Clara (County) funds for a program in North Santa Clara County. He inquired about knowledge gained from monitoring the program.

Ms. Stump remarked that Community Services Staff could provide specific information regarding that program. The reference to monitoring conditions and impacts was a reflection of the ongoing administrative work performed to address the myriad issues related to homelessness. The item was not agendized for an extensive exploration of those issues.

Council Member Schmid noted the Staff Report specified that the two Motions were passed at the same time and the intention was to link those two Motions.

Mr. Keene inquired about the level of specificity Council Member Schmid sought. The phrase applied to both aspects of the Motion; the impact to residents by the repeal of the Ordinance and the impact of the funding provided to the County. The County program was designed to provide a bit of relief related to housing.

Council Member Schmid remarked that the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget would make decisions about funding for the program; therefore, the Council should have a report regarding conditions and impacts.

Mr. Keene indicated the Council could assume Staff would report on that aspect. In Budget discussions, Staff could identify the effectiveness of the first year and funding implications for the second year.

Council Member Scharff inferred from the Staff Report that repeal of the Ordinance was possible because outreach had been effective. However, the Staff Report did not indicate that spending the \$250,000 had been effective. He hoped Staff would report on expenditure of the funds as they appeared to have been spent primarily on hiring somebody. He inquired whether the City of Menlo Park had repealed its Ordinance.

Ms. Stump believed the City of Menlo Park had a different type of regulatory program which was no overnight parking in residential neighborhoods. Information from the original discussions in 2012 and 2013 indicated most jurisdictions in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties had some type of regulation.

Council Member Scharff asked if other jurisdictions were revising, repealing, or ignoring their Ordinances.

Ms. Stump reported the court decision applied specifically to a Los Angeles Ordinance, which was 30 years old and contained archaic language not contained in other Bay Area Ordinances. Lawyers would disagree about the extent to which the decision applied. A group of plaintiffs would need to decide to challenge an Ordinance in order to require a jurisdiction to review an Ordinance. Because Palo Alto was one of the last communities to act, the plaintiffs' legal community had focused on Palo Alto and indicated they would challenge Palo Alto's Ordinance.

Council Member Scharff did not believe the Police Department had received many complaints in the prior year and inquired about the exact number of complaints.

Ms. Stump advised that some complaints similar to those that prompted the discussion had been made. The \$250,000 amount could not and had not eliminated all problems related to homelessness. The City did not track that type of complaint and should not, because it would require emergency service workers to make a classification. Citizens also should not make that type of classification. Acute concerns that motivated Council action had eased due to other circumstances; however, some concerns remained in the community. Staff would need to work with the Police Department and Community Services to help citizens resolve their concerns.

Vice Mayor Kniss recalled the Policy and Services Committee discussion was contentious because of problems at Cubberley. Those problems were much better now. She inquired whether anyone was fined under the Ordinance.

Ms. Stump replied no. The Ordinance was never applied and never enforced.

Vice Mayor Kniss noted no one personally spoke in support of retaining the Ordinance. Peninsula Healthcare Connections had been hired for the homeless program. The Santa Barbara program was operated by a nonprofit organization and utilized parking lots located on the outskirts of the city or county. She suggested the Council provide Staff with definitive direction to explore alternative programs. She would not feel comfortable supporting the Motion without the additional discussion of exploring alternative programs. She inquired about the difference between no overnight parking in residential neighborhoods and the current Ordinance. The City was considering a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) Program.

Ms. Stump explained that a no-parking restriction was very different legally from a vehicle habitation ordinance. Briefly, the issue raised before the court was clarity of the vehicle habitation law. That type of vulnerability did not exist in a no-parking restriction.

Vice Mayor Kniss was concerned that an RPP Program could exacerbate or alter the problem.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member XXX to refer this back to Policy and Services Committee to discuss an updated Ordinance and should it include differential about size of vehicle.

MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Council Member Klein believed repealing the Ordinance was a mistake for a variety of reasons. The community would not like repealing the Ordinance. There had not been a final legal determination that the Ordinance was unconstitutional. He agreed with public comment that the issue was vehicle dwellers, not homelessness. Some people preferred to live in vehicles. Police officers should not determine whether car dwellers were homeless or choosing an alternative lifestyle. The social welfare agency for the area was the County, not the City. The City could not solve the homeless problem alone. The City should not take the lead in abolishing the Ordinance as it would send a message that Palo Alto was open to vehicle habitation. The City should not submit to legal threats.

Council Member Burt recalled that the community identified two problems: the number and behavior of additional car dwellers at Cubberley and limited means to enforce existing Ordinances. The Council's response moved from one extreme to another. He suggested the Council convene a stakeholder group perhaps led by the Human Relations Commission and Staff to identify issues and prospective solutions. He questioned whether vehicle size could be limited and whether the City should engage surrounding communities for a subregional approach to services. He requested Staff explore alternative ways to provide essential services, such as showers and bathrooms, for vehicle dwellers efficiently, cost effectively, and with the least impact. The Council should frame the discussion broadly enough to allow for those topics.

Mayor Shepherd was impressed by the debate and the strategic plan that came out of the original discussion of the Ordinance. She had referred two or three email complaints to the Police Department regarding vehicle habitation. She had heard of people who appeared to be renting vehicles for overnight habitation. She would support the Motion, because people had the right to be safe in a car. She understood the Ordinance provided an ability to identify and offer services to car dwellers. She looked forward to additional discussions around solutions.

MOTION PASSED: 7-1 Klein no, Holman absent

12. Approval of the Proposed Grocery Store Tenant (College Terrace Market) Within PC 5069 (College Terrace Centre) Based on the Finding that the Proposed Grocery Tenant Would Likely be Comparable in Quality of Products and Services as JJ&F as it Existed and Operated on December 7, 2009 at 2180 El Camino Real.

This item was continued to December 1, 2014.

Council took a break from 8:59 P.M. to 9:05 P.M.

13. Review of City Hall Remodel Project (Continued From November 10, 2014).

James Keene, City Manager, reported the Council passed unanimously the item on June 16, 2014 as part of the Consent Calendar. On August 4, 2014, Council Members requested it be scheduled as an Action Item. Staff did not recommend a specific action other than to continue with the City Hall Remodel Project (Project) as approved. The Council seemed to want a public discussion and review of the item. Items on the Consent Calendar were publicly noticed, contained written reports, and could be removed from the Consent Calendar. The Consent Calendar complied with the Brown Act and was a means to manage the workload of the Council. The Project was He could argue that providing adequate public space had long overdue. more value than "behind the scenes" investments. A project that improved the effectiveness of City Hall should be considered in conjunction with the infrastructure strategy. The Project was built into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) over a number of years and vetted by the Council on numerous occasions. The first floor was dead space, ineffective, and unattractive. The Project included space and technology for 21st century public participation, several new public meeting spaces, and a new Council Conference Room. The Project improved facilities to comply with Code requirements. Customer service functions would move to the first floor of City Hall for easier public access. Human Resources (HR) Staff and Information Technology (IT) Staff would be consolidated. The Project included public art and elevator renovations and upgrades in signage. An interactive digital piece of art was scheduled for Council approval. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Budget contained a CIP project at an estimated cost of \$2.7 million. The contract amount was increased to \$4.5 million because of the change in pricing; however, that amount included \$250,000 that was returned to the Infrastructure Reserve. Costs for furniture and furnishings were originally to be billed to departments, but those costs were later included in the total cost for the Project. The CIP cost adopted in June 2013 for FY 2014 was an out-of-date estimate for the Project. The April 2014 prebid engineering estimate updated the cost to \$3.8 million. Bids submitted for the Project were slightly more than 20 percent above Staff's estimate. Because of rapidly increasing costs, the difficulty of working in a public building, errors in the original estimate, and the difficulty of small firms to obtain a bond, Staff concluded that the contract amount was fair. Staff then began looking for and found legitimate methods to pay for the increased cost. The Council Conference Room and the HR Conference Room would accommodate meetings more easily, allow for better interaction, and include video and broadcast technology.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether Staff was required to obtain Council approval of contracts totaling more than \$85,000.

Mr. Keene answered yes.

Mayor Shepherd explained that a Committee vote unanimously approving an item moved the item to the Council's Consent Calendar unless the Committee requested it be placed on the Agenda as an Action Item.

Mr. Keene indicated the Council had the discretion to remove an item from the Consent Calendar.

Mayor Shepherd clarified that three Council Members had to support removal of an item from the Consent Calendar. The Council then discussed the item with the same Staff Report.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, added that other types of Resolutions and sometimes Ordinances were appropriate for placement on the Consent Calendar. Members of the public always had an opportunity to speak to items on the Consent Calendar.

Wayne Douglass was pleased with the City Manager's review of the item.

Stephanie Munoz felt the remodel of City Hall was trivial compared to other problems in the community. The money could be spent on more worthwhile projects.

Herb Borock inquired about the cumulative amounts expended on August 4, October 20, November 10, and November 17, 2014, each date the Council was scheduled to hear the item. The Council should learn what happened when it had concerns about the cost of a project yet postponed the Agenda Item while project expenditures continued.

Council Member Price asked if the Project was not required to have prevailing wage, because it was 100 percent City funded.

Brad Eggleston, Public Works Assistant Director, replied yes, the City was not required to pay prevailing on the Project. The engineer's estimate for construction costs assumed a non-prevailing wage contractor; however, the contractor generally was a prevailing wage contractor.

Council Member Price was disappointed with the Resolution exempting the City from prevailing wage.

Council Member Klein did not understand the means by which the item was placed on the Council's Agenda and requested an explanation.

Mr. Keene clarified that at the August 4, 2014 meeting, Council Members Holman and Burt and possibly Council Member Schmid requested the item be agendized. At that time, he stated that Staff would return with an informational item as the Project was already underway.

Ms. Stump added that the Council was essentially receiving a report.

Council Member Klein inquired about the number of contracts let.

Mr. Keene advised that two contracts had not been let; one for the public art project totaling \$174,000 and one for wayfinding totaling approximately \$307,000.

Council Member Klein believed the Council followed its procedures. Any large building needed capital investment regularly. City Managers since construction of City Hall had indicated it was inadequate. All previous improvement projects for City Hall had been placed on the Consent Calendar. Projects totaling more than \$2.7 million were routinely placed on the Consent Calendar. Council Members knew the procedure for removing an item from the Consent Calendar. Approval of the contract was conducted according to Council procedures.

Council Member Schmid had requested the item be agendized. The City Manager's review was useful and valuable. A contract totaling \$4 million placed on the Consent Calendar raised questions. The contract was an investment in the City's future, which was important to him. An item on the Consent Calendar did not necessarily alert the public to events affecting them. A \$4 million contract concerning the public's property was more appropriate for an Action Item.

Council Member Burt believed consolidating IT Staff would result in efficiency. He asked if the City could abandon the space formerly occupied by IT Staff.

Mr. Keene did not know the term of the lease for the space; however, Utilities Staff would backfill that space.

Council Member Burt indicated the explanation was informative and useful. The Project involved primarily upgrades and secondarily maintenance to City Hall. The City should not only justify projects in and of themselves but also in relation to other community needs. The Council owed the public a greater accountability for a project affecting community space.

Mayor Shepherd noted Council Members had not mentioned any action on the item. The Council had been aware of the Project for several years. During the economic downturn, bids were submitted under budget.

Council Member Scharff observed three members of the public remained for discussion of the item; although, it was a contentious topic during the campaign. He did not recall receiving a single email on the topic for the meeting.

Mayor Shepherd advised that the Council received one email requesting the item be discussed earlier in the meeting.

Council Member Scharff felt the City needed to invest in City Hall. City Hall had other maintenance needs as well. He inquired about work needed on the plaza.

Mr. Eggleston reported the Civic Center Plaza deck was identified as needing work on the waterproofing. One cost estimate totaled \$16 million for the project.

Mr. Keene agreed that the Project concerned improvement to the space and remediation of bad design. The issue seemed to be the cost increase. Staff identified funds that were not easily fungible to pay for the cost increase. Staff would return to the Council for approval of contracts for the public art and wayfinding. Staff could place those contracts on the Consent Calendar.

Council Member Klein explained that City Hall was designed in an era when public protests and demonstrations were common; therefore, the building was designed not to welcome the public.

14. Policy Discussion on Whether to Conduct a Closed Session Prior to an Open Session to Discuss the 2014-2015 Management & Professional Compensation Plan; Possible Referral to Policy & Services Regarding Closed/Open Session Practice for Compensation Matters.

James Keene, City Manager, reported the Management and Professional Compensation Plan (Plan) was the pay plan for 200 Management and Professional Staff, excluding four Council Appointed Officers (CAO). Management and Professional Staff did not have an approved Plan for the current fiscal year. The Council requested he postpone his compensation recommendations during Budget hearings, because of pending negotiations with the Service Employees International Union (SEIU). Depending on Council action in the current discussion, Staff would return to the Council for action regarding the Plan.

Staff recommended the Council continue its practice of discussing Management and Professional Staff compensation in Closed Session and refer the larger question to the Policy and Services Committee for discussion related to Management and Professional Staff and other bargaining groups. Staff would notice the Closed Session for the next Council meeting. Council directions given to Staff during the Closed Session would be placed on the Council Agenda for action at the following meeting. After the Closed Session, Staff would meet with representatives of Management and Professional Staff to advise them of the Council's likely action at the Open Session.

Herb Borock suggested the City Manager's initial recommendation regarding compensation for an employee group should be made public and included in the packet for the Closed Session. The Council's deliberations and subsequent City Manager recommendations would continue to be made in Closed Session. Alternatively, offers and counteroffers exchanged between the City and employee groups during negotiations could be made public. A third alternative would be for City and employee group negotiations be held in public if employee groups agreed. Information regarding the Management Compensation Committee would be useful.

Bob Moss felt Staff should publicly present the range of salaries for categories of Staff and compare salaries with private industry and other cities. City negotiations with employee groups should be held in private. The City should inform the public first, so that the public could provide feedback.

Stephanie Munoz remarked that the public should be made aware of negotiation terms as they were exchanged rather than simply being informed of the results.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to accept Staff recommendation to:

- 1) Continue the current practice of discussing appropriate elements of the FY 2015 proposed Management & Professional Compensation Plan ("Plan") in closed session as permitted under the Ralph M. Brown Act ("Brown Act"), followed by a presentation, discussion and adoption of the Plan in open session as an Action Item.
- 2) Refer to the Policy and Services Committee the discussion of alternatives regarding the use and sequence of closed and open sessions for discussing compensation and benefits changes for the various labor groups and the unrepresented Management and Professional group.

Council Member Price indicated it was important to proceed with practices as outlined. Because Professional and Management Staff was the only unrepresented employee group, it was inappropriate to hold compensation discussions in Open Session. The Council needed a thorough discussion of alternatives in order to understand implications to Staff and various labor groups.

Council Member Burt did not want to create new policy without a thorough review and discussion. Mr. Borock's suggestions would be helpful in framing alternatives for consideration by the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Scharff understood the issue was holding Closed Sessions for negotiations with labor groups but Open Sessions for discussion of compensation for Professional and Management Staff. Negotiating with labor groups in public would present a host of issues and should be referred to the Policy and Services Committee. There was no negotiation with Professional and Management Staff; therefore, compensation could be discussed in public. With respect to the note that Professional and Management Staff were working without a Plan, more than likely the Council would make any new Plan retroactive. There was no disadvantage to discussing a Plan in public.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member XXX to: 1) discuss proposed Management and Professional Compensation in public session; and 2) refer to the Policy and Services Committee the discussion of alternatives regarding the use and sequence of closed and open sessions for discussing compensation and benefits changes for the various labor groups and the unrepresented Management and Professional group.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF SECOND

Vice Mayor Kniss believed an open discussion at the Policy and Services Committee would be useful.

Council Member Schmid commented that the public knew more details of Staff compensation than of any private entity. He asked if Vice Mayor Kniss recalled the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) holding public negotiations in 1990.

Vice Mayor Kniss did not.

Council Member Schmid referred to PAUSD as an example of public negotiations. Public negotiations could create bad feelings between City workers and the public.

While salary increases for public employees were modest, benefits were growing twice as fast. He questioned whether public negotiations could lead to a better understanding of salaries and real wages. A discussion at the Policy and Services Committee would be helpful.

Council Member Berman remarked that similar discussions were occurring in other cities along the Peninsula.

Mayor Shepherd expressed concern about referring the question to the Policy and Services Committee given the length of its Agenda. She supported treating Professional and Management Staff as though they were an organized labor group. Compensation terms were always made public once an agreement was reached.

Mr. Keene clarified that he and the Chair of the Policy and Services Committee would schedule the Open Session/Closed Session discussion at a convenient time rather than on December 9, 2014 as mentioned in the Staff Report.

Council Member Scharff asked if the City Manager anticipated holding a discussion at the Policy and Services Committee prior to the end of the year.

Mr. Keene would work with the Chair to determine a date.

MOTION PASSED: 7-1 Scharff no, Holman absent

Council Member Ouestions, Comments And Announcements

Vice Mayor Kniss announced the Bay Area Air Quality Management District kicked off the Spare the Air campaign. There was some discussion of banning smoking of meats outdoors.

Council Member Klein could continue to serve on the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) even though his Council term would end on December 31, 2014; however, he felt it was more appropriate to resign his appointment. He requested an Agenda Item in December to name his successor. He interpreted the Council Policies and Procedures as the individual Council Member had the discretion to determine whether he could participate in a Council meeting by telephone. The confusion at the November 10, 2014 Council meeting was unfortunate. Council Member Schmid and he urged the Council to change the Charter to end Council Member terms early in December; however, a majority of the Council did not agree. Council Members were mandated to do their best and to vote their conscience, which he would do until he left office on December 31, 2014.

Council Member Berman attended a joint event hosted by the Art Center and Rinconada Library. The public art located between the two buildings was brilliant.

Council Member Scharff was elected Vice President of the Santa Clara County Cities Association for the upcoming year.

Council Member Price requested Staff work with the Human Relations Commission (HRC), other cities, and nonprofit agencies to convene a summit of innovative homelessness programs and partnerships including, but not limited to, the Santa Barbara Safe Parking Program and the San Francisco Mobile Shower Units.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, explained that Council Members could request an item be placed on the Council's Agenda to consider directions to Staff to perform the work.

Council Member Klein suggested Council Member Price limit her proposal to a general statement.

Ms. Stump agreed that a broader description of an Agenda Item was often better. Staff would retain Council Member Price's proposal as notes for the item. A broader description would allow for more ideas to be brought forward.

Council Member Burt asked if a Motion was permitted in the current item.

Ms. Stump responded no. Council Members could agendize an item for a future discussion.

Mayor Shepherd asked if there was support for the concept.

Council Member Schmid supported a broad Agenda Item regarding homelessness.

Ms. Stump explained that the proposal was an oral Colleagues' Memo to place on a future Agenda a discussion of issues related to homelessness, county services, and related matters.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether support by two Council Members was sufficient to agendize an item.

Ms. Stump replied yes. Staff would shape an Agenda Item that would allow a broad discussion.

Council Member Burt asked if the Agenda Item would allow discussion of improving or modifying existing enforcement regulations.

Ms. Stump answered no. Enforcement was related to unlawful conduct rather than homelessness.

Council Member Burt asked if vehicle dwelling would be acceptable for both support and enforcement programs.

Ms. Stump inquired whether Council Member Burt wished to discuss vehicle dwelling.

Council Member Burt understood vehicle dwelling was going to be the primary focus of the Agenda Item.

Mr. Keene believed vehicle dwelling should be included.

Ms. Stump preferred the term vehicle dwelling to the term homelessness, and recommended substituting the terms.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the Council could discuss social service initiatives to support needs as well as potential ways to support neighborhoods under the Agenda Item.

Ms. Stump replied yes.

Council Member Price felt the earlier statement was more global and would allow more discussion.

Mr. Keene understood the Council's intent was to allow a discussion of issues pertaining to vehicle dwelling, homelessness, and related services.

Council Member Schmid noted homelessness was in both his and Council Member Price's original comments.

Ms. Stump suggested substituting vehicle dwelling for homelessness because of Council Member Burt's interest in quality of life, criminal enforcement. Enforcement was not and should not be directly related to homelessness. She asked if Council Member Schmid wanted to discuss other types of social services related to community people without homes.

Mr. Keene suggested "county services and related homeless services."

Council Member Schmid reiterated that both Council Member Price and he specifically stated homelessness.

City Clerk	Mayor			
ATTEST:	APPROVED:			
ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 P.M.				
Ms. Stump agreed.				
Council Member Berman suggested "rela	ted services for the unhoused."			

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.