

# CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL RETREAT MINUTES

Special Meeting February 1, 2014

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date at Ventura Activity Center at 9:05 A.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss, Price, Scharff, Schmid,

Shepherd

Absent:

## MAYOR'S WELCOME AND OVERVIEW OF DAY

Mayor Shepherd reported she had worked with the City Manager to craft a Work Plan for 2014. She hoped to begin the day with a community conversation, and then move to Council Priorities. After lunch, the Council would discuss Council Committees and time management of Council meetings.

#### ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

## 1. Core Values Update.

James Keene, City Manager, noted the City discussed management of the Ventura Activity Center with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD). The City was providing portable Wi-Fi for the Retreat.

Claudia Keith, Chief Communications Manager, reported at the November 4, 2013 meeting, the Council directed Staff to conduct community outreach regarding Core Values. Staff employed Open City Hall, a smart screen, and a video to perform outreach. A question was posted to Open City Hall and social media sites, and emails were sent to 867 subscribers and neighborhood associations. As of January 31, 2014, 439 people reviewed the question on Open City Hall with 112 posting responses. Responses were provided in the Council Packet and posted to the City's website. Responses were received primarily from persons aged 50 and up and from the Barron Park, Crescent Park, and Downtown North neighborhoods. Broad themes in responses were environmental protection sustainability, a pedestrian and

bike friendly community, walkable communities, quality of life, vision and innovation, planning, open and transparent government, inclusiveness and tolerance, youth well-being, safety and security. A smart screen was rotated throughout locations in the City. The smart screen captured more than 50 responses reflecting themes similar to those provided on Open City Hall. Four Jordan Middle School students interviewed residents about Core Values and a video was created. All input and video would be posted online for public review.

Mr. Keene recalled the Council's discussion of Priorities at the 2013 Retreat. As part of that discussion, the Council wanted to identify enduring Core Values. Staff would continue to collect community input and proceed as the Council directed. Use of Open City Hall encouraged direct citizen participation.

Tom Dubois felt the limited number of responses was not representative of the community. Analysis of comments on paloaltoonline.com could be useful. Because the National Citizen Survey had a more rigorous methodology, its data would be more useful.

Penny Ellson hoped the Council would place emphasis on bicycle and pedestrian transportation during the discussion. She noted the Matadero Bike Boulevard was delayed by months and hoped it would move quickly.

Cheryl Lilienstein encouraged Staff to focus data collection in areas south of Page Mill Road.

Council Member Price inquired about Staff's use of traditional methods of outreach to the community.

Ms. Keith indicated Staff would continue outreach using non-technology methods, such as face-to-face interviews and written responses.

Council Member Price suggested Staff utilize natural networks, such as the Council of Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs).

Council Member Berman reported the thoughtfulness of responses exceeded his expectations. He encouraged Staff to continue their outreach efforts and the public to respond.

Council Member Klein was concerned whether Staff was reaching the entire community. The Asian-American community, residents under age 40, and renters constituted a majority of Palo Alto citizens; however, their input was not received. To obtain an understanding of community values, Staff needed to reach all citizens.

Council Member Burt felt Staff needed to figure out more effective ways to reach newer residents. From his observation of the room, no one from the Asian community was present at the Retreat. Inclusion of all residents would be a challenge. Responses had a diversity of perspective but with some unifying themes. He was impressed with the thoughtfulness and civility of comments, unlike comments posted to paloaltoonline.com. Building the forum was proceeding in the right direction; however, analysis of comments could be a problem. In 2013, the Council committed to setting Core Values; however, the process for determining Core Values was ongoing. The Council's prior discussion of Core Values was not provided as a reference point for community input. Offering a reference point would facilitate a deeper discussion.

Council Member Holman felt responses were not received from low-income residents, young parents, and environmental communities. She suggested Staff utilize neighborhood associations, environmental organizations, and public safety networks in an effort to reach the entire community. When the Council discussed Core Values, it decided not to define Core Values for community discussion, which she felt was unwise. In 2013, the Council considered Healthy City Healthy Community as a potential Core Value; yet, that was not included in any of the discussions. She inquired whether the videos would continue and whether the National Citizen Survey would be included in information given to the Council.

Council Member Schmid felt the Council should recognize the messages it received quite clearly from the community. Four areas of the National Citizen Survey with historically low scores were traffic impact, lack of parking, land use policies, and quality of new developments. Scores for those four areas decreased dramatically in the prior 12 months. The National Citizen Survey should provide a clear message to the Council in addressing Priorities.

Council Member Scharff suggested Staff utilize networks for sports teams in order to include young families in outreach. A second round of outreach could allow the public to react to a menu of Core Values. Staff should provide a timeline for outreach and Council discussion.

Vice Mayor Kniss believed Core Values were evident. Core Values were quality of life, environmental sustainability, and some variation of traffic. The Council's struggle was in determining how to state those Core Values.

Signed comments carried more weight than unsigned comments. She suggested Staff hold public meetings in different areas of the City.

Mayor Shepherd was interested in the Council, Staff, and the community being more personable. Residents wanted to see each other and know each other. She believed that was a Core Value.

Mr. Keene believed the Council could discuss Staff returning with Core Values as an Agenda Item for the next Council meeting. A larger discussion regarding Our Palo Alto would address the questions of communities and channels for engagement. Staff made the decision to leave the question open-ended because the Council did not define Core Values. Staff could analyze existing responses for data and then perform additional outreach for specific responses. He requested the Council provide Staff with general direction regarding a schedule for returning with the Core Values discussion.

Mayor Shepherd understood components of Core Values were woven throughout the Work Plan. The Council could add items to the Work Plan.

#### 2. 2014 Work Plan and Our Palo Alto Initiative.

James Keene, City Manager, drafted the Agenda for the Retreat based on Agendas from prior Retreats. In the past, the Council identified Priorities, and Staff identified needed projects or actions related to those Priorities. Staff provided their list of potential issues for calendar year 2014. He discussed the 31 items on the list with the Executive Leadership Team in relation to programming the items for Council meetings during the year. He requested the Council discuss the list of items. Staff would return to the Council within 30 days with details of the items. The discussion of the Our Palo Alto Initiative would provide additional details about a number of the items, particularly Land Use and Transportation.

Mayor Shepherd reiterated that Staff would provide a master calendar within 30 days. She noted the list of potential meeting dates did not include a Council Break.

Mr. Keene felt the Council should first determine the items of importance, and then consider the scheduling of those topics. Any master calendar would change as additional issues arose during the year.

Annette Glanckopf was concerned about the omission of public safety and emergency preparedness from the list of items. She recommended the Council specifically include in the Work Plan the Public Safety Building as a Priority.

Robert Moss suggested the Council concentrate on consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The Planned Community (PC) process needed to be restructured as development impacted schools.

Stephanie Munoz felt a good community could be achieved through a high quality of life. Quality of life was not a Core Value but a peripheral value. Residents of Buena Vista Mobile Home Park should be allowed to keep their homes.

Mayor Shepherd requested the Council provide feedback on the list of items for calendar year 2014.

Mr. Keene suggested the Council indicate whether the items were appropriate for discussion and possible action in 2014. The list of items informed the evolution of a work calendar for the year.

Council Member Price felt the list was daunting. In considering the list, the Council should bear in mind the distinction between discretionary and regulatory items. The list did not contain a general category that acknowledged the City's ongoing responsibilities and subsequent work items; particularly regarding social services for the community. Many items in categories had a natural affinity with one another and many would naturally cluster in terms of scheduling.

Mr. Keene indicated the Council should not consider how Staff managed their workload. The discussion should focus on unavoidable issues that should be agendized in calendar year 2014.

Council Member Scharff suggested the list be broken into a Work Plan for Staff and a Work Plan for the Council. The Council was not aware of all the work Staff was performing. A Public Safety Building was far more important than the remodeling of the first floor of City Hall. The item of infrastructure projects should be expanded to indicate the infrastructure projects. Less notable items such as sidewalk setbacks and expanding and protecting retail in Downtown should be on the list.

Council Member Holman concurred with Council Member Price's comments regarding social services for the community to include homelessness and the Human Service Resource Allocation Process (HSRAP). Some items were more appropriate for Staff rather than the Council. Some items were traditionally combined with a regular Council meeting. Action on sidewalk setbacks and Downtown retail could not wait for completion of the Downtown CAP Study. Current zoning should be listed under Parking. State

legislation and lobbying should be on the list. A business registry should be added to the list. Upstream potential solutions should be added to the list under San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority. Under Urban Forest Master Plan, natural habitat should be highlighted.

Vice Mayor Kniss suggested Staff assign a weight to topics. Many times one item would drive the remaining items. Some items might need only updates to inform the Council and the public. Social services for the community needed further discussion.

Council Member Berman noted the Council would work on the items but probably would not finish them. With respect to items with stated timeframes, he requested Staff present them to the Council as soon as the items were ready.

Council Member Burt believed cross-referencing items with Council Priorities and Core Values would be informative. The process would convey whether the Work Plan was a rational plan around a vision and prioritization or a list of reactions. Many of the items were enabled through the City's financial reforms. The Landscape Zoning Ordinance could be utilized in reviewing natural habitat. Community services should be included on the list. The City's major development issue was not Planned Communities (PC). Zoning reform should be the Land Use and Transportation Priority. Land Use and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan were concerns for the community and should be the focus of the Comprehensive Plan update in 2014.

Council Member Schmid believed the Council needed elements of the Comprehensive Plan to make decisions. The Council did not have basic data to make decisions. The Council should rethink how it dealt with economics in the Budget and decision making. The amount of commercial development and the tradeoff between office space and retail space were critical issues for the Comprehensive Plan. This was the basic information the Council needed to make decisions and the public needed to provide input.

Council Member Klein believed the list was a useful tool to identify issues the Council would face. The number of issues would determine whether the Council would have sufficient time to cover all items and to include other initiatives. Entire meetings should not be devoted to public safety, emergency preparedness, or homeless issues. Developing a state lobbying policy and a business registry should be included. A category of issues in the Utility Department containing items regarding the proposed Western Transmission Line and water rates should be included. The first floor remodel of City Hall and Main Library should not be included in the list.

Page 6 of 23 City Council Meeting Minutes: 02/01/14 Mayor Shepherd requested Staff note the lead department and lead Staff for each item when they returned in 30 days. Services to the community were included in Standing Committee procedures. The two focus areas of California Avenue and East Meadow Circle should be included as subsections of the Comprehensive Plan. Under Land Use and Transportation, 27 University Avenue should be included. In addition, the Downtown CAP Study and playing fields should be contained in the list. Under Environment, the Cool Cities Challenge and Georgetown Prize remained outstanding. PC Zone reform was part of the Council Agenda for February 3, 2014.

Mr. Keene indicated the Council's useful feedback would guide Staff's next steps. The first floor remodel of City Hall was included on the list because of its possible impact on meeting rooms. He viewed the list of items as a means to focus the Council's discussion of Priorities and meetings.

The City Council took a break at 11:05 A.M. and returned at 11:23 A.M.

Mayor Shepherd noted the topic of Our Palo Alto was on the Agenda for the February 3, 2014 Council meeting.

Mr. Keene believed the worksheet regarding Our Palo Alto would help the Council work through and move forward regarding elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The Ideas section of the worksheet addressed the Council's commentary regarding engagement of the community. The City's job was to design opportunities for the community to provide input. Staff felt a discussion of Our Palo Alto connected to the Council's work regarding Priorities and the Work Plan.

- 3. Council Annual Priorities Setting
  - a. Process Foundation
  - b. Public Comment
  - c. Individual Nominees
  - d. <u>Action:</u> Final Grouping into Priorities and Vote and Approval

James Keene, City Manager, reported the Council's suggestions relating to Priorities for 2014 were included in the packet. He did not believe it would be difficult for the Council to reach agreement based on the Priorities suggested by Council Members. He hoped the Council could be efficient and set Priorities for 2014.

Council Member Klein wanted to hear Council comments regarding the process for setting Priorities. The process the Council adopted in 2013 was

designed to avoid a free-for-all discussion which wasted time. The Council should comment first, so the public could provide appropriate input.

Mayor Shepherd agreed the process for the Retreat was not the process adopted by the Council in 2013; however, it was a new process and this was the first time it was used.

Council Member Klein felt the City Manager's request for suggested Priorities was confusing. In 2013 the Council agreed to adopt Priorities for two consecutive years with the understanding that a compelling case could warrant a change in Priorities.

Council Member Price was uncertain regarding the topic for Council comment. She questioned whether she should speak to a process for setting Priorities, retaining the 2013 Priorities for 2014, or defending her suggested Priorities.

Mayor Shepherd suggested Council Members comment on the process for setting Priorities or retention of the 2013 Priorities for 2014.

Council Member Price originally believed the 2013 Priorities should be retained for 2014. Based on results of the previous year's work, she now believed the Council should determine slightly different focus areas. Priorities should be Transportation and Mobility, Environmental issues, Sustainability, and Climate and Drought Adaptation.

Mayor Shepherd understood Council Member Price wished to discuss expanding Priorities.

Council Member Price indicated the Work Plan was already vast and dictated Council action.

Council Member Berman preferred a discussion of Council Priorities.

Vice Mayor Kniss stated the Council needed to complete planning for infrastructure projects. A community conversation was a good Priority to have.

Mayor Shepherd hoped the Council would indicate whether it wished to hold a discussion of Priorities.

Council Member Burt wished to have some discussion of Priorities. The Council should hold to its definition of a Priority and to its commitment to continue Priorities for a two-year period unless change was needed.

Council Member Scharff agreed Council Priorities should remain in place for two years. He wanted to expand the California Avenue and Downtown Priority and discuss Mobility and Transportation.

Council Member Holman reported the Council should discuss Priorities. The existing Council Priorities were not clearly stated in the packet.

Council Member Schmid found the results of the National Citizen Survey strikingly different from the past, so striking that the Council should have a new discussion of Priorities.

Mayor Shepherd agreed with comments regarding the definition of a Priority. Typically the Policy and Services Committee would have reviewed proposed Priorities prior to the Retreat and taken public input. She was inclined to take comments at the current time in order to learn whether the Council wished to refer the item to the Policy and Services Committee.

Aram James felt the Police Department's practices were improving. He requested the Council discuss the cost of tasers and possibly limiting their use. The Council should hold at least one forum regarding homelessness in order to continue the progress made in 2013.

Shani Kleinhaus, Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, felt sustainability and green efforts often ignored the complexity of nature in the urban landscape. The Council should incorporate livability of wildlife and nature into Priorities.

Jeff Hoel understood Priorities would carry over from 2013 to 2014. He favored the Council adopting Technology and the Connected City (Technology) as a Priority again in 2014. The City should focus on municipalities implementing Fiber to the Premises without a private partnership.

Stephanie Munoz indicated the Priorities for 2013 should be retained in 2014. The Council should decide Priorities based on circumstances. She thanked Council Members for their service and good intentions.

Mr. Keene believed continuing the topic to another day would not be in the best interest of the Council and the community. When the Council set Priorities in 2013, they discussed identifying Priorities that needed particular, concentrated attention. He did not recommend the Council retain Technology as a Priority. Staff would continue working on fiber and wireless without it being a Priority. Reframing the California Avenue and Downtown issue would be more relevant to the Council retaining the existing Priorities.

The Council received messages and data that should be considered when reenacting Priorities for the year.

Council Member Burt concurred with City Manager comments regarding Technology, as it could be folded into the Work Plan. He suggested the Land Use and Transportation portion of the Comprehensive Plan update be the Priority for 2014. He proposed use of the term "built environment" rather than "urban design" because urban design was a real concern for many members of the community. Our Palo Alto was a process, not a Priority. Our Palo Alto could help the Council move toward concrete actions.

**MOTION:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to have two priorities for 2014; 1) Updated Comprehensive Land Use and Transportation Plan; the Built Environment –Transportation, Parking and Livability, and 2) Infrastructure Strategy and Funding.

Council Member Klein expressed concern about eliminating Technology as a Priority. He would agree to its elimination with the City Manager's assurance that Staff would continue working on it.

Mr. Keene clarified he suggested substituting another Priority for Technology. If the question was accountability, he would prefer it remain as a Priority. Technology could provide assistance with the larger piece of community conversation and outreach.

Vice Mayor Kniss inquired whether Council Member Burt was agreeable to retaining Technology as a Priority.

Council Member Burt responded yes.

Council Member Klein preferred retaining Technology as a Priority.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add Technology and the Connected City back in as a third priority.

Council Member Holman supported Priority Number 1 and Number 2, and suggested the third Priority be Natural Environment: Urban Forest, Natural Habitat Resource Conservation.

Council Member Burt viewed that as a Core Value around environmental sustainability.

Council Member Holman stated it became a Priority because of the drought and preparation of the Urban Forest Master Plan. It should replace Technology as a Priority.

**AMENDMENT:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member XXX to include A Natural Environment –Urban Forest Natural Environment Resource Conservation as a priority.

## AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

**AMENDMENT:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to add "natural habitat" to the first part of the Motion "the Built Environment –Transportation, Parking and Livability."

Council Member Holman felt livability addressed the human experience. The natural environment and livability for animal life affected the livability of the community.

Council Member Schmid felt natural habitat was a natural extension of livability. Being explicit did not diminish the thrust of the Motion.

Council Member Scharff would not support the Amendment. Retaining the focus of the Motion was important.

Vice Mayor Kniss remarked the Motion was sufficiently broad. To expand it further would lose the intent.

## **AMENDMENT FAILED:** 2-7 Holman, Schmid yes

Mr. Keene understood the intent of the wording on the first Priority in the Motion, but was concerned the language could have counterproductive components. It could be interpreted that all Council actions related to land use and transportation should be subsumed under the Comprehensive Plan discussion. If the Council wished to focus first on land use and transportation in reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, perhaps the Council should rethink the Priorities. There could be unintended consequences if the Council did not change the language. If the Council wished to place emphasis on the Comprehensive Plan, they should consider breaking it into two parts.

Council Member Burt struggled with whether to have the proposed Priority under the umbrella of the Comprehensive Plan or the subject matter. It would be the subject as opposed to the document.

**MOTION RESTATED**: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to have; 1) comprehensive Land Use and Transportation Planning and Action; the Built Environment –Transportation, Parking and Livability, 2) Infrastructure Strategy and Funding, and 3) Technology and the Connected City.

Mr. Keene reported utilizing the subject included all of that and did not limit Staff or the Council.

Vice Mayor Kniss believed the Council needed to move in that direction. The Infrastructure Committee was moving toward a decision that would be presented to the Council. She supported retaining Technology as a Priority because the City did not make sufficient progress on it in 2013.

Council Member Scharff felt mobility was slightly different from transportation and suggested adding mobility to the Motion.

Council Member Burt was unsure whether the community would understand the Council's meaning by adding mobility.

Council Member Scharff reported mobility included such items as timing of signal lights and fixing the Town and Country issue.

Council Member Burt stated those were traditionally transportation issues.

Council Member Scharff believed shuttles, bike paths, car trips, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Programs were usually considered transportation issues. Adding mobility created an emphasis for Staff.

**AMENDMENT:** Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Kniss to include mobility after "Built Environment-Transportation".

Mayor Shepherd added that Arastradero Road was another project for mobility. Mobility brought a different element to transportation.

**AMENDMENT PASSED:** 6-3 Berman, Burt, Schmid no

Mr. Keene requested a clarification of the Motion.

Council Member Burt did not believe there was a substantive difference between the Motion and Staff's proposed language.

Council Member Klein indicated transportation and land use should be in lower case letters.

Council Member Burt noted an inconsistency between lower case land use and transportation and the other proposed Priorities.

Mayor Shepherd reported mobility would be included under the bullet point.

Council Member Berman felt the first bullet point reflected the goal of a community conversation regarding the City's future. He supported the three proposed Priorities.

Council Member Price agreed with the change in language and felt the change supported her earlier comments. She questioned how Priority Number 1 was different from current efforts to update the Comprehensive Plan. Many of the items were identified as part of the Work Plan. She inquired whether the Council could vote on each Priority separately.

Mayor Shepherd concurred.

Council Member Schmid understood this would involve the prioritization of data gathering and sharing. The most basic decisions required traffic data, parking data, and development cap data. He wished to be explicit that he anticipated Staff would provide good data for the Council and for the public.

Mr. Keene reported data was a critical component. No matter how good the data was, there would still be many debates regarding it.

Mayor Shepherd supported retaining Priority Number 2 because she wanted the infrastructure management system to be part of the strategy to bring infrastructure needs to a conclusion.

#### MOTION SEPARATED FOR PURPOSES OF VOTING

**MOTION PASSED for** comprehensive planning and action on land use and transportation: the built environment, transportation, mobility, parking and livability: 9-0

Mayor Shepherd noted the proposed Priorities were not presented in order of priority. Each Priority had equal weight.

**MOTION PASSED for** Infrastructure Strategy and Funding: 8-1 Price no

Council Member Price felt the Council had made sufficient progress with respect to Infrastructure Strategy and Funding. It was clearly articulated in the Work Plan. Environmental and sustainability issues were critical in terms of much of the Council's work.

Council Member Burt wished to ensure Mayor Shepherd's comment regarding relative importance of the Priorities was not reflected as the position of the Council. The order of the Priorities was roughly aligned in importance to the Council and to the community.

Mayor Shepherd suggested the Policy and Services Committee determine whether the Priorities were equally weighted.

**MOTION PASSED for** Technology and the Connected City: 9-0

Council took a lunch break from 12:30 PM until 12:45 P.M.

Priorities & Work Plan: Getting the Work Done

#### 4. Committees

- a. Technology & Connected City: <u>Action</u>: Review reappointment of the Committee. Schedule Staff updates to Council as part of 2014 Work Plan.
- b. Rail Committee: <u>Action</u>: Consider folding the committee work into Council for 2014. Cal Train EIR will be brought to full Council. Staff will monitor other items and bring to Council as needed.
- c. Committee of the Whole: <u>Action</u>: Consider establishing a Committee of the Whole format for use a few times a year (quarterly?) for key emergent issues that could benefit from full Council discussion and potential action in a committee setting format.

Mayor Shepherd stated Agenda Item Number 4 was focused around not yet having assigned Council appointments to either the Technology and the Connected City Committee or the City Council Rail Committee for 2014.

James Keene, City Manager, reported the Clerk's calendar for calendar year 2014 contained 31 Council meetings, 21 Finance Committee meetings, 10 Policy and Services Committee meetings, 11 Regional Housing Mandate Committee meetings, 1 Infrastructure Committee meeting, and 11 Rail Committee meetings.

Page 14 of 23 City Council Meeting Minutes: 02/01/14 Mayor Shepherd inquired whether Staff had prepared a list of milestones for the Technology and the Connected City Committee or the City Council Rail Committee.

Mr. Keene indicated Staff was in the process of a series of milestones for the Technology and the Connected City (Technology) Committee. He recommended the Mayor not appoint a Committee in order to direct resources to other things. The Council could direct Staff to provide information to the Council or request the Mayor reappoint an Ad Hoc Committee. The Council had set in motion the work to be done. The City Council Rail Committee (CCRC) had four major issues in 2014; Caltrain modernization, High Speed Rail (HSR) litigation, potential HSR legislation, and the preliminary Palo Alto grade separation study. The Caltrain electrification Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was the only issue with a specific milestone which was included in the Work Plan. Staff was capable of continuing work and recommending action to the Council.

Mayor Shepherd inquired about a Staff presentation regarding Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Keene suggested the Committee of the Whole process as a means for the Council to schedule discussion and action as needed. A Committee of the Whole format could inform the full Council regarding issues which remained in Committee. The Council could meet in a less formal Committee setting that allowed for action and exchange of ideas.

Mayor Shepherd remarked that the Work Plan for the Technology Committee could be referred to a Standing Committee. She requested Colleagues comment on transitioning the CCRC into the Council's Work Plan and the Technology Committee to the Policy and Services Committee or the Council. She wanted to allow the City Manager to use the concept of Committee of the Whole.

Jeff Hoel agreed the Technology Committee did not accomplish enough in 2013. The City should completely disregard wireless until Fiber to the Premise was complete. The Utilities Advisory Committee (UAC) deferred any action on Fiber to the Premise. He questioned whether the UAC could be involved again.

Stephanie Munoz cautioned the Council against doing things that constrained its ability to act on important items. She requested the Council not allow Palo Alto Housing Corporation to dispose of the property before the Council considered the Housing Element.

Page 15 of 23 City Council Meeting Minutes: 02/01/14 Vice Mayor Kniss suggested continuing the Technology Committee. If technology was a Priority but there was no Standing Committee, progress would not proceed quickly.

Council Member Holman requested clarification of when the Council would discuss Priorities and the Work Plan.

Mayor Shepherd indicated the City Manager spoke regarding the efficient use of Staff time by having fewer Committees by utilizing the Committee as a Whole format. She requested Council Members comment regarding the Technology Committee, the CCRC, and Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Holman asked if she could address Getting Work Done under Item Number 5b.

Mayor Shepherd replied yes.

Council Member Holman did not believe the CCRC and Technology Committees were needed currently. She expressed interest in the Committee of the Whole concept and how that might differ from, supplement or replace Study Sessions.

Council Member Scharff was unsure whether a Standing Committee would create more work for Staff than a Council meeting. If less work was performed in Committee meetings, the Council would not complete work or would have more meetings. He was hesitant to eliminate either Committee. The purpose of a Committee was to fully vet and understand the details of a document and report to the Council. The purpose held true for both the Technology and Rail Committees. He did not understand the concept of a Committee of the Whole and was not sure it was viable.

Council Member Schmid felt the danger of a Committee was the Council lost touch with issues or lost momentum on important issues. He suggested the Council review the necessity of Committees once a year. The City had reached the stage of not needing an ongoing Rail Committee. With respect to the Technology Committee, the Council could meet on issues and provide momentum to decisions. A Committee of the Whole process was tricky. He was unsure whether nine people discussing a topic would be effective or efficient.

**MOTION:** Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Price to: 1) discontinue the Technology Committee, 2) no reappointment to

the Rail Committee, and 3) try the Council as a Whole for items pertaining to the Rail Committee and Technology Committee.

Council Member Schmid felt the key point was not to create too much bureaucracy while keeping the major decisions and momentum at the Council level.

Council Member Price believed it was important for the full Council to be involved in discussions. Given the density and complexity of the Work Plan, Staff's time would be better spent preparing items for the Council or the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Klein supported the Motion. The Rail Committee served its purpose well; however, a Standing Committee focused on HSR was not needed for the next year or two. There would be no savings of Staff time as the issues could be referred to other Standing Committees. It was appropriate for all Council Members to be involved in technology issues. He was willing to experiment with Committee of the Whole because the City Manager requested it.

Vice Mayor Kniss inquired whether a Committee of the Whole meeting would have action items.

Mr. Keene explained a meeting could involve Council action if the meeting was noticed and agendized.

Council Member Burt asked if that was the difference between a Committee of the Whole meeting and a Study Session.

Council Member Klein reported there was no difference between a Committee of the Whole meeting and a Council meeting.

Mr. Keene concurred. Typically a Committee of the Whole meeting would pertain to a single subject or topic.

Council Member Burt understood a Committee of the Whole meeting would fall under the informal guidelines of a Study Session but could include action items. The Downtown Library was a good venue for Committee of the Whole meetings. He hoped the Infrastructure Committee could reach its sunset later in 2014.

Council Member Berman suggested the Mitchell Park Library be a possible location for the Committee as the Whole meetings. He concurred with

Council Member Burt respective of sunsetting or eliminating the Infrastructure Committee in 2015.

Mayor Shepherd believed the Stakeholder Group would scrub technology information for the Council. Attending a Fiber to the Premises conference was an option for obtaining information. Former CCRC Members would provide information and expertise with respect to future HSR issues.

MOTION PASSED: 7-2 Kniss, Scharff no

# 5. Council Meetings

a. <u>Action:</u> Resolution 9392 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto setting the 2014 Council Summer Break and Winter Closure".

Donna Grider, City Clerk, reported three Council Members wanted to hold the Summer Break during the month of July and the Winter Closure from December 22-26, 2014. One Council Member proposed the Summer Break be held July 21-August 15, 2014. The last day of school was scheduled for May 29, 2014 and the first day of school was scheduled for August 18, 2014.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to take the month of July 2014 for summer break and the winter closure will be December 22 through 26, 2014.

### **MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

James Keene, City Manager, noted the first meeting after the Summer Break would be scheduled for August 4, 2014. A fifth meeting in June could be scheduled for June 30, 2014.

b. Council Meeting Management: <u>Action (possible)</u>: Council Members are asked to bring ideas to streamline meetings or get through more items. Preliminary decisions may be made (Action). Follow-up action at a subsequent Council meeting may be necessary.

Mayor Shepherd would follow the policy of one round of Council Member comments during meetings. She requested Colleagues comment on the possibility of scheduling additional meetings on Wednesdays; individual Council Members speaking for a maximum of five minutes; scheduling Study

Sessions for Wednesdays and not preparing Minutes; and notifying Staff of questions to be asked at Council meetings.

Council Member Price proposed having one Wednesday each month as a placeholder for potential Council meetings and proceeding with a meeting when six Council Members were present. She suggested the Wednesday meetings be evaluated after three or four months.

Council Member Holman recommended Council Members address individual topics and suggest other ideas.

Mayor Shepherd concurred. Some topics could require additional thought and discussion.

Council Member Holman reported Council Members could have three meetings in one week if the Council added meetings on Wednesdays. She did not subscribe to a five-minute time limit for Council Member comments as some Council Members had specific expertise relevant to discussion. She suggested Staff provide on the City website a listing of opportunities for the public to engage with the Council and/or Boards and Commissions on specific topics. Perhaps members of the public could subscribe to email notifications regarding topics of interest.

Council Member Schmid could agree to limiting Council comments to one round if all Council Members knew the rules.

Mayor Shepherd indicated the one-round limitation was included in the Council's Policies and Procedures.

Council Member Schmid suggested the Council review the policy after three or four months and hold an informal discussion. He would agree with limiting comments to five-minutes in length. He inquired whether a Staff response would be counted against a Council Member's five-minutes.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the Council preferred to allow Staff to respond to public and Council comments at the conclusion of Council comments.

Council Member Schmid would be happy to begin meetings prior to 6:00 P.M. The Council should not conduct business after midnight.

Mayor Shepherd noted the Council could not open discussion of an item after 10:30 P.M. under the current Council's Policies and Procedures.

Mr. Keene clarified the Council held a check in at 10:00 P.M. with a goal of ending the meeting at 11:00 P.M.

Council Member Schmid would not support omitting Minutes for Study Sessions. The Council should submit questions to Staff early and have Staff respond publicly at the meeting. That could extend the length of meetings. Before proceeding with meetings one Wednesday a month the Council should determine if other measures obviated the need for regularly scheduled extra meetings.

Council Member Berman would appreciate a Wednesday meeting being scheduled for a set date. He suggested items expected to require one hour of discussion be scheduled on Tuesday nights with a Standing Committee meeting. Council Members should be mindful of the length of time they spoke.

Council Member Klein agreed with regularly scheduling one Wednesday a month for Study Sessions, interviews, and occasionally Closed Sessions. Meetings should be held to a length of five or six hours or alternatively end at 11:00 P.M. The Mayor and City Manager had the authority to schedule meetings when less than nine Council Members would be present. Some issues required more than one round of discussion. He could support a voluntary five-minute rule or indicator. It would be better to schedule a meeting on the fourth Monday of each month than to have extended meetings three times a month.

Council Member Scharff interpreted the protocol for Council discussion as being one round of general comment, one round regarding a Motion, and one round regarding a Substitute Motion. He inquired whether Mayor Shepherd wished to change that procedure.

Mayor Shepherd felt it was appropriate to limit comment to one round unless many Council Members indicated a desire to comment further.

Council Member Scharff agreed to Wednesday meetings as long as they were scheduled for the same Wednesday each month. Before implementing Wednesday meetings, the Council should plan for four Monday meetings each month. Council meetings should always begin at 6:00 P.M.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the Council could change the meeting start time to 6:00 P.M.

Council Member Scharff suggested the Council change their Policies and Procedures to four Monday meetings per month and add a monthly Wednesday meeting if necessary.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported the start time for Council meetings was stated in the Municipal Code but it could be changed by Ordinance.

**MOTION:** Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Kniss to direct the City Attorney to draft an Ordinance to change the Municipal Code so Council meetings began at 6:00 P.M.

Ms. Stump inquired whether the Council wished the Ordinance to state a start time of 6:00 P.M. the first four Mondays of the month.

Council Member Scharff wanted to change the start time to 6:00 P.M. only. A Special Meeting could be called for the fourth Monday of a month.

Council Member Holman preferred not to change the Municipal Code. The Council could always begin meetings at 6:00 P.M. if necessary. She did not wish to set the expectation that Council Members would attend meetings every Monday at 6:00 P.M.

Council Member Burt noted the Council was to review protocols annually. The Council should do that to allow public comment. He inquired whether the Regular Meeting would begin at 6:00 P.M. and Closed Sessions at 4:00 P.M. or 5:00 P.M. Moving the time could limit Council and public participation. The issue needed additional thought.

Mayor Shepherd indicated she requested the Clerk not schedule meetings prior to 6:00 P.M.

Council Member Burt asked if that included Closed Sessions.

Mayor Shepherd answered yes.

Council Member Burt inquired when Study Sessions would be held if Council meetings began at 6:00 P.M.

Council Member Scharff explained Study Sessions were part of the Regular Meeting. Meetings beginning at 6:00 P.M. would include Study Sessions and Closed Sessions. Changing the start time would eliminate the need to call them Special Meetings.

Ms. Stump explained a Study Session or a Closed Session could be a Special Meeting at a different time or part of the Regular Meeting.

Council Member Scharff clarified a Regular Meeting could open with a Study Session or a Closed Session.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to have Policy and Services Committee discuss and clean up the Ordinance regarding Council meetings start times.

Cheryl Lilienstein suggested Staff place programs and processes on the City's website and post agendas ten days in advance of meetings in the interests of efficiency and transparency.

Stephanie Munoz felt the Council's remarks should be self-monitored. Each Council Member should prepare a paragraph of ideas to discuss and questions to ask. The public could have one minute to respond to Council Member comments.

#### **SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 9-0**

Council Member Burt agreed with scheduling special meetings on a standard day. The start time for Study Sessions was elective as stated in the protocols. The Regular Meeting had a set time. The Council should reexamine Policies and Procedures while remembering the rationale for existing policies. He inquired whether Council questions and comments would continue to be combined into one round.

Mayor Shepherd noted that policy began three years prior.

Council Member Burt stated the Council should set a Council policy. Council questions would inform public comment and public comment would then inform Council discussion. There was value in segregating questions and comments. Council Members were responsible for adhering to that distinction. Oftentimes when a Motion was made during the comment period some Council Members did not have an opportunity to speak.

Mayor Shepherd asked if Council Member Burt would like to refer the process to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Burt indicated a number of issues needed better vetting. The Council needed a process to provide input to the Policy and Services Committee. He had not seen the Clerk's solicitation regarding review of Council protocols.

Page 22 of 23 City Council Meeting Minutes: 02/01/14 Donna Grider, City Clerk, reported she provided notice the prior week.

Vice Mayor Kniss wanted to end Council meetings by 11:00 P.M. She would be willing to note and provide the length of time Council Members spoke. She was frustrated by the lack of Staff available to answer Council Member questions on 9/80 Fridays. If the Council choose to meet one extra meeting each month, the date should be predictable. She could not imagine not having Minutes for meetings.

Council Member Holman suggested separating Council comments and questions. Council Members could bring their devices to meetings in order to email Motions to the Clerk. The Policy and Services Committee should discuss the issue of early Packet release and standard criteria for Staff Reports.

# 6. Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Mayor Shepherd understood the Council supported the scheduling of Wednesday meetings. The City Manager wanted to play a larger role in moving meetings along.

James Keene, City Manager, liked the idea of Council Members submitting questions to him early and Staff responding at Council meetings. Staff placed items on the Consent Calendar to allow sufficient time for other issues. Staff would attempt to place items on the Consent Calendar that were not time sensitive. He noted the Planning and Transportation Commission met on Wednesday which could conflict with a Council meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**: The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 P.M.