Special Meeting February 17, 2015

Action Items482			
1.	Discussion and Potential Action on:	482	
1A).	Discussion and Potential Action on Procedures and Protocols	482	
1B).	Discussion and Potential Action on Meeting Management	487	
1C).	Discussion and Potential Action on Committees	488	
1D).	Discussion and Potential Action on Staff Relations	491	
Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 P.M503			

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Community Meeting Room at 5:05 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Schmid, Wolbach

arrived at 5:19 P.M.

Absent: Scharff

Vice Mayor Schmid inquired about procedures for a Committee of the Whole meeting.

Mayor Holman explained that procedures for a Committee of the Whole meeting were similar to those for a Council meeting. Proceedings would be slightly less formal.

Action Items

- 1. Discussion and Potential Action on:
 - A. Procedures and Protocols
 - B. Meeting Management
 - C. Committees
 - D. Staff Relations

1A). Discussion and Potential Action on Procedures and Protocols

Roger Smith spoke to Item 1A. Public comment should be limited to two minutes. Agenda Items allowing public comment should be placed first on the Agenda. Each Agenda Item should have a time limit. If an item exceeded the time limit, it should be moved to the end of the Agenda.

Herb Borock spoke regarding Item 1A. He reviewed procedures and protocols of past Councils.

Mayor Holman noted a few Council Members had submitted Procedures and Protocols items for consideration by the Policy and Services Committee.

James Keene, City Manager, advised that the meeting materials contained a summation of Meeting Management and Procedures and Protocols from the Retreat discussion. Staff received supplemental information from Vice Mayor Schmid and Mayor Holman.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported that Council Members had raised the issue of data analysis and research that had not been prepared and presented as part of the Staff Report. This issue could have legal, policy, and operational implications which the Council needed to discuss and

possibly institute additional guidelines for. She was most concerned about the potential for legal issues to be implicated in a quasi-judicial matter. Typically Council Members acted as a legislative body that set policy, at which time the Council had broader discretion. From time to time, the Council acted as a quasi-judicial body and made decisions regarding a particular item to which existing laws should be applied. In a quasi-judicial proceeding, constitutional principles of due process applied. The parties appearing before the Council had a right to be heard and the right to obtain a decision based on the record before the Council. When new items were added to the record, they had to be added in a way that honored due process rights. The Council could discuss various ways to do that. Partly it would be a question of timing. The Council should consider additional elements of disclosure that were made when a due process item was called.

Mayor Holman added that new information should be presented sooner.

Ms. Stump stated that adding new information to the record the night of the decision had implications. Legally, the key implication was that the parties were receiving the information for the first time. The parties had a right to understand that the decision could in part be based on that new information. Therefore, parties needed time to understand, absorb, and respond to the new information. If new information was added at a meeting, the Council would need to reschedule its final decision to another night so that parties would have an opportunity to respond to the new information. The information could be presented earlier in the process, such that the Council could hear and resolve the item at the scheduled time.

Mayor Holman reiterated that topics would be referred to the Policy and Services Committee. The City Attorney suggested writing a summary of potentialities, risks, and opportunities for submission to the full Council.

Ms. Stump wanted to prepare a primer for the Council regarding the full issue of due process. She did not mean to imply there were unaddressed problems; however, due process was an important duty of the Council.

Mayor Holman clarified that Staff was attempting to avoid problems rather than addressing existing problems.

Vice Mayor Schmid assumed the City Attorney was not concerned about reinterpretation of old data or presentation of data that might have been presented in a different context. The City Attorney was concerned about new data that had not been publicized in a Council packet in the history of the Council.

Ms. Stump explained that in the context of a due process matter, new data was narrower. New data pertained to the record before the Council. If a

Council Member identified relevant data in work from the previous year and wished to rely on that data, the data should be placed in the record in a due process matter.

Vice Mayor Schmid asked if Council Members could mention only information that Staff had presented. That would be a constraint.

Ms. Stump clarified that due process concerned information on which the Council would base its decision. The parties were entitled to know all information the Council would consider in making its decision. A quasijudicial proceeding was very different from policy making. In a quasi-judicial proceeding, the Council would take existing laws and apply them to a particular application or project before the Council. Negative policy implications from existing rules were often revealed through due process. The law did not allow the Council to change the rules and apply the new rules to the project. The applicant was entitled to know the rules and the information the Council would consider. If Council Members wished to consider information that was not part of the record, then all parties had to be provided with the information and be allowed to respond to it.

Vice Mayor Schmid remarked that having the packet earlier would allow Council Members to raise issues publicly. He asked if Council Members could make information a part of the record simply by mentioning it.

Ms. Stump concurred that the early packet release would allow items to remain on the Agenda while adding to the record. Staff and the Council should discuss ways to add information to the record. Adding information had implications for Staff.

Council Member DuBois felt it was critical for City Commissions and Boards to understand due process as well. If a Board or Commission failed to question an issue, then it would be missing from the record.

Ms. Stump advised that if a Council Member believed an important issue had not been fully reviewed by a Commission or Board, then that issue could be added at the Council level. Boards and Commissions should thoroughly review all issues. Staff should also thoroughly prepare issues.

Council Member DuBois reiterated that Boards and Commissions should understand due process as well.

Ms. Stump concurred.

Mayor Holman suggested Council Members other than members of the Policy and Services Committee ask questions. Members of the Policy and Services

Committee could ask questions at the Policy and Services Committee meeting.

Mr. Keene presumed only 20 percent of the Council's work concerned due process. Perhaps Staff could implement a method to clearly distinguish legislative and due process items on the Agenda. The City Attorney was focusing on specific circumstances that could be problematic if the Council did not follow procedures.

Ms. Stump concurred with 20 percent of the Council's work falling under due process. People brought their life experiences, general knowledge, and intelligence to bear on a record before them. Her comments reflected a new Council and Commission approach to research or data development.

Council Member Burt commented that the Council was not restricted from presenting new information, but that information needed to be provided in advance to parties, the public, and decision makers.

Ms. Stump agreed. As a policy matter, strong interests were served by ensuring information was provided to parties, the public, and decision makers. Legally, only people who had property interests at stake were entitled to that information.

Council Member Burt requested his Colleagues express their interest in the Policy and Services Committee discussing recommendations for similar circumstances in a legislative hearing. Procedures were binding; protocols were agreed upon practices.

Ms. Stump did not find a bright line between procedures and protocols when reading the document. The Council adopted the Procedures and Protocols document to guide its behavior. The document sometimes required interpretation. The document was a set of guidelines that the Council had to interpret and apply to itself.

Council Member Burt questioned whether the Policy and Services Committee should explore a recommended practice for Council Members to share substantive materials relevant to a legislative discussion.

Mayor Holman felt the Policy and Services Committee should discuss that. If a body of evidence had been discovered, it should be disclosed.

Council Member DuBois suggested a Council Member using his personal experience rather than information could be tricky.

Council Member Kniss remarked that the chances of being sued were good if the Council did not follow due process. Information from a quasi-judicial proceeding could be presented in a court of law.

Council Member DuBois was discussing broadening beyond the due process.

Ms. Stump stated Council Member DuBois wanted to go beyond what was being requested.

Council Member Kniss would say far less in a quasi-judicial proceeding than in other proceedings.

Vice Mayor Schmid preferred to be light-handed on the legislative issue. In order to respond to public comment, the Council had to be flexible in its responses.

Council Member Burt did not understand Vice Mayor Schmid's concern. The discussion did not concern constraining Council Members' ability to respond. He questioned whether Council Members should share new data relevant to a legislative matter in advance.

Vice Mayor Schmid was referring to a Council Member recalling a piece of information in response to public comment.

Ms. Stump added that Council Members should share information with colleagues, Staff, and the public. That would allow Council Members to be more effective and inclusive.

Mr. Keene reported Staff discussed advancing the release of packets so that the Council and public had more time to prepare for meetings. The Council should consider customs for Council interaction. The Policy and Services Committee could explore boundaries for providing information and for altering Council discussion to allow assimilation of information.

Mayor Holman inquired whether Council Members could submit suggestions for Policy and Services Committee discussion subsequent to the meeting.

Ms. Stump answered yes.

Mr. Keene remarked that the Council governed itself by adopting procedures and protocols. If the Council wished to memorialize a decision, then it could be incorporated into the Procedures and Protocols document.

Mayor Holman suggested the Council provide direction to the Policy and Services Committee regarding additional Committee of the Whole meetings.

Council Member Burt noted the Council held straw polls at the Retreat to refer a number of items to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member DuBois reported pages 22 and 23 of the Retreat Minutes indicated the Council referred guidelines for telephone participation, review

of rules regarding consent items, and clarification of the roles of Staff and Council Members in Agenda setting to the Policy and Services Committee.

Mayor Holman added that her notes from the Retreat indicated all items under Number 1, Procedures and Protocols, on the handout were referred to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member DuBois clarified that items under Numbers 1 and 2 were referred to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Kniss recalled public comment regarding procedure and protocol changes. Council procedures and protocols evolved and changed and would continue to change.

1B). Discussion and Potential Action on Meeting Management

Mayor Holman requested suggestions other than those discussed at the Retreat.

Vice Mayor Schmid noted page 24 of the Retreat Minutes stated all Meeting Management items would be referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member DuBois did not believe the Council voted to refer all items to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Wolbach recalled that the Council agreed not to make any decisions after Council Member Scharff left the Retreat.

Mayor Holman again requested suggestions for Policy and Services Committee consideration.

Council Member DuBois inquired whether a Motion was needed to refer topics to the Policy and Services Committee.

Mayor Holman wanted to hold Motions until the end of the item. In light of full Council Agendas and the inability to schedule a second meeting for the Committee of the Whole, she requested Council Members not repeat comments, remain on point, and offer concise comments during meetings.

Council Member Burt interpreted policies as rules and protocols as practices. If protocols could be practices, then Mayor Holman's request could be added to guidelines for the Council. That would not constrain Council Members' comments, but it could remind Council Members to avoid those issues. He suggested referral of that topic to the Policy and Services Committee; however, any discussion would be meaningful only with clarification of policy versus protocol.

Mayor Holman stated that her comments were not intended to curtail anyone's right to speak or to participate in a meeting. It was a matter of being efficient and effective.

Council Member Wolbach did not believe the Council decided to send any items to the Policy and Services Committee for consideration. He asked if the Council had decided not to refer items of Meeting Management to the Policy and Services Committee.

Mayor Holman explained that she had requested Motions be offered at the end of the discussion.

1C). Discussion and Potential Action on Committees

Council Member DuBois asked if Council Members had proposed any topics at the Retreat.

Mayor Holman recalled three suggestions from the Retreat. In 2014, the Regional Housing Mandate Committee committed to continue review of housing sites and to provide comments regarding housing mandates and the Density Bonus Law to lobbyists. Currently the Regional Housing Mandate Committee was inactive. Without a Regional Housing Mandate Committee, the Council should assign those tasks to another body. She questioned whether the body should be the Policy and Services Committee, the Council, or an ad hoc Subcommittee of the Council.

Council Member Berman asked if the Comprehensive Plan process would be appropriate for that discussion.

Mayor Holman did not believe the legislative aspect was a part of the Comprehensive Plan process. Housing sites were typically Zoning issues.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, advised that Staff made a commitment in preparing the Housing Element to consider eliminating sites in the southern part of the City, adding new sites, or increasing densities. Staff included those issues in the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Mr. Keene indicated the Council was faced with what it wanted to accomplish and how to accomplish it. The question of Committees fell under that discussion. The Council should question the role of Committees for the Council. A particular Committee was not needed to solve a particular problem. The Density Bonus Law could be handled through the Council legislative process.

Council Member Burt had intended to add the Density Bonus Law to the legislative Agenda. The Council could handle the legislative aspect, and

housing sites could be folded into the Comprehensive Plan. Some important issues could be referred to the City/School Liaison Committee for deeper collaboration and policy discussions with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) Board. Perhaps the City/School Liaison Committee could advise the Council with respect to Project Safety Net, planning for Cubberley Community Center, and searching for future school sites.

Council Member DuBois had proposed forming Committees around Council Priorities. A Comprehensive Plan Committee could follow up on housing sites and Comprehensive Plan Elements. A Healthy City/Healthy Community Committee could be a part of the City/School Liaison Committee or separate. He proposed the Council outline priorities and provide direction to key advisory Commissions and Boards.

Council Member Kniss expressed concern about the number of meetings requiring Council Member attendance. A Comprehensive Plan Committee would alter the existing model for the Comprehensive Plan Update. A Healthy City/Healthy Community Committee could be a part of the City/School Liaison Committee, but it could also tie into land use. She urged caution when considering new Committees and whether those had merit as a standalone Committee or woven into other Committees. Project Safety Net was appropriate for referral to the City/School Liaison Committee.

Council Member DuBois suggested the Regional Housing Mandate Committee become the Comprehensive Plan Committee.

Council Member Kniss believed the full Council should handle the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Berman agreed that it was not logical to form a Committee to perform work that the Council would later duplicate and expand. That would be a main factor for him in determining whether to create new Committees. He was intrigued by referring topics to existing Committees. Cubberley Community Center probably should not be referred to the City/School Liaison Committee as only two Council Members participated in that Committee.

Vice Mayor Schmid concurred with the City/School Liaison Committee taking on specific issues. He was hesitant about forming new Council Committees, especially on important issues such as the Comprehensive Plan and land use. He liked the idea of Council Priorities being given to Committees, Commissions, and Boards. Commissions and Boards were good places to have clear Council direction to review certain issues. Given better Council direction, Commissions and Boards could help leverage Council time.

Council Member Wolbach suggested the Council assign Boards and Commissions to lead Priorities. The Historic Resources Board (HRB) and Parks and Recreation Commission (PARC) could work on Healthy City/Healthy Community. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) and Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) could focus on the Built Environment and the Comprehensive Plan. He inquired whether the Council could accomplish that and provide clear direction as to where those Boards and Commissions should focus their time. The City/School Liaison Committee should have more substance. Perhaps a third Council Member could be assigned to that Committee.

The City/School Liaison Committee could draft proposals regarding Project Safety Net, Cubberley, bike routes, traffic, shared use of fields and gyms, and land use issues.

Council Member Berman indicated the Council should attempt to provide direction to Committees, Commissions, and Boards and carefully consider how to provide those directions and topics for review.

Council Member Kniss commented that it was difficult to provide specific directions from nine different people. Attempting to alter the City/School Liaison Committee did not disparage it; however, the PAUSD Board had its own challenges and charges. That would be a very interesting direction, but the Council should be aware of sensitivity at that Committee.

Council Member Burt advised that certain issues on the horizon lent themselves to having a greater dialog through the City/School Liaison Committee. Council Member Berman expressed concern about delegating too much of the Cubberley issue to the City/School Liaison Committee. The Council could circumscribe which issues it delegated. Committees did not make decisions but provided recommendations to the Council. The role of a Committee was to hold deeper discussions and vet topics to allow the Council to reach better decisions more efficiently. Few infrastructure issues would need to be vetted by a Committee. He questioned whether the Council would have less discussion of the Comprehensive Plan if a Comprehensive Plan Committee vetted it and made recommendations to the Council. Instead of creating Council Committees, perhaps the Mayor could appoint two liaisons. The Healthy City Healthy Community concept was new. He was unsure whether that should be referred to the Policy and Services Committee or created as an ad hoc Committee.

Council Member DuBois suggested a Comprehensive Plan Committee would allow Council Members to work on the Comprehensive Plan more often. The Council could apply the model of the Housing Element and Regional Housing Mandate Committee to the Comprehensive Plan Committee. Perhaps the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan citizens group could change from

communication to making recommendations to a Comprehensive Plan Committee.

1D). Discussion and Potential Action on Staff Relations

Mayor Holman noted several suggestions and submissions were made at the Retreat and requested other suggestions.

Council Member DuBois inquired about an update to the prioritization exercise.

Mr. Keene provided a matrix of work plan projects that tracked with Council Priorities. Staff identified projects by Council Priority and added the level of effort and urgency for projects. Staff did not include some high-level projects and issues facing the Council. Council Members could add projects at the Council level of importance particularly relating to policy issues or public interest. Many projects were rated as high urgency, because they were connected to Council Priorities. He requested Council Members provide feedback within two weeks. Staff would incorporate Council feedback into the matrix.

Council Member DuBois understood the purpose of the matrix was to survey Council Members.

Mr. Keene was asking Council Members to rate the urgency of projects.

Council Member DuBois asked if the City Manager was attempting to identify the average from the Council or the Council's agreement with Staff's urgencies.

Mayor Holman stated individual responses would be good; however, Council Members needed to come together and determine if they agreed.

Mr. Keene reported the ultimate purpose was to learn Council Members' individual view of projects. Council Members could array projects in each Priority, and Staff could report that to the Council.

Council Member DuBois suggested Council Members rank order each Priority or distribute 100 points among Priorities.

Council Member Kniss suggested Council Members provide a certain number of top strategies.

Mr. Keene noted the Council had provided Staff with directions for every project on the list. He was asking the Council to rank order projects in order to provide information to Staff.

Council Member Kniss commented that projects had very different cost amounts. The Fry's site would require a fair amount of expense; yet, it was a high priority.

Mayor Holman asked if the City had received grant funds for the Fry's site.

Ms. Gitelman replied yes.

Mr. Keene explained that when Staff reviewed the Council's rankings and patterns, they could talk about costs and the Council could prioritize projects. Many infrastructure projects did not need much near-term Council interaction or policy decisions

Vice Mayor Schmid remarked that the matrix contained all projects for 2015. Staff identified most of them as high or medium priority. The Council had a special focus of ensuring the decision process was working. He wanted to figure out how to leverage policy time. Maybe the Council should determine how to prioritize Agendas. The key part for the Council was Agenda setting.

Council Member Burt suggested separating Staff tasks and Council actions into two columns. Some projects could be high importance rather than high urgency. He did not know how to contend with ongoing projects that did not need Council action. Maybe the Council should determine whether some projects fell under more than one Priority.

Mr. Keene explained that the matrix served multiple purposes. One was to collect topics about which the Council could report activities to the community. Another was to determine where the Council should focus its time. The Council could use the matrix to determine the depth of focus on an issue.

Council Member Filseth inquired whether this was the same list presented at the Retreat

Mr. Keene clarified that Staff added some columns.

Council Member Filseth recalled Council Member comments that some topics proposed for Council Priorities were important, but they were not contained in the list. The list did not include any projects for the Healthy City/Healthy Community Priority. Allocating projects to Priorities was not appropriate.

Mr. Keene indicated Council Members would make judgment decisions in ranking projects.

Mayor Holman asked if Council Members were agreeable to extending the meeting time to 7:30 P.M.

Council Member Kniss suggested the Council discuss Healthy City/Healthy Community after Council Members returned from a conference where information would be plentiful.

Mayor Holman concurred. She requested Motions to refer items to the Policy and Services Committee or to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Wolbach suggested forming an ad hoc Committee to propose projects for Healthy City/Healthy Community.

Mayor Holman requested Motions on how to affect outcomes.

Council Member DuBois indicated three Motions were voted on under Procedures and Protocols.

Mayor Holman asked Council Member DuBois to list the three items.

Mr. Keene responded telephone guidelines for Closed Sessions, procedures for Consent Calendar items, and clarification of the role of the City Manager, Staff, Mayor, and Vice Mayor in setting of Agendas.

Council Member Kniss clarified those items mentioned were to be referred to the Policy & Services Committee. A decision was not presently being made.

Mayor Holman stated yes, those items were referred to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Wolbach clarified the first item as telephone participation for either Closed or Open Sessions.

MOTION: Mayor Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer everything submitted by Council Members and the public under Procedures and Protocols to the Policy and Services Committee. The Policy and Services Committee would evaluate and make recommendations of those items to the Committee of the Whole or the Council. Three items voted on at the Retreat; 1) telephone participation guidelines for Closed or Open Sessions, 2) procedures for Consent Calendar items, and 3) clarification of the role of the City Manager, Staff, Mayor, and Vice Mayor in setting of Agendas), plus those items submitted prior to this meeting by the City Manager be referred to Policy and Services Committee, review of any other public submission with the caveat that those items which were determinant would be handled by the Policy and Services Committee, those that would generate full Council consideration would go to the Committee of the Whole or Council for deliberation and determination.

Council Member Burt asked who would decide which items returned to the Committee of the Whole.

Mayor Holman advised it would be a judgment call.

Vice Mayor Schmid remarked that Committees usually determined placement on the Agenda if there was one opposing vote.

Council Member Kniss asked if Mayor Holman was looking at the draft Minutes to pull information for the Motion.

Mayor Holman stated no, she was looking at the submissions and the handout from the Retreat.

Mr. Keene clarified that items referred to the Policy and Services Committee were: the three items listed under Procedures and Protocols on the summary from the Council meeting; submissions from Vice Mayor Schmid and Mayor Holman.

Council Member Burt stated items under Meeting Management on the document from the Retreat appeared to include items that could potentially be Procedures and Protocols.

Mayor Holman advised that Council Members could move to refer all submissions under Procedures and Protocols to the Policy and Services Committee except for items they felt could take more discussion.

Council Member Filseth asked if the Policy and Services Committee would reject, accept, or send back to the Council for discussion each item.

Mayor Holman explained that the Policy and Services Committee would make a recommendation to accept, reject or modify each item. Rather than both the Policy and Services Committee and the Council vetting controversial items, the Policy and Services Committee could provide an initial vetting or refer items to a Committee of the Whole for vetting.

Council Member Filseth reiterated that each item would receive one of the three actions.

Council Member Burt suggested a fourth scenario. The Policy and Services Committee could do some vetting and then recommend that the full Council hold a discussion. The Policy and Services Committee would help the discussion but not conclude it.

Mayor Holman added that the Policy and Services Committee would perform preliminary work to assist the discussion of the Committee of the Whole or the Council.

Council Member Kniss commented that it would be a vetting process.

Council Member Wolbach inquired whether the Motion added submissions made after the Retreat.

Mayor Holman answered yes. The three items referred at the Retreat were included in the current Motion.

Council Member DuBois asked if the Motion included emails from citizens.

Mayor Holman replied yes.

Council Member Burt asked if the Motion directed the Policy and Services Committee to take up anything received from the community as an item without any screening as to whether it was appropriate.

Mayor Holman reported the Council was free to consider or not consider any communication, whether oral or written, from the public.

Council Member Burt remarked that "free to consider or not consider" was different from a Council direction "to consider." He understood the Council was giving directions to consider. One was to consider all things including every comment from the public. The other was to consider all things referred by the Council and may consider things that came from the public.

Mayor Holman wanted to ensure the Council did not ignore submissions from the public.

Vice Mayor Schmid offered language for the caveat of "if there is one dissenting vote or the group thinks it is appropriate to have a full Council discussion."

Ms. Stump advised that the current policies, protocols or procedures included that rule. Committees always had the ability to place an item on the Action Agenda even with a unanimous vote. She understood Mayor Holman was suggesting something slightly different. Before fully vetting an issue, the Policy and Services Committee might feel the item would be better handled by the full Council.

MOTION RESTATED: Mayor Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer everything submitted by Council Members and the public under Procedures and Protocols to the Policy and Services Committee. The Policy and Services Committee would evaluate and make recommendations of those items to the Committee of the Whole or the Council. Three items voted on at the Retreat; 1) telephone participation guidelines for Closed or Open Sessions, 2) procedures for Consent Calendar items, and 3) clarification of the role of the City Manager, Staff, Mayor, and Vice Mayor in setting of Agendas), plus those items submitted prior to this meeting by the City Manager be referred to Policy and Services Committee, review of any

other public submission with the caveat that those items which were determinant would be handled by the Policy and Services Committee, those that would generate full Council consideration would go to the Committee of the Whole or Council for deliberation and determination.

Council Member Burt had proposed completion of Core Values adoption at the Retreat under Staff Relations, but it was a standalone item.

Mayor Holman advised that that was referred to the Policy and Services Committee at the Retreat.

Council Member Berman reiterated that the Council was sending everything to the Policy and Services Committee with direction for Policy and Services Committee actions. He had not reviewed the at-places information. Page 2 of one of the Number B documents, possibly the one provided that day, stated "increased office occupancy density beyond what is considered in the Municipal Code of 4 per 1,000." There was nothing in the Code about office density. The Code stated that there should be 4 parking spots per 1,000 square feet of office space. Members of the public often misrepresented that. Council Members should be clear about requirements contained in the Code.

Mayor Holman understood that 4 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet was based on the presumed office occupancy density. That Number B document was a list of examples of things that Staff would bring to the Council as they saw emerging issues.

Council Member Berman did not see the language about the list being examples. That statement assumed every employee drove their own single-occupant vehicle, which they did not.

Mayor Holman stated the Policy and Services Committee could not change the Code.

Council Member Wolbach asked if the Policy and Services Committee would recommend policy changes to request Staff watch for issues that could become problems and alert the Council of those issues before they became problems.

Mayor Holman responded yes.

Council Member Burt did not believe the Council took action on his suggestion for the Policy and Services Committee to consider having greater clarity with respect to the meanings of policy and protocol.

Mayor Holman advised Council Member Burt, as Chair of the Policy and Services Committee, to raise the question at a Policy and Services Committee meeting.

Council Member Burt explained that the Council would conduct its annual review of policies and procedures; however, he wished to obtain a sense of whether colleagues wanted the Policy and Services Committee to review that.

Mayor Holman stated clarification was good.

Council Member Burt recalled that the issue of Priorities being a few succinct words or one- or two-sentence narratives was mentioned when the Council set its Priorities.

Mayor Holman asked if she had not captured an item under Priorities.

Council Member Burt clarified that it was a follow-up question from the Council's Priority setting. Colleagues may not want to refer it. At the Retreat, the Council discussed attempting to capture the meaning of Priorities in a few words. A sentence or two could clarify the Council's intent.

Mayor Holman suggested the Council vote on the Motion and return to Council Member Burt's thoughts.

Council Member Kniss commented that the number of items referred to the Policy and Services Committee would be an enormous amount of work. She asked Council Member Burt if he believed the Policy and Services Committee could accomplish those tasks by June while meeting only twice a month.

Council Member Burt anticipated the Policy and Services Committee meeting twice in some months. He did not assume that all items would be detailed by June, but hopefully many of them would.

Mayor Holman agreed the Council was giving the Policy and Services Committee a great deal of work. For that reason, she added the caveat to the Motion that the Policy and Services Committee could identify and refer controversial issues to the Council or the Committee of the Whole without fully vetting those issues.

Mr. Keene understood the Motion gave the Policy and Services Committee discretion to determine which issues it could focus on, which could be placed in a parking lot, and which could be referred back to the Council.

Mayor Holman reported the list was not as extensive as it appeared because it contained duplicate items.

Council Member Kniss asked if the Motion included Meeting Management.

Mayor Holman responded no.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Scharff absent

Mayor Holman requested a Motion for items under Meeting Management. Another Committee of the Whole meeting or referral to Policy and Services Committee was possible.

MOTION: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer Meeting Management items to the Policy and Services Committee and bring back to Council.

Council Member Burt advised that some of the items were already in the discretion of the Mayor. He inquired whether the intent was to provide more clarity that that discretion existed.

Mayor Holman stated clarity was good. It would be appropriate for Council Member Burt to state that when the Policy and Services Committee reported to the Council.

Council Member Burt believed it would be more of a reminder of the discretion that existed.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Vice Mayor Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to direct the Mayor to make a proposal to the Committee of the Whole and they would respond to the Mayor's proposal.

Council Member Kniss asked if the Motion intended for Mayor Holman to distill a proposal to its essence and present it to the Policy and Services Committee.

Vice Mayor Schmid clarified that Mayor Holman could not present a proposal to a four-member Committee because it would be a Brown Act violation.

Council Member Wolbach would not support the Substitute Motion. The suggestions from the Mayor were already included in the referrals to the Policy and Services Committee with a report to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Filseth interpreted the Motion and Substitute Motion as involving a screening process. The difference between Council Member Wolbach's Motion and Vice Mayor Schmid's Motion was who would do the screening, the Policy and Services Committee or the Mayor. Either one was appropriate.

Council Member Burt reported the Substitute Motion was misguided, because it contained an implicit premise that Meeting Management items pertained to this year and this Mayor. Meeting Management items pertained to Council policies for how the Mayor would run meetings, but not about a given Mayor.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED: 2-6 Kniss, Schmid yes, Scharff absent

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Scharff absent

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Wolbach to refer to Policy and Services Committee consideration of proposals to replace the Regional Housing Mandate Committee with a Council Comprehensive Plan Update Committee, to form a new ad hoc Healthy City/Healthy Community Committee, and the City/School Liaison Committee explore with PAUSD taking a more substantial role.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether those Committees would be subject to Policy and Services Committee review prior to their being created or altered.

Council Member DuBois answered yes.

Council Member Burt believed the Committee of the Whole should review formation of Committees, not the Policy and Services Committee. He asked if there would be a second meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

Mayor Holman indicated a second meeting would be held once a date could be identified.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to refer the Motion to eh Committee of the Whole rather than the Policy & Services Committee.

Council Member Wolbach asked if the item could be agendized for a regular Council meeting.

Mayor Holman responded no, because Council Agendas were full.

Council Member Burt felt an informal dialog would be more productive.

MOTION RESTATED: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Wolbach to refer to the Committee of the Whole consideration of proposals to replace the Regional Housing Mandate Committee with a Council Comprehensive Plan Update Committee, to form a new ad hoc Healthy City/Healthy Community Committee, and the City/School Liaison Committee explore with PAUSD taking a more substantial role.

Council Member Burt suggested referring the Core Values discussion to the next Committee of the Whole meeting so that all Council Members could provide input. He inquired whether that could be added to the Motion.

Mayor Holman preferred Council Member Burt offer a separate Motion.

Vice Mayor Schmid noted the Motion did not propose a Built Environment Committee.

Council Member Wolbach asked if the Motion proposed the Comprehensive Plan Committee as an ad hoc or Standing Committee.

Mayor Holman recommended that be determined at the Committee of the Whole meeting.

MOTION AS AMENDMENT PASSED: 8-0 Scharff absent

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Mayor Holman that a discussion of Core Values be moved to the next Committee of the Whole meeting.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Scharff absent

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to refer to the Policy and Services Committee Council Priorities be detailed in short narratives with directions to key advisory commissions and boards on how we want projects evaluated and criteria we would like them to use in their reports to the Council. Council to approve and send specific directions to Architectural Review Board (ARB), Planning & Transportation Commission (P&TC), Historic Resources Board (HRB) and the Parks and Recreation Commission (PARC).

Council Member Berman inquired about a process for accomplishing the item and whether it was referred to the Policy and Services Committee or the Council. He was not comfortable supporting the Motion.

Council Member Kniss would not support the Motion.

Council Member DuBois would agree to amend the Motion to add referral to the Policy and Services Committee at the beginning.

Council Member Berman would support the Motion and hoped it would not be controversial such that the Council duplicated the Policy and Services Committee discussion.

Council Member Kniss would not support the Motion as it was extremely directive for Commissions and Boards.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to replace "projects" with "initiatives".

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to replace "specific directions" with "guidance".

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to replace "ARB, P&TC, HRB and PARC" with "appropriate Boards and Commissions".

Council Member Filseth commented that the Council needed to receive value and guidance from its Boards and Commissions. He would support the Motion.

Council Member Wolbach inquired whether "narratives with directions" changed to "narratives with guidelines."

Council Member DuBois answered no.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to substitute "narratives with directions" with "narratives with quidelines".

Mayor Holman expressed concern because it was not only Priorities but the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Keene advised that the Policy and Services Committee would likely refer it back to the Council for discussion. The Council had to determine guidelines.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to refer narratives to Policy and Services Committee and the balance to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Burt clarified that the Policy and Services Committee would discuss narratives for Priorities. The committee as a whole would discuss guidelines for Boards and Commissions including whether guidance regarding the Comprehensive Plan was included.

MOTION PASSED: 7-1 Kniss no, Scharff absent

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to refer items under Staff/Council Relations to the next Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Keene advised that many Staff Relation items were included in other Motions.

Mayor Holman explained that the preamble to Attachment B, suggestions for Procedures and Protocols, identified that some of the suggestions were not necessarily Procedures and Protocols.

Council Member Berman suggested changing the Motion to referral to "a" Committee of the Whole rather the "next".

Council Member Burt indicated the next Committee of the Whole could defer the item to a subsequent meeting if necessary.

Council Member DuBois asked if Council Members should respond to the City Manager's request to rank projects.

Mayor Holman recommended that be a separate item.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Scharff absent

Mayor Holman requested suggestions for addressing the work plan provided by the City Manager.

Council Member Kniss reported the room setup was not suitable for discussion as she could not see who was speaking. In addition, there was no projection of Motions for Council Member review and consideration.

Mayor Holman agreed.

Mr. Keene explained that the room setup was suitable for the single camera recording the meeting. He preferred Council Members sit around a table. Once multiple cameras were installed, the room setup would be better.

Mayor Holman repeated her request for suggestions to address the 2015 work plan.

Mr. Keene requested the Council make corrections to Priority categorizations and rank projects within Priorities. Staff would organize responses and report pattern information that could engender a subsequent conversation.

Council Member Burt requested an electronic copy with a column for Priorities and comments.

Mayor Holman requested blank lines be inserted after each topic for Council Member additions.

MOTION: Mayor Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Burt that the Council return rankings and Priorities to the City Manager within 2 weeks, March 3, 2015, and the City Manager would compile the results and forward them to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Filseth was uncomfortable ranking projects within Priorities because some projects did not relate to the Priority.

City Clerk	Mayor		
, , , , <u> </u>	/ II / 110 / 25 /		
ATTEST:	APPROVED:		
Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 P.M.			
MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Schartt absent			

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.