STUD	Y SESSION555
1.	Review of Planning and Transportation Commission Recommended Revisions of all Elements of the Comprehensive Plan
SPEC	IAL ORDERS OF THE DAY571
2.	Proclamation Expressing Appreciation to the Electric Vehicle (EV) Task Force for Outstanding Public Service
AGEN	IDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS572
CITY	MANAGER COMMENTS572
ORAL	COMMUNICATIONS573
MINU	TES APPROVAL574
CONS	SENT CALENDAR574
3.	Resolution 9409 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Determining That Net Energy Metering Aggregation Will Not Result in Increased Cost-Shifting to Non-Participants."
4.	Update on 2013 Know Your Neighbor Grant Program and Direction to Continue Pilot for One Year575
5.	Approval of a Contract Amendment with Bibliotheca, Inc. Extending the Term to June 30, 2017 and Adding An Amount Not to Exceed \$300,000 for the Ongoing Purchase of a Radio Frequency Identification System (RFID) for the Palo Alto City Library - Capital Improvement Program Project TE-06001
6.	Recommending Council Authorize the City Manager to Approve Law Enforcement Regional Data Sharing Agreement ("Memorandum Of Understanding For The South Bay Information Sharing System South Bay Region Node")
7.	Resolution 9410 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending and Restating the Administrative Penalty Schedule and Civil Penalty Schedules for Certain Violations of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and the California Vehicle Code Established by Resolution No. 9209."

8.	Adoption of a Resolution Approving the Proposed Google Network Hut License Agreement			
9.	Budget Amendment Ordinance 5244 entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 to Adjust Budgeted Revenues and Expenditures in Accordance with the Recommendations in the FY 2014 Midyear Budget Review Report."			
10.	Approval of Municipal Code Amendment to Mandate Reporting of Rabies Vaccinations			
ACTION ITEMS576				
11.	PUBLIC HEARING: Resolution 9411 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2015 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding Allocation and the 2015 Draft Action Plan."			
12.	Comprehensive Plan Update Review of the Comprehensive Plan Update Community Engagement Plan and Community Leadership Group			
COUN	ICIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS584			
CLOS	ED SESSION584			
13.	CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY – EXISTING LITIGATION584			
ADJO	URNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 P.M			

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

Present: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss arrived at 5:13 P.M., Price

arrived at 5:11 P.M., Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd

Absent:

STUDY SESSION

1. Review of Planning and Transportation Commission Recommended Revisions of all Elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Shepherd indicated the Council requested a 2-4 hour Study Session in order to review the work prepared by the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC). The Council wanted to hear and learn from the community. Community outreach would begin with Our Palo Alto workshops.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, reported the City's Comprehensive Plan had been amended slightly since its implementation in 1998. The Comprehensive Plan was the City's constitution with respect to local policies for land use and development. It was organized into chapters or elements, some of which were required by State law and some created by Palo Alto. Overall the Plan reflected the City's vision for the future. Although it had a horizon year of 2010 and needed updating, the Development Cap established in 1998 remained intact. The P&TC's and Staff's work updating the Comprehensive Plan began in 2006 and culminated with the document provided to the Council. Updates to the Housing and Governance Elements were not made. Element had its own update process. The P&TC determined the Governance Element was a good summary of the process and deferred it to later in the update process. The Council considered and endorsed the Our Palo Alto framework for ideas, action, and design in January 2014. Comprehensive Plan was the design portion of the Our Palo Alto framework. In mid-March 2014, the Council considered and endorsed a revised strategy and schedule for the Comprehensive Plan update. At that time, the Council requested a Study Session and a discussion of the Community Engagement The Comprehensive Plan document would evolve as the update Utilizing the community engagement process, Staff process continued. would draft a Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for release to the public and Council at the end of 2014.

A proposed final Comprehensive Plan would be presented to the Council for consideration at the end of 2015. Within the document, the status of policies and programs was shown in red. Existing policies were compared to proposed replacements and edits in blue. Staff included disposition tables to allow the Council to see changes to existing policies and programs. In the next 90 days, Staff would undertake an expanded community outreach and engagement effort, followed by Council discussion and direction in early On August 4, 2014, Staff hoped to receive Council direction regarding critical issues and alternatives for inclusion in the draft Comprehensive Plan and draft EIR which would be reviewed and developed in the fall. This update was an opportunity for the community to discuss the location and pace of development across the City. At the end of the visioning process, Staff wanted to have a range of alternatives that bracketed possible outcomes of the planning process. The Staff Report suggested some high-level questions for Council discussion. The Council's original direction for the Comprehensive Plan update was to: focus on the preservation of commercial land uses including retail and community services, to support new residential growth and to incorporate sustainability concepts, and to prepare Area Concept Plans for East Meadow Circle and the California Avenue area. The first question was whether the Council wanted to reconsider or expand its original direction in identifying priorities for the update. The second question concerned critical issues and alternatives as well as baseline data. Staff identified critical issues of growth management strategies and how and where growth should occur in Palo Alto. requested the Council discuss other critical issues about which Staff should engage the community in the next few months. Staff could only evaluate a limited number of alternatives and proposed the draft Comprehensive Plan and draft EIR consider three alternatives. Staff requested the Council comment on specific alternatives or planning concepts that it felt should be prioritized for consideration.

Mark Michael, Planning and Transportation Commission Chair, advised that the Staff Report and draft Comprehensive Plan accurately documented outreach efforts. The Our Palo Alto initiative showed great potential to tap into the thoughts, hopes, and concerns of residents. He encouraged people to focus on a succinct statement of a vision for Palo Alto. The pace of innovation, rate of change, demographic shifts, and activities in the surrounding region and local economy made a compelling argument that goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan should be kept current and updated at shorter intervals. The P&TC made recommendations on vision statements for the five Elements in the document and two Area Concept Plans. He hoped the Council would seek a common vision for managing the changes to come and that such vision statement would provide direction for all Comprehensive Plan Elements, goals, policies, and programs.

Adina Levin recommended the Council view the Comprehensive Plan from a sustainability and carbon emissions lens building on the Climate Action Plan update. Senate Bill (SB) 743 replaced the automotive level of service in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) with a different metric to better assess the environmental impact of transportation impacts. The Governor's Office was considering metrics of vehicle miles traveled or vehicle miles traveled per capita. As part of the Climate Action Plan, Staff currently tracked vehicle miles traveled.

Eric Filseth agreed with Mr. Michael regarding a vision statement. The overall thrust of the Comprehensive Plan from its inception was to preserve the livability and neighborhood character of Palo Alto and to avoid the sacrifice of these things in pursuit of other goals. The Comprehensive Plan should focus first and foremost on residents' issues and should clearly identify livability as the overriding priority as measured by density, traffic, safety, infrastructure, school crowding, parking, pollution, and City services.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether colleagues would support an initial 5-minute round of comments. She proposed either three rounds of comments, one for each question, or a first round of initial thinking followed by subsequent rounds.

Council Member Scharff supported two rounds of comments.

Council Member Schmid suggested a first round of 10 minutes for each Council Member and a shorter second round.

Vice Mayor Kniss suggested three rounds and 5-6 minutes for each colleague.

Council Member Klein questioned the purpose of the Council's discussion.

Mayor Shepherd wished to determine a procedure for Council discussion. Staff proposed a process to obtain information from the Council.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt for Council to respond to the three questions that Staff is proposing, but also to review the Planning and Transportation Commission Draft Comprehensive Plan to indicate agreement or disagreement with major policies, but not to wordsmith it.

Council Member Klein understood the need to proceed and the proposal to begin at a high level of discussion. The Council should review the draft Comprehensive Plan, because the public would perceive that the Council provided input for it.

Council Member Scharff called Point of Order, indicating Motions were not appropriate in a Study Session. Council Members could speak to any topic relevant to the item, but not make any Motions.

Mayor Shepherd was attempting to determine procedure for Council comment. She could take a Motion regarding procedure.

Council Member Burt explained that under the proposed scenario Council Members would basically have no input into any of the very substantive changes to policies and programs. Under the proposed process, the Council would relinquish any input to the Comprehensive Plan prior to it being provided to the public for consideration. The Council should discuss concerns regarding recommendations that differed from the current Comprehensive Plan. Under the proposed scenario for the meeting, the Council would have inadequate time to consider policies and programs.

Vice Mayor Kniss inquired whether Council Member Klein's Motion implied additional meetings to discuss the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Klein answered yes.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if Council Member Klein had a proposal for additional meetings.

Council Member Klein would have a better idea of additional time at the end of the discussion.

Vice Mayor Kniss felt Council Member Klein wanted a procedure different from the one Staff requested. She inquired whether he wanted either more Study Sessions or more time spent on the document.

Council Member Klein indicated the Council might need to spend more time which would be appropriate. The Comprehensive Plan would set the course of the City for the next 10-20 years. Finding a more important topic would be difficult.

Vice Mayor Kniss stated the timing as set forth by the Planning Department was logical. This was the time to go to the public. She wanted to hear from the community before the Council reviewed the update line-by-line.

Council Member Holman agreed with Vice Mayor Kniss regarding timing. The Council would review the policies, programs, and goals and then provide high-level comments in the current discussion.

Council Member Schmid understood this would be an opportunity for the Council to make statements about the Comprehensive Plan prior to it being made public. An 8-minute time period would allow each Council Member sufficient time to give a full opinion.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER that the first round of Council comments would be 8 minutes in length.

Ms. Gitelman explained that the visioning phase of the planning process set aside detail in order to look at big picture issues. Big picture issues would be discussed in the public dialog and would necessitate changes to policies and programs contained in the document provided. Draft policies and programs would be circulated for detailed public and Council review beginning at the end of 2014. The draft phase of the planning effort extended from December 2014 through July 2015 in the proposed timeline. The next iteration of the draft, as informed by public dialog, would have seven months of review. There would be ample opportunity for detailed review when the next iteration was produced with a draft EIR at the end of the year.

Mayor Shepherd indicated Staff would accept all Council comments and inquired whether the Motion coincided with Staff's intentions.

Ms. Gitelman welcomed Council comments on the P&TC's work. Staff suggested the Council focus on three main questions to aid Staff in focusing public dialog.

Council Member Schmid emphasized the importance of discussing the big picture and believed 8 minutes would be sufficient time for Council comments.

Council Member Holman agreed that 5 minutes was not sufficient time for comment, and a second round would be needed for summary comments.

Mayor Shepherd reported the Council would have sufficient time for a second round of comment if discussion of the Motion proceeded quickly.

Council Member Berman inquired whether the Motion proposed multiple meetings to discuss the Comprehensive Plan if necessary.

Council Member Klein felt the Council would need an additional meeting to take specific actions, but did not believe an additional meeting would delay the process. This was a perfect issue for discussion at a Saturday meeting.

Mayor Shepherd requested discussion remain relevant to the Motion.

Council Member Berman stated a policy-by-policy review would require several meetings. If Council Members had pressing concerns around individual policies, then they should mention them. Discussing the big picture and providing overall guidance to Staff was logical.

Council Member Scharff was not sure the Motion was different from Staff's proposal. He questioned whether Staff would accept as direction one Council Member's in-depth comments regarding a policy if other Council Members did not specifically rebut those comments. He wished to focus on the big picture.

James Keene, City Manager, advised that the public could perceive a detailed discussion as deciding changes to the Comprehensive Plan without public input. A line-by-line discussion could also appear to limit public input to only those willing to read each page rather than to a general discussion of growth and density. In the proposed timeline Staff envisioned the Council speaking to each policy and identifying issues of concern. A more involved process would be needed if the Council wished to drive to decisions on each policy at the current time. He requested the Council define potential implications for this as far as timeline and process support.

Council Member Scharff asked how the discussion would be different if the Motion passed versus if the Motion failed.

Council Member Burt clarified that Staff proposed the Council discussion focus on three questions and discouraged a discussion of policies and programs. The Motion would open that discussion and allow a discussion of whether additional time was needed.

Council Member Price would not support the Motion. The proposed process was logical. The original process did not preclude any Council Member from making comments on policies. She expressed concern that a discussion of policies and programs would not provide overall guidance to Staff.

Based on Staff comments, the Council would have time to make refinements. It was important for the public to receive the document quickly to inform Council thinking.

Mayor Shepherd understood the Council utilized Study Sessions to provide feedback to Staff. She did not believe Staff was interested in limiting Council comments. She would support the Motion as amended, because it aligned with the original procedure.

Vice Mayor Kniss inquired whether Council Member Klein intended to move a continuance to a further Study Session or a Saturday meeting.

Council Member Klein would wait until the end of the current discussion to determine if additional time was needed. Staff asked the Council to respond to three questions; yet, the Council could not take action in a Study Session.

Vice Mayor Kniss associated herself with Council Member Price's comments. She preferred to proceed to public engagement as soon as possible.

Mr. Keene indicated Staff did not intend for questions to be prescriptive, but to gather the Council's perspective. Reviewing each section and gathering comments from each Council Member would be a different process. He asked if the Council would resolve the different points raised in a detailed discussion or provide them to the public for input.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether Mr. Keene meant this process was more restrictive than the original.

Mr. Keene was attempting to clarify the process.

Mayor Shepherd would be concerned if this was more restrictive. She did not want to limit Council comments.

Mr. Keene understood the Council needed to make a statement in advance of the document being provided to the public about the status of policies and recommendations. Under that process, the Council would be in an action mode where it would have to make decisions. That was different than having a Study Session to collect ideas. At the end of discussion, Staff would have to design and support an involved community process.

Mayor Shepherd indicated the Council would have 8 minutes to speak primarily on the four items in the Motion, if the Motion passed.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 7-2 Kniss, Price no

Council Member Schmid believed the key part of planning was to establish The P&TC stated clearly that the Land Use Element was priorities. important, because the relationship between land use, urban design, transportation, and economics was emphasized in that particular piece. The vision statement contained three critical words: balance, sustainable, and quality of life. Those were priorities the Council could use in planning for public engagement. One element for consideration was changes in the City. commercial development Population growth and meant Comprehensive Plan programs and policies did not necessarily address the critical tradeoff between balance and quality of life on one side, and density on the other. Four key questions ought to be addressed by the public. The first question was sustainable growth. The Housing Element should state one-third of housing should be located in Downtown, one-third in California Avenue, and one-third in El Camino Real. Quality of design was extremely important. Design standards should be compatible with the neighborhood and with the City. Commercial spaces were monetized immediately in that market value of the property reflected the zoning of the property. Residents could only monetize when homes were sold. Despite the fantastic growth in commercial property, 73 percent of property taxes were paid by residents, and that amount grew 1 percent per year. The issue of fair share should be addressed in the public forum. While there was some debate about extending the boundaries of the development cap area, the City needed a development cap. Staff should provide good data prior to beginning public engagement.

Vice Mayor Kniss indicated density was a primary concern. Council Member Schmid suggested new density be located one-third in Downtown, one-third along California Avenue, and one-third in south Palo Alto. That sounded like a good plan; however, it was difficult to be that prescriptive. Designing and maintaining street frontages that contributed to walkability and to retail vitality in all commercial districts was difficult along El Camino Real. That It was difficult to take each one was not a good area for walking. individually without considering the whole. Again, ensuring that every residential neighborhood had public gathering spaces was difficult. If she considered the draft Comprehensive Plan as a whole, then it was close to She wanted to ask the P&TC how infrastructure what she wanted. improvements could serve all areas of the City fairly. She questioned the interaction between expanding the scope of the original direction and density. She wanted to hear from residents before the Council addressed other critical issues. Priority of specific alternatives or planning concepts had to include density.

Council Member Klein noted draft Comprehensive Plan amendments were written as declarative sentences. Staff would not get answers to declarative sentences. Perhaps a change in language would garner citizens' opinions. Density was the major issue and always had been. Staff should make the distinction that the City was planning for the future. Historical data could be used to analyze goals for the future. The ordinary citizen would not respond to abstract planning issues. The document did not address energy use of the existing built environment, which should be a policy or question. With respect to "manage redevelopment of vacant and underused properties," he asked if there was a definition of underused property. The document needed a glossary of acronyms and terms. Policy L2.3 discussed reinforcing the existing character and scale of streets and new public plazas. He asked if there were new public plazas. Program L2.5.3 and Policy L2.21 appeared to be holdovers from the 1998 version. Staff should review programs and policies for relevancy. He did not believe L2.23.2, constructing new trails in neighborhood parks, should be included. He hoped the Council could provide the document to the public as early as possible.

Council Member Holman stated the preservation of commercial land uses addressed the East Meadow Circle area where commercial uses converted to residential standalones. She did not believe that was a topic of conversation any longer. Baseline data was critical. Baseline data compared to historical data could track the consequences of zoning and policy changes. The list of goals were P&TC goals and should be placed near existing goals. Within the land use section, especially in vision and goal statements, the heart and soul of existing goals had been removed. Goals seemed to focus on innovation, and did not include character-defining details. New goals seemed to overemphasize redevelopment. The document should address diversity of residences and businesses; policy statements to guide design; compatibility standards; balance of private property rights with public expectations of development projects; historic preservation, particularly L2.6.2; buffer zones and transitions; and retention of existing housing units.

Council Member Burt believed the public would comment on high-level issues as well as details of the Comprehensive Plan. A discussion of the built environment should strongly emphasize design quality and compatibility. Environmental sustainability did not emphasize sustainable landscaping and agricultural landscaping. He requested a community discussion on that issue. In a number of places, aspects of environmental sustainability were substituted with climate change protection as if the two were synonymous. The document seemed to indicate that neighborhood centers and neighborhood services encompassed all centers and services. The existing Comprehensive Plan defined them separately.

He concurred that maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) was essentially equated to minimum FAR. The City could not limit a developer to anything less than the maximum. The Comprehensive Plan should have a policy for FAR. The California Avenue area needed a concept plan. He recommended the Council agendize a follow-up discussion to remove FAR recommendations from the Area Concept Plan and to defer recommendations to a specific plan.

Council Member Berman agreed with Council Member Holman regarding diversity, particularly socioeconomic diversity. Socioeconomic diversity should be included in public engagement. He was pleased to see an emphasis on data and data collection. A strong data infrastructure was incredibly important. Another topic for community discussion was the housing imbalance. Strategic intelligent growth could benefit the City. Residents should remember that development in other cities affected Palo Alto. He inquired whether the Downtown CAP Study would be a part of the Comprehensive Plan discussion.

Ms. Gitelman intended to discuss it as part of the process.

Council Member Scharff felt some components of the document were too For instance, the energy policy indicated the City would participate in cost-effective programs offered by Northern California Power The City chose not to participate in NCPA programs on Agency (NCPA). several occasions, because NCPA programs reduced the City's renewable Another concern was the instruction to "maximize." Maximizing programs was not always feasible or desirable. The document implied that growth would continue and quality of life would decrease slightly. Diversity of retail businesses could be accomplished by increasing retail throughout the area so that marginal retail sites allowed smaller businesses to thrive. He wanted a resident-centered concept focused on livability and improved quality of life. He wanted to know the P&TC's rationale for including some statements. It was a mistake to even consider the jobs-housing imbalance, because additional housing units would not improve the quality of life. The jobs-housing imbalance should not be part of the conversation. He agreed with the policy to have diverse housing types; however, the effect on the community should be considered.

Council Member Price wanted to know how Staff would incorporate into the document existing conditions, changes from the existing Comprehensive Plan, and implications of forums. The issue of growth management and alternative scenarios was critical. The document should contain the financial implications for the various types of land use scenarios.

Millennial preferences and seniors' need would determine the evolution of needs and outcomes in the community. She did not recall the document using the phrase "smart growth." The document should include the implications of smart growth related to transient-oriented development, economic vitality, housing, and a less economically diverse community. She inquired whether the document would reference or index various Master Plans. The scope as defined was well done and emphasized the issue of sustainability and green infrastructure. She hoped the document would contain a discussion of schools and school capacity and a preamble describing why the language of the document was presented as it was. The document should allow flexibility for the community to evolve.

Mayor Shepherd indicated some terms needed defining or quantifying. She inquired whether the Downtown CAP included methods for enforcement. The Downtown CAP could be replicated in the California Avenue area as development began. Policy T2.10.2 of the Transportation Element was important for routine measurements. She asked if the document discussed the possibility of allowing certain areas to exceed the height limit by 10 feet. Some neighborhoods felt underserved by not having grocery stores. The document should contain more specificity in the meaning of community services. The scope of the direction should be expanded to include impacts of densification in south El Camino Real.

Council Member Holman believed edible gardens should be a required part of multifamily and mixed-use projects. There were many missed opportunities for design enhancement. Grocery store preservation should be incorporated into the document. Noise had numerous impacts on individuals and livability that should be considered. The document should strongly consider reducing the noise threshold; methods to identify the largest contributors to noise impacts; and methods to move noise-producing equipment indoors. The document should recognize salvage and adaptive reuse of building materials as positive environmental practices it should evaluate programs that supported local independent businesses and led to their success. The document should include an evaluation of methods for the business community to pay its fair share. Exceptional design should be a requirement for every project.

Council Member Schmid supported Council Member Burt's comments regarding maximum density; Council Member Holman's emphasis on design standards; and Council Member Berman's comments regarding the need for data. Our Palo Alto would begin without traffic and parking data and data from the Downtown CAP Study. A number of Council actions should give priority to programs and policies.

The economic chapter did not mention who paid a fair share for changes and impacts in the City. The Comprehensive Plan should have some financial analysis regarding the balance between residents and businesses.

Council Member Klein stated City policies were not responsible for the growing school population. A turnover in population caused the majority of the change in school population. A jobs-housing imbalance was not bad. The update process was an opportunity for teaching the community. The document should discuss the possibility of expanding the City's shuttle system. Sections T2.23 and T2.25, regarding converting one-way and two-way streets, should be deleted.

Council Member Burt noted colleagues had primarily discussed the Land Use Element; thus, the Council would need additional time to opine regarding other Elements. Public gathering spots referred to areas in every neighborhood. Residents should not have to cross major arterial roadways or walk considerable distances to reach public gathering spots. The Comprehensive Plan contained tensions rather than gross contradictions. Staff should exercise caution in utilizing the term "all" and in making a firm commitment to something. Sustainability was not a code word, but Staff should exercise discipline in using the term.

Vice Mayor Kniss inquired about methods to enlist community participation in public engagement efforts.

Ms. Gitelman reported engagement efforts would focus on issues. Staff wanted to provide data and obtain reactions and input regarding future alternatives. Staff would hold community workshops and online engagement around critical issues, such as direction of growth, pace of development, density issues, and terminology.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked how Staff would entice the community to participate.

Ms. Gitelman would address that in Agenda Item 12.

Vice Mayor Kniss believed another issue for discussion was people remaining in their homes because of Proposition 13 and people paying exorbitant prices for homes on the market. The document should consider a prescriptive method for determining where to locate additional housing units. The most critical issues were development, growth, and long-term density.

Council Member Scharff advised that "revitalize" was not the correct word for Policy L3.16. Midtown residents were concerned that non-retail uses were creeping into the area. The document contained other neighborhood specific policies. Staff should engage with those neighborhoods to determine residents' wants. From the 1998 version, the document retained a policy to prepare a plan for Midtown. He questioned whether a plan had been drafted and whether Midtown residents wanted a plan. Many topics in the energy section did not match current City practices.

Council Member Price did not believe the document mentioned the impact of delivery of services to multifamily and single-family residential properties as a means to reduce car trips. Within multiple uses of existing and new public buildings, the Council discussed providing limited health functions at Fire Stations. The Innovation and Technology Element did not reference the academic and college community and the implications of a City partnership with Stanford regarding test bed options. Under conversion of existing buildings, she inquired whether the Plan considered innovative practices and their economic feasibility. The Transportation Element should discuss the implications of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and changes in driving behaviors related to the need for traditional built parking structures.

Mayor Shepherd wished to see the programs and policies removed from the document. She was concerned about strategizing zoning for the Housing Element based on property tax receipts. She suggested the Council have a separate discussion of sharing costs for Safe Routes to School with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD).

Ms. Gitelman would discuss next steps and engagement efforts in Agenda Item Number 12.

Mr. Keene added that Staff would discuss capturing additional content from the Council under Agenda Item Number 12.

Council Member Holman asked how Council comments would be presented to the public. The Council needed additional time for discussion of the document. Public comment was held at the beginning of the discussion even though Council policy indicated public comment would occur at the end of Study Sessions. Therefore, members of the public who arrived late should be allowed to speak.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to schedule a special City Council meeting the first available Saturday in June for discussion of the Comprehensive Plan regarding policy direction.

Council Member Klein suggested a meeting in June to allow time for Staff to revise the draft document or respond as appropriate. At a Special Meeting, the Council could take action, if appropriate, with regard to the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Holman suggested the Motion include the intention to discuss policy direction.

Council Member Klein clarified that the agenda for a Special Meeting would be limited to discussion of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Gitelman reported initiating the public engagement process while scheduling an opportunity for additional Council direction could send mixed messages to the public. Staff would have difficulty designing public outreach, engaging with the public, and supporting another detailed Council meeting simultaneously. Another Council meeting could elongate the entire Comprehensive Plan update process.

Mr. Keene requested clarification as to whether Staff should delay the process for a month.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the Motion implied a delay in the process.

Mr. Keene indicated some clarity would be helpful. Scheduling another meeting would create a tradeoff.

Council Member Klein would support delaying public outreach for a month.

Council Member Holman did not expect Staff to revise the draft document. She inquired whether Staff could schedule a Special Meeting for a Saturday in May.

Mr. Keene advised that the date would depend on work required of Staff.

Council Member Holman did not believe Staff would need to perform additional work. The meeting would allow Council Members to conclude their comments.

Council Member Burt understood Staff was concerned about additional work. If Council Member Klein was agreeable to simply continuing the discussion, then that would not create additional Staff work.

Council Member Klein was agreeable. Staff could make revisions; however, revisions would not be required for the Special Meeting.

Council Member Burt asked if a Special Meeting could be scheduled sooner than June if Staff did not need to revise the draft document.

Ms. Gitelman did not want to create an expectation that Staff could move forward with extensive community outreach while preparing for another Study Session. Community outreach would need to be delayed.

Mayor Shepherd noted the Council would take action at the proposed meeting; therefore, it would not be a Study Session.

Council Member Klein used the term "Special Meeting" so that the Council could take action.

Mr. Keene reported continuing the discussion to another meeting would require less effort than determining Council expectations of Staff at the end of the session.

Council Member Burt suggested Staff frame the issues raised by Council Members as questions or alternatives for the public to ponder. The Council was raising issues rather than taking action. He inquired whether colleagues felt that would be a good method to incorporate input from the Council.

Vice Mayor Kniss knew Staff had expended an enormous amount of time to prepare public engagement. She understood Council Member Klein's wish to continue the discussion; however, public engagement should begin as planned.

Council Member Scharff asked if the Council would review the proposed document line-by-line and take action at the proposed Special Meeting. The Council should receive public comment, and then review the proposed document line-by-line at the August 4, 2014 Council meeting. He assumed the first available Saturday in June meant a Saturday in June rather than the first Saturday in June.

Council Member Berman concurred with comments made by Vice Mayor Kniss and Council Member Scharff.

Council Member Price agreed with Council Members Scharff and Berman and Vice Mayor Kniss. Receiving public input first would allow the Council to have a refined and intelligent discussion.

Council Member Schmid believed the extra meeting was important for the Council to accept responsibility for the Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Shepherd suggested the Council consider another meeting between August 2014 and early 2015 under Agenda Item Number 12. She wanted to proceed to public engagement.

Council Member Schmid requested clarification of the Motion.

Mayor Shepherd explained that the Motion proposed a Special Meeting of the Council on the first available Saturday in June for a discussion of the Comprehensive Plan regarding policy direction.

MOTION FAILED: 4-5 Berman, Kniss, Price, Scharff, Shepherd no

Council Member Holman recalled the Council discussion of the California Avenue Area Concept Plan was limited by time constraints. She asked when the Council discussion would continue. The Council needed to provide policy direction for the Area Concept Plan and specific plan.

Ms. Gitelman explained that a specific plan was discussed in the context of the grant proposal. Staff committed to return to the Council with a specific scope of work if the City received the grant. Thus, she did not have a date. Over the next few months, Staff would work with the public to ensure alternatives for the Area Concept Plan reflected a range of uses and densities consistent with Council input. Following public comment, the Council could make final adjustments.

Council Member Holman stated the current Area Concept Plan contained FARs when it should not.

Council Member Burt felt presenting an Area Concept Plan with FARs to the public would result in community backlash.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to have Staff return with a Consent Calendar item for removal of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from the California Avenue Concept Plan.

Mr. Keene suggested the Council direct Staff to remove FAR language from the draft Area Concept Plan.

Council Member Burt did not believe that would be an appropriate action as the P&TC had made a recommendation.

Council Member Price asked if the Council would discuss the Concept Plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan discussion scheduled for early August 2014.

Ms. Gitelman reported the Council would discuss densities around the California Avenue area as part of the alternatives analysis.

Council Member Price asked if the Concept Plan would be a part of that discussion.

Mr. Keene advised that it could be a part of the discussion. He was comfortable with presenting the item on the Consent Calendar.

MOTION PASSED: 8-1 Price no

Council Member Klein wanted to know how Staff would handle Council comments.

Mr. Keene indicated Staff would group comments under headings and convert them into questions. The Council could provide ongoing written comments. The public would be interested in knowing the types of issues raised by the Council. Staff suggested video interviews with Council Members so they could personalize concerns and questions about the Comprehensive Plan and update process.

Council Member Klein suggested the draft document indicate it had not been reviewed or approved by the Council.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

2. Proclamation Expressing Appreciation to the Electric Vehicle (EV) Task Force for Outstanding Public Service.

Council Member Burt read the Proclamation into the record.

Peter Pirnejad, Development Services Director, thanked the Council for the Proclamation. Mobile sources accounted for more than half of emissions that contributed to ozone and particulate matter and nearly 40 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in California.

The City was named the 2014 Most Electric Vehicle (EV) Ready Community at the Charged and Connected Symposium. In the next few months, Staff would present additional measures to promote EVs.

Vice Mayor Kniss reported the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Board of Directors recognized the City the previous week. Palo Alto was the first city to enact an Ordinance.

Craig Lewis indicated EVs were a large part of the transition to a smart energy future. The Council, Staff, and community embraced EVs.

Sven Theisen felt it was critical for the community to electrify transportation as quickly as possible.

Mike Thompson stated Council actions were the beginning of defining the future and solving issues related to EV driving.

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Mayor Shepherd announced Staff had continued Agenda Item Number 8 to another date.

James Keene, City Manager, expected it to return at the meeting scheduled for May 19, 2014.

Mayor Shepherd noted a correction to Agenda Item Number 10, which was stated in the At-Places memorandum regarding a potential amendment to the Municipal Code.

Mr. Keene advised that an At-Places memorandum indicated the material was part of the full packet.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

James Keene, City Manager, announced the Our Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee Reunion and Kick Off of the 2030 Plan would occur May 8, 2014 at 6:00 P.M. Although the total water use reduction achieved in City Facilities was 40 percent, the City could only legitimately attribute 30 percent to the City's conservation efforts. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) 10 percent reduction target could be increased at any time; however, a change was not likely prior to the next water supply update scheduled for mid-June 2014. The Santa Clara Valley Water District continued to call for a 20 percent water use reduction.

The Governor's drought declarations did not impose water use restrictions, but served to heighten public awareness. Residents of Palo Alto achieved a nearly 20 percent reduction in water usage in March and April 2014 over March and April 2013.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Wynn Greich stated smart meters allowed radiation levels to increase in homes. Police officers could utilize smart meters to see inside homes.

Melodie Cheney reported 67 families lived in Buena Vista Mobile Home Park, 129 children from Buena Vista attended local schools, and no children from Buena Vista dropped out of school. She requested the Council keep Buena Vista open if possible.

Mayra Escalante invited Palo Alto residents to voice their support for Buena Vista Mobile Home Park at the public hearings scheduled for May 12-14, 2014. Most Buena Vista residents worked in local markets, restaurants, and schools. Proposed relocation benefits stated in the impact report were not adequate.

Jennifer Guzman was upset that the owner of Buena Vista Mobile Home Park wanted to kick her family out of their home. It would be very difficult for the family to find a new home.

Luz Lopez was sad that she might have to leave her home and friends in Buena Vista Mobile Home Park. Her parents had no answer for why they had to leave Buena Vista.

Elisa Guzman did not want Buena Vista Mobile Home Park to close, because she had a lot of family living there. It would be difficult to move and make new friends.

Angel Martinez did not want to leave his home at Buena Vista Mobile Home Park or his current school.

Jose Morales did not want to leave his friends at Buena Vista Mobile Home Park.

Jennifer Tello requested the Council not take Buena Vista Mobile Home Park away. Moving away from Buena Vista would mean changing schools and leaving friends.

Ralph Britten noted the transfer of the Airport was a complex problem with several Federal, State, and County agencies involved in the process. On August 4, 2014, Staff intended to present the transfer of the Airport to the Council for approval. He invited the public to Airport Day scheduled for September 28, 2014.

Cory Wolbach, speaking as an individual, stated Staff's work on greenhouse gas reductions made the City a leader in environmental justice. However, the community had challenges with other areas of justice. He hoped the person elected to fill Council Member Price's seat on the Council would continue her tradition of speaking honestly.

MINUTES APPROVAL

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to approve the minutes of March 24 and April 7, 2014.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

CONSENT CALENDAR

Herb Borock supported the recommendation for Agenda Item Number 10; however, the item should be placed on the Consent Calendar for the next meeting. The at-places memorandum indicated the posted agenda misstated the proposed Council action and, thus, the item did not fulfill Brown Act requirements.

Council Member Holman requested the City Attorney respond to Mr. Borock's comments.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported the item did not utilize technical words typically employed by Staff. The item did adequately inform the public that an amendment to the Municipal Code was contemplated. The Council could take action at the current time. A second reading of the Ordinance would provide an additional opportunity for public comment.

Council Member Klein recorded a no vote for Agenda Item Number 4.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-7, 9 and 10 with at-places changes.

3. <u>Resolution 9409</u> entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Determining That Net Energy Metering Aggregation Will Not Result in Increased Cost-Shifting to Non-Participants."

- 4. Update on 2013 Know Your Neighbor Grant Program and Direction to Continue Pilot for One Year.
- 5. Approval of a Contract Amendment with Bibliotheca, Inc. Extending the Term to June 30, 2017 and Adding An Amount Not to Exceed \$300,000 for the Ongoing Purchase of a Radio Frequency Identification System (RFID) for the Palo Alto City Library Capital Improvement Program Project TE-06001.
- 6. Recommending Council Authorize the City Manager to Approve Law Enforcement Regional Data Sharing Agreement ("Memorandum Of Understanding For The South Bay Information Sharing System South Bay Region Node").
- 7. Resolution 9410 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending and Restating the Administrative Penalty Schedule and Civil Penalty Schedules for Certain Violations of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and the California Vehicle Code Established by Resolution No. 9209."
- 8. Adoption of a Resolution Approving the Proposed Google Network Hut License Agreement.
- 9. <u>Budget Amendment Ordinance 5244</u> entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 to Adjust Budgeted Revenues and Expenditures in Accordance with the Recommendations in the FY 2014 Midyear Budget Review Report."
- 10. Approval of Municipal Code Amendment to Mandate Reporting of Rabies Vaccinations.

MOTION PASSED for Agenda Item Numbers 3, 5-7, 9 and 10: 9-0

MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 4: 8-1 Klein no

Council Member Klein indicated a majority of funds was spent on food. Organizations receiving grants held similar events in the past and would hold similar events in the future. Grants were awarded to a few activist organizations. This program was not an appropriate expenditure of City funds.

ACTION ITEMS

11. PUBLIC HEARING: Resolution 9411 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2015 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding Allocation and the 2015 Draft Action Plan."

Consuelo Hernandez, Senior Planner reported the City received funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) annually as an entitled city under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. To be eligible for funding, the City had to prepare a five-year strategic plan, referred to as a consolidated plan, and a one-year action plan. The City was experiencing a 7.1 percent reduction in funds; however, the budget was comprised of entitlement funds, program income, and prior year resources. Funds were allocated to five categories: Public Service, Planning and Administration, Economic Development, Housing, and Public Facilities. The Federal statute placed two spending caps on Public Service activities and Planning and Administration. Public Service activities were similar to those funded under the Human Services Resource Allocation Process (HSRAP). For Fiscal Year (FY) 2015, the spending cap was \$95,320. The Human Relations Commission (HRC) and Finance Committee agreed to fund the Opportunity Center and SRO Resident Support Services program at a higher rate than other agencies, because they addressed priority needs contained within the consolidated plan. Staff proposed to fund Project Sentinel through Planning and Administration. For FY 2015, \$113,996 was proposed for Planning and Administration. Staff included a request to fund a consultant contract to prepare the next five-year consolidated plan and to analyze fair housing services. Development activities did not have spending caps. Staff proposed to fund both programs in Economic Development at the requested amounts. Staff requested an additional \$150,000 to fund the Microenterprise Assistance Program (MAP).

Public Hearing opened and closed without public comment at 8:55 P.M.

Council Member Scharff felt \$150,000 was a great deal of money to fund six MAP projects. Perhaps those funds would be better spent for other high-impact projects.

Ms. Hernandez advised that the total budget was \$150,000. Of that, approximately \$37,000 funded six projects. Approximately \$35,000 would be spent on personnel costs. The balance of funds would be carried forward to the next fiscal year.

Council Member Scharff clarified that \$69,000 was utilized to fund six projects. He inquired about Staff's reasons for requesting additional funding.

Ms. Hernandez explained that Staff would assess and evaluate the program in June 2014. Through that process, Staff hoped to determine additional uses of funding. Staff proposed a roundtable discussion in June 2014 to develop MAP for the following year. If the full amount of funding was not utilized, then Staff would apply remaining funds to another program.

Council Member Scharff asked why Staff did not request \$75,000 for MAP and \$75,000 for another high-impact program.

Ms. Hernandez indicated funding amounts were within the Council's discretion. If the Council chose to decrease MAP funding to \$75,000, then Staff would have to revise the CDBG application, which was due May 15, 2014.

Council Member Scharff asked why Staff did not present CDBG funding earlier so that Council revisions would not negatively impact programs.

Ms. Hernandez advised that Staff held two public hearings, and the Finance Committee approved the recommendation.

Council Member Scharff reviewed Minutes of the Finance Committee's discussion regarding the lack of an informational report. The Council had the informational report; however, any revisions would delay the application. That was not good planning.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, did not wish to miss the deadline, because it would jeopardize funding.

Council Member Scharff asked if Staff could submit an application for other programs while revising MAP funding.

Ms. Hernandez reported the only option was to place funding in the Workforce Development program; however, Staff allocated funding for Workforce Development at the maximum amount requested. The City also had to meet HUD's spending timeliness test. Staff could return with a Budget Amendment Ordinance (BAO) after exploring options for use of funding.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether Staff could submit the application without MAP.

Ms. Hernandez advised that the Council could submit the application for MAP funding of \$150,000 and direct Staff to provide additional information on how to spend the \$150,000.

Council Member Scharff asked if the Council could refer a BAO to the Finance Committee for review.

Ms. Hernandez indicated a BAO would not be necessary if funding remained at \$150,000. Staff would simply add a program under MAP.

Council Member Schmid recalled that CDBG funding was usually presented with HSRAP funding. The Staff Report did not contain a comparison of FY 2014 allocations to FY 2015 allocations. He requested Staff comment on any notable differences in allocations.

Ms. Hernandez noted the allocation for the Public Service category decreased \$8,200 in FY 2015.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the proportionate share for each agency would remain the same.

Ms. Hernandez stated the percentage of funding for each agency within Public Service remained the same.

Council Member Schmid asked if any agencies also applied for HSRAP funding.

Ms. Hernandez understood two agencies applied for both programs. The Community Services Department (CSD) Budget contained allocations for HSRAP.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether Staff would have a separate presentation for HSRAP funding.

Ms. Hernandez replied no. HSRAP funding was based on a two-year cycle and not contingent upon HUD funding.

Council Member Schmid felt the time could be appropriate for the Council to consider an increase.

James Keene, City Manager, reported the Council had discretion to revise funding during the Budget process.

MOTION: Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Kniss to: 1) adopt the Resolution allocating CDBG funding as recommended by staff in the 2015 Action Plan; 2) authorize staff to submit the 2015 Action Plan to the Department of Housing and Urban Development by the May 15, 2014 deadline; 3) authorize the City Manager, on behalf of the City, to execute the 2015 application and Action Plan for CDBG funds and any other necessary documents concerning the application and to otherwise bind the City with respect to the application and commitment of funds; and 4) beginning with CDBG 2016 cycle, Staff to provide pertinent information describing the Microenterprise Assistance Program.

Mayor Shepherd recommended the Finance Committee review CDBG funding during Budget hearings. She inquired whether impact investment was the City's categorical name or a standard program name.

Ms. Hernandez indicated the Economic Development category was a general language.

Mayor Shepherd felt impact investment was more logical than microenterprise. Impact investment implied economic development at the entry level of social entrepreneurship. Staff was working with the Downtown Streets Team to identify those with viable abilities for MAP.

Council Member Holman noted the Motion did not contain the fourth item recommended by the Finance Committee.

Ms. Gitelman stated Staff failed to include the fourth recommendation in the Staff Report. It was a direction to Staff concerning the following year's funding cycle.

Council Member Holman recalled that the Finance Committee included the fourth point based on concerns similar to Council Member Scharff's concerns.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to refer the Microenterprise Assistance Program to Finance Committee for review.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the Finance Committee would review MAP during the Budget process.

Council Member Scharff answered yes.

Ms. Hernandez reported Staff could return to the Finance Committee with specific programs or projects within the \$150,000 amount.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether any other Council Members received the informational report. Because the informational report was missing from his packet, he obtained a copy from the City Clerk.

Ms. Gitelman would investigate the matter.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0

 Comprehensive Plan Update -- Review of the Comprehensive Plan Update Community Engagement Plan and Community Leadership Group.

Mayor Shepherd explained the item allowed the Council to discuss and direct Staff regarding the engagement plan and composition of the leadership group. No Council action was required.

Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning and Community Environment, recalled that the Council specifically requested a review of the Community Engagement Plan in March 2014. The engagement plan covered the entire 18 or 24-month update process. As Council Member Burt suggested earlier, Staff could frame questions for the community in the visioning phase based on Council comment. The Community Engagement Plan was intended as a roadmap for engagement efforts. It contained three broad objectives: 1) to solicit meaningful input regarding critical issues facing the City and a design for the future; 2) to ensure participation by a wide cross-section of the community including groups usually underrepresented; and 3) to ensure public input informed the final work product. The Community Engagement Plan grouped tools and technologies into four categories: 1) community meetings and workshops; 2) virtual meetings and online interactions; 3) a campaign to meet people in their spaces; and 4) formal public hearings. Staff wanted to enlist of group of 12-15 members of the public who had established networks in the community or who had expertise in community engagement. The members would be appointed by the City Manager based The group would focus primarily on community applications. engagement, meet monthly in public, and advocate for the Comprehensive Plan process. Applicants would live or work in Palo Alto; have established connections and networks in the community; belong to an existing community or professional organization or have a special expertise in community engagement; have energy and ideas about expanding engagement; and be willing to meet on a monthly basis. engagement would begin with a social event on May 8, 2014. Thereafter, Staff would disseminate information regarding the first round of community meetings and online interactions.

The first traditional planning workshop was scheduled for May 29, 2014 with subsequent meetings scheduled in mid- and late-June. One public hearing would occur at a Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) meeting in July. In August the Council would discuss community input and hopefully provide Staff with direction on how to proceed with the draft Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) phase. Staff requested Council comment regarding the Community Engagement Plan and composition of the Community Leadership Group.

Lois Salo wanted the City to obtain State and Federal funding to buy the Buena Vista Mobile Home Park property and to build a homeless shelter.

Vice Mayor Kniss recalled Council Members submitted names as a consideration for the leadership group in 1992. Staff could consider that for the proposed group.

James Keene, City Manager, encouraged the Council to submit names and to urge folks to apply. The concept for the Community Leadership Group was to focus on a robust engagement effort.

Vice Mayor Kniss indicated participation in the group would require a big commitment.

Council Member Price asked if Staff would consider cultural, ethnic, age, and socioeconomic diversity within the group. The group needed to represent a broad range of individuals. She suggested Staff consider naming alternates for the group in case members had to leave the group. She asked if current Board and Commission members could be considered for the group.

Ms. Gitelman accepted Council Member Price's suggestions regarding diversity and alternates. She wanted to look beyond members of existing Commissions, Boards, and task groups in an attempt to involve more people. Applications would determine whether Staff could meet those goals.

Council Member Price requested a deadline for the Council to submit names for consideration.

Ms. Gitelman could disseminate an application form with a deadline towards the end of May 2014.

Council Member Klein liked the idea of street stalls for engagement. Staff should invite people to apply for the Community Leadership Group. Staff needed to consider outreach to churches, businesses, Chamber of Commerce, Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), Jewish Community Center (JCC), homeowner associations, Parent Teacher Associations (PTA), Avenidas, and other senior organizations. Current members of Boards and Commissions should not be considered for the leadership group so that new people could participate.

Council Member Burt supported comments made by Council Members Price and Klein. Many aspects of outreach would apply to community meetings. He suggested notices be placed in libraries, school entrances, and train stations. Typically alternates became members of the group whether or not a member dropped out. A fourth objective for engagement should be to educate the community with objective information. The Staff Report did not mention a balancing of stakeholder perspectives for the Community Leadership Group. At the initial social event, he suggested Staff solicit recommendations from former Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) members regarding engagement that was and was not effective in developing the existing Comprehensive Plan as well as request written comments from former CPAC members.

Council Member Holman concurred with the suggestion for Council Members to submit names for the leadership group. She interpreted the purpose of the group as outreach rather than leadership and suggested the name not include the word "leadership." The group should have a good balance of residents compared to businesses and service organizations. Pages 2 and 3 Community Engagement Plan mentioned use of recommendations for a starting place. The appropriate starting place was the existing Comprehensive Plan. With respect to the community group becoming experts on the Comprehensive Plan, members with no experience on Boards and Commissions would not become experts in the timeframe Proposed questions for alternative futures seemed to direct responses toward redevelopment. The City needed a working group or task force to work with the consultant in coalescing community comments.

Council Member Schmid supported Council Member Holman's comments regarding use of the word "leadership" in the name of the group. Having an appointed group become "leaders" was slightly wrong.

Ms. Gitelman reported Staff proposed "leadership," because they wanted busy, connected people to apply for the group. The group should sound important, and applicants should know the group was valuable. Of course Staff would accept alternate suggestions.

Council Member Schmid felt the use of "leadership" implied members of the group would be the leaders rather than Staff, Council, or residents. He asked if members would represent themselves individually or organizations. In the June 10, 2014 meeting regarding future growth manage, Staff would utilize base data from the Silicon Valley Index. However, the index represented an advocacy position and point of view. Members of the group should represent as clearly as possible the general voting population of Palo Alto. He inquired about the Existing Conditions Report that would be background material for the May 29, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Gitelman reported Staff would create and disseminate a collection of data regarding existing conditions as a method for evaluating strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities.

Council Member Schmid noted earlier discussion indicated base data was a good starting point. The Council would be interested in the Existing Conditions Report. Schools would be a great place to engage younger families and younger people. Perhaps Staff could utilize emergency preparedness block leaders for outreach.

Council Member Berman concurred that current members of Boards and Commissions should not be members of the community group; however, they and their networks should not be overlooked. As long as the group's scope of work was fairly narrow, then the term "leadership" could remain in the name. Perhaps Staff could utilize Nextdoor for outreach efforts. He assumed Staff's proposed criteria for the leadership group were minimum criteria.

Council Member Scharff accepted use of the word "leadership" for the name of the group. He wanted the group to be comprised of new people from the community.

Mayor Shepherd requested Staff explain outreach for Our Palo Alto. She was impressed with the diverse outreach obtained. The leadership group should involve all new people. She supported comments regarding diversity of group members.

Ms. Gitelman would make every effort to ensure the Community Leadership Group was diverse. The existing Comprehensive Plan was the starting point for P&TC recommendations; however, both documents would be put aside during the visioning exercise. Perhaps a working group or task force could be formed once Staff provided a draft Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for review.

Staff was searching for leadership group members with established networks in the community. Staff would give more thought to the name of the group as they drafted an application form.

Council Member Holman asked if Council Members could submit names for the leadership group and, if so, what was the deadline.

Ms. Gitelman would provide information once an application form was created and a deadline for applying was determined.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the Council was allowed to submit names.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, replied yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Price noted National Children's Mental Health Awareness Day was May 6, 2014. More information was available at samhsa.gov.

The City Council went into the Closed Session at 10:00 P.M.

CLOSED SESSION

13. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY – EXISTING LITIGATION
City of Palo Alto v. Regional Water Quality Control Board, San
Francisco Bay Region: Petition for Review and Reconsideration of
Failure to Act on Application for Section 401 Water Quality Certification
of the City of Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course Reconfiguration Project,
and Request to Hold Petition in Abeyance (petition filed April 1, 2014,
before the California State Water Resources Board)

Request for Reconsideration to the Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (letter filed April 1, 2014)

Authority: Government Code section 54956.9

The Council returned from the Closed Session at 10:30 P.M. and Mayor Shepherd advised no reportable action.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

ATTEST:	APPROVED:	
City Clerk	Mayor	

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