

CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL FINAL MINUTES

Special Meeting May 19, 2014

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Conference Room at 6:00 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss arrived at 6:15 P.M., Price,

Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd

Absent: None

CLOSED SESSION

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

City Designated Representatives: City Manager and his designees pursuant to Merit System Rules and Regulations (James Keene, Lalo Perez, Joe Saccio, Kathryn Shen, Dania Torres Wong, Eric Nickel, Catherine Capriles, Geo Blackshire, Melissa Tronquet, Mark Gregerson, Nancy Nagel, Molly Stump, Walter Rossmann)

Employee Organization: International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), Local 1319

Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6(a)

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

City Designated Representatives: City Manager and his designees pursuant to Merit System Rules and Regulations (James Keene, Lalo Perez, Melissa Tronquet, Joe Saccio, Molly Stump, Walter Rossmann, Nancy Nagel, Dennis Burns, Mark Gregerson, Kathryn Shen, Dania Torres Wong)

Employee Organization: Palo Alto Police Officers Association (PAPOA) Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6(a)

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to move Agenda Item Number 12 forward to be heard at this time, and renumbered as Agenda Item Number 2A.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Kniss absent

CLOSED SESSION

2A. (Former No. 12) CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY-Existing Litigation

Subject: Donald Sipple, et al. v. City of Alameda, et al., Los Angeles

County Superior Court, Case Number: BC462270

Subject Authority: Government Code Section 54956.9(a)

The City Council reconvened from the Closed Session at 7:00 P.M.

Mayor Shepherd announced no reportable action.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

James Keene, City Manager, reported Staff was conducting a thorough review of the work being performed at 1101 Embarcadero Road. work appeared to fall within the scope of permits issued for landscaping and HVAC work. The prior week the Architectural Review Board (ARB) conducted a preliminary review of architectural concepts related to a rezoning proposal filed in 2011 that would permit 21 new housing units rather than 11 units on a vacant site on El Camino Real. The applicant agreed to submit to the prescreening process; although, the project was not subject to prescreening requirements of the Municipal Code. He felt it was best to steer the applicant to the Council initially, so that the Council could perhaps take action on the request before further work was performed. The City made \$6 million available from its Housing Trust funds for development of affordable Interested community organizations and affordable housing projects. housing developers were encouraged to apply by the deadline of June 30, Palo Alto was named one of the top ten best cities for kids by May 19-23, 2014 was designated Emergency Medical livability.com. Services (EMS) Week. Under City law on May 12-14, 2014, an Independent Hearing Officer took evidence and heard oral testimony and comments from residents and neighbors regarding the Buena Vista Mobile Home Park closure application. The Hearing Officer's decision on the closure application was expected in August or September 2014. Either party could appeal that decision to the City Council. On May 14, 2014, three large commercial customers responded to Staff's request to reduce peak electrical usage caused by record heat. Altogether customers reduced usage by 4 megawatts, more than four times the amount Staff hoped to obtain. Nearly two dozen residents attended the Solar 101 workshop to evaluate whether a solar/electrical system was suitable for their homes. Palo Alto ranked number 12 in the country in April's National Mayor's Water Conservation Challenge. Earlier in May, a record crowd of 85 attended the Laundry to Landscape workshop to learn about gray water.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Ken Horowitz indicated the West Bay Opera Association was experiencing financial difficulties. He asked the Council to invite the Director to speak to the Council regarding the West Bay Opera Association.

Donald Barr previously reported on a survey of Barron Park residents. Residents were very aware of the demographics and policy issues surrounding Buena Vista Mobile Home Park. Barron Park residents supported retention of Buena Vista residents in Palo Alto and preferred redevelopment of the property as low-income and market-rate apartments with a preference given to Buena Vista residents.

Roger Smith attended Avenidas' awards ceremony and a Boy Scout event. In speaking with other attendees, many agreed that the number of Council Members should be reduced. He encouraged the Council to place a Charter amendment on the Ballot.

Fred Balin advised that the proposed new grocer for College Terrace Center was the developer's son who had no grocery experience. He questioned whether a lease agreement between father and son would be enforceable and whether a grocery owner with no experience would operate a market comparable to the former JJ&F grocery. He encouraged the Council to abide by the wording and intent of the Conditions of Approval related to the selection of a new grocer.

Art Liberman referred to an article in the *Daily Post* regarding hazardous materials and toxic fumes at CPI. The topic would be presented to the Council in the future. City Staff and Council Members were concerned about citizens' welfare and searched for creative solutions to problems in the community.

Council Member Burt inquired about the procedure for reviewing the lease of the former JJ&F grocery site to determine the adequacy or validity of the lease.

James Keene, City Manager, understood Staff had conducted some preliminary review.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reviewed the lease for commercially reasonable, appropriate, and customary terms. The lease met that standard. The Planning Department was reviewing the nature of the lease in other contexts.

Mr. Keene would provide a written response to the Council within the week.

Council Member Scharff asked if the City could require the background of the lessee to be commercially reasonable. He felt the public was reacting to the lack of experience of the proposed lessee.

Ms. Stump believed the Planning Department was reviewing that aspect of the lease.

Council Member Scharff asked when Staff would present an item regarding CPI.

Mr. Keene reported Staff was meeting on the topic. There was not a specific date for presentation to the Council.

Council Member Scharff wanted to determine whether a Public Safety Building could be constructed at that site.

Council Member Holman inquired about the process for informing neighbors regarding the status of and process for evaluating a grocer.

Ms. Stump advised that Staff was not present to address that aspect; however, Staff would provide the information at a later time.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Robert Moss realized that working residents would not be able to attend a Council meeting that began at 6:00 P.M. Typically the Council participated in closed sessions or study sessions between 6:00 P.M. and 7:00 P.M. Beginning business items at 6:00 P.M. would limit the number of people who could participate in Council meetings. He suggested the Council reserve the 6:00 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. hour for closed sessions or study sessions with the stipulation that business items would be taken up after 7:00 P.M.

Staff requested Agenda Item Number 5B pertaining to the Park Improvement Ordinance be continued to June 2, 2014 Consent Calendar as it was noticed incorrectly.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-7, and continuing Agenda Item Number 5B-Park Improvement Ordinance to June 2, 2014.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to remove Agenda Item Number 4 from the Consent Calendar.

MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF SUPPORT BY A THIRD COUNCIL MEMBER

- 3. Approval and Authorization for the City Manager to Execute an Electric Enterprise Fund Construction Contract with Cal Electro Inc. In a Total Not to Exceed Amount of \$650,100 to Rebuild the Underground Electric Distribution System in Areas Along Middlefield Road, San Antonio Road and Fabian Way.
- 4. Policy & Services Committee Recommendation to Adopt an Ordinance Amending the Municipal Code to Change the Regular Meeting Start Time from 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.; Amend the Council's Procedures to Reflect the 6:00 p.m. Meeting Start Time.
- 5a. Resolution 9414 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Authorizing the City Manager to Accept on Behalf of the City of Palo Alto, a Grant of \$150,000 Made by the County of Santa Clara for the Purpose of Funding the Construction of the Magical Bridge Playground at Mitchell Park" and Adoption of the Related Budget Amendment Ordinance 5245.
- 5b. The Magical Bridge Playground Design/Construction Agreement—Between the City of Palo Alto and the Friends of the Magical Bridge; and Adoption of a <u>Budget Amendment Ordinance 5246</u> entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto for Fiscal Year 2014 to Provide an Additional Appropriation in the Amount of \$1,874,182 for the Magical Bridge Playground Capital Project (PG-12006) and \$30,000 for the Art in Public Places Capital Project (AC-86017)".
- 6. <u>Budget Amendment Ordinance 5247</u> entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto in the Amount of \$80,000 for the Furniture and Technology for Library Projects Capital Improvement Project LB-11000 for a New Monument Sign, Supported by Transfers from the Library Development Impact Fee Fund (\$40,000) and Community Center Development Impact Fee Fund (\$40,000)."
- 7. Ordinance 5248 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Mandating Reporting of Rabies Vaccinations (First Reading: May 5, 2014 PASSED: 9-0)".

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

ACTION ITEMS

8. Consideration of Finance Committee Referral to the Human Relations Commission Regarding Additional Funding for Human Resource

Allocation Process Agencies. (This item was continued from May 12, 2014.)

James Keene, City Manager, reported the Finance Committee discussed potentially expanding funding and engaging the Human Relations Commission (HRC) in review. Presenting this item to the Council to establish perspective and direction was appropriate. The Council should ask questions or issue recommendations.

Council Member Berman, Chair of the Finance Committee, advised that during the Finance Committee's discussion of funding for Human Services Resource Allocation Process (HSRAP) agencies, a Committee Member suggested referring the item to the HRC for a recommendation regarding the potential for additional funding of new or increased needs. Vice Mayor Kniss suggested a cap of any additional funding. The Finance Committee unanimously approved a cap of \$200,000. The Finance Committee stressed that the cap was the ceiling for any additional funding and that the Finance Committee was not approving funding in the total amount of \$200,000.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the expiration of two-year contracts coincided with the expiration of six-year contracts.

Minka Van Der Zwaag, Manager Community Services Senior Programs, indicated contract expirations coincided in Fiscal Year (FY) 2016. The removal of Palo Alto Community Child Care (PACCC) and Avenidas from HSRAP altered the discussion. Those two agencies would be general services contracts starting in the next fiscal year.

Council Member Schmid noted the Finance Committee's recommendation was for the HRC to distinguish among needs. However, the HRC would no longer review the two six-year agencies. He asked if the Motion focused on two-year agencies.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag reported Staff was seeking Council direction on that issue as well as additional funding. The Finance Committee did discuss the possibility of PACCC and Avenidas being removed from HSRAP.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the Finance Committee wanted to refer only two-year agencies to the HRC.

Council Member Berman did not recall the Finance Committee restricting HRC consideration of PACCC and Avenidas. The issue seemed to be the restructuring of HSRAP agencies so as to exclude PACCC and Avenidas. The Council should make a determination whether PACCC and Avenidas should be included in any additional funding.

Council Member Schmid asked if the Finance Committee made any recommendation on that point.

Council Member Berman did not recall the Finance Committee recommending additional funding be restricted to only the two-year agencies.

Council Member Schmid believed Staff's recommendation and the Finance Committee's approval of referral to the HRC meant only the two-year agencies.

Council Member Berman explained that the Finance Committee discussion and recommendation occurred while the HRC retained oversight of PACCC and Avenidas. Thus, the Finance Committee did not opine regarding the current situation.

Council Member Schmid referenced the Council's allocation of \$250,000 for homeless outreach, which was not included in HSRAP. That also could be included in the package or discussion.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag reported that the homeless effort was a two-year contract with the County of Santa Clara (County) and not part of HSRAP.

Mr. Keene stated Council Member Schmid's point prospectively was a policy question.

Council Member Schmid questioned whether the pool could be wider than those agencies awarded contracts two years ago, if money was available.

Council Member Scharff understood the Finance Committee discussion occurred when Avenidas and PACCC were part of HSRAP. He inquired whether PACCC and Avenidas would participate in any additional funding should the Council approve it.

Council Member Berman felt that was a valid point for Council discussion. When the Finance Committee made its recommendation, the HRC had oversight of all agencies. He understood the Finance Committee's decision was for the cap to apply to all agencies. Now that PACCC and Avenidas were not part of HSRAP, perhaps the Finance Committee should review its recommendation.

Council Member Scharff recalled that the Council decision the prior week to remove PACCC and Avenidas from HSRAP included the point that PACCC and Avenidas should not suffer because of that action. If PACCC and Avenidas were not considered for additional funding, then they would suffer.

Council Member Berman indicated that should be part of the current conversation.

Council Member Scharff referenced Staff's recommendation that funding be taken from the Council Contingency Fund. The recommendation would utilize all but \$50,000 of the Council Contingency Fund. He asked why Staff made that recommendation.

Mr. Keene reported the funding would be for FY 2015. Staff made the recommendation because of the requirement to identify a funding source. Staff did not have discretion to create a new funding source for an item. The process presumed the item would be referred to the HRC for a recommendation. At any point during the process, the Council could identify a new funding source. The Council should consider this item in the context of all Budget decisions.

Council Member Scharff asked if Staff would have difficulty identifying a funding source within the FY 2015 Budget.

Walter Rossmann, Director Office of Management and Budget, explained that HSRAP allocations for FY 2014 and 2015 were set at the same time. The direction to Staff was to ensure that the allocation for FY 2015 was consistent with the Budget, which Staff did.

Mr. Keene clarified that the Finance Committee during the Budget review process could reprogram funds, reduce funds, or request different revenues be associated with different issues. In this particular case, the Finance Committee could benefit from obtaining a preview approval of additional funding for HSRAP.

Council Member Berman indicated Staff recommended the funding source, and the Finance Committee determined the \$200,000 amount.

Council Member Price felt it was a useful modification. The extent to which the Council could make additional allocations to HSRAP was extremely important. She asked if she could inquire about items within the HSRAP discussion.

Mayor Shepherd advised that the Council needed to understand the Finance Committee's recommendation and to determine if it could support the Finance Committee's recommendation. More in-depth questions regarding HSRAP could be asked at a later time.

Council Member Price asked if a Motion could direct Staff and the HRC to return with additional models for sustaining an additional allocation.

Mayor Shepherd responded yes, that could be part of any Motion. She requested questions regarding existing policy.

Council Member Price noted over the past several years, there had been a significant slippage in HSRAP funding while the cost of providing services had increased. If the Council was serious about providing needed services, then this type of adjustment was important, necessary, and overdue.

Council Member Klein inquired whether Council Members should make comments later in the discussion.

Mayor Shepherd answered yes.

Council Member Klein referred to the Staff recommendation for the HRC to revisit potential funding for underfunded new and emerging needs for agencies. He interpreted "new" needs as needs not considered by Staff and the HRC in previous decisions. He requested Staff's interpretation of "new" needs in the context of the Staff recommendation.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag reported "new and emerging needs" came from her presentation to the Finance Committee in explaining that the HRC was conducting a supplemental needs assessment with all major agencies under two-year contracts. During the needs assessment, agencies identified new, critical needs that should be addressed.

Council Member Klein inquired whether "new" needs were included in agency requests for funding or were beyond what had been requested.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag advised that "new" needs could be beyond agency requests at the beginning of the two-year cycle.

Council Member Berman understood Council Member Klein's question to be whether agency requests at the outset of the two-year cycle were prohibited from being considered.

Council Member Klein concurred with Council Member Berman's restatement of his question and added whether Staff would encourage agencies to go beyond those initial needs. Presumably agency requests for funding covered specific projects.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag replied yes. Not all projects were funded at that time.

Council Member Klein inquired whether different projects would be considered part of the process.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag indicated that decision was within the Council's discretion. New needs were brought to the attention of the HRC when it conducted the supplemental needs assessment.

Council Member Berman stated the Finance Committee understood that different projects could be funded.

Council Member Klein requested the Finance Committee's reasons for using agencies' requests for funding as one factor to determine the \$200,000 amount.

Council Member Burt explained that it was half of the unfunded requests by the agencies.

Council Member Berman reported \$200,000 was the full amount. The Finance Committee was searching for logic in setting a cap. That number was determined as a logical, maximum amount. The Council was free to disagree with the \$200,000 amount set by the Finance Committee.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag clarified that \$200,000 was the difference in the amount that the 14 smaller agencies requested and were funded. It did not include requests by and funding for PACCC and Avenidas.

Council Member Klein asked if the Finance Committee considered the amount requested compared to the amount allocated to the smaller agencies. Some agencies received 100 percent of their requests and some received less than 25 percent.

Council Member Berman noted the Finance Committee briefly discussed it in the context that the ceiling of \$200,000 did not break down to individual agencies. For example, DreamCatchers requested \$55,000 and was allocated \$8,000. The Finance Committee did not state that DreamCatchers could receive an additional \$47,000.

Council Member Klein asked if the Finance Committee had any doubt that the full \$200,000 would be allocated.

Council Member Berman stated a few Finance Committee Members wanted to stress to the HRC that \$200,000 was a cap.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the Finance Committee recommended the Council approve funding for the second year of the two-year cycle.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag believed the Finance Committee postponed that issue until the Council could hold the current discussion.

Mayor Shepherd understood HSRAP funding requests covered a two-year cycle. She asked how the Finance Committee expected the HRC to address this. She asked why the second year of funding was presented to the Finance Committee for approval.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag explained that the Finance Committee approved the second year of the contract. Staff's recommendation had always been for the City Manager to have the authority to approve the second year of two-year funding. The second year had usually been funded at the same amount as the first year unless a funding reduction was necessary.

Mayor Shepherd noted the only active HSRAP contracts were requests that were not fully funded.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag reported the intention was not to assess any other unmet needs by agencies not currently funded by HSRAP. The intention was to review needs expressed to the HRC during the supplemental needs assessment process and for the HRC to make recommendations regarding increased funding.

Mayor Shepherd asked if Staff and the HRC would consider only current HSRAP agencies for needs that were not funded in FY 2014.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag answered yes. Staff and the HRC would not look back to any agencies who submitted an application but did not receive funding.

Mayor Shepherd felt this would be a very narrow review.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to approve the Finance Committee recommendation for the Human Relations Commission to review the funded agencies in Human Services Resource Allocation Process to identify the most critical needs that were requested and unable to be allocated for FY 2015, not to exceed the amount initially requested by those agencies with the following guidelines: 1) include any critical, new and emerging needs that the Human Relations Commission has identified, as well as critical needs that were identified previously but unable to be allocated in the previous budget cycle; and 2) not to exceed the additional \$200,000 that was requested in aggregate that was not funded at the beginning of the prior two-year cycle.

Council Member Burt indicated the Finance Committee discussed Budget reductions for HSRAP in light of the City's recent Budget surpluses. The Staff Report did not discuss the amount of reductions.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag advised that from 1993 to 2003, HSRAP received Consumer Price Index (CPI) increases of 3 percent every year. In 2005 and 2009, HSRAP funds were reduced by 5 percent each year. In 2002-2003, the HSRAP Budget was \$1.3 million. Ten years later, the Budget was \$100,000 less.

Council Member Burt added that in 2002-2003, the \$1.3 million Budget amount was slightly more than 1 percent of the City's total Budget. Currently, the HSRAP Budget was well below 1 percent of the City's total Budget. If the Council allocated an additional \$200,000 to HSRAP, HSRAP's proportionate share of the City's total Budget would not approach the amount in 2002-2003. The Finance Committee also discussed the openended nature of the recommendation and increased funding for PACCC and Avenidas. The wording of the Motion allowed inclusion of PACCC and Avenidas for additional funding.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag noted the recommendation was left open because of the uncertainty regarding PACCC and Avenidas remaining as HSRAP agencies.

Council Member Burt reported the Finance Committee also discussed a rainy day fund for HSRAP. Perhaps some portion of the \$200,000 amount should be placed in a rainy day fund for HSRAP. He did not understand that the funding source would be the Council Contingency Fund. He thought the Finance Committee would examine additional funding as part of the Budget process. The Finance Committee wanted to give the HRC the opportunity to make specific recommendations for additional funding should the City have sufficient funds. The Finance Committee explicitly stated it was not committing \$200,000 in additional funding. The Finance Committee wished to hear the HRC's recommendations regarding requests which were previously denied as well as new programs.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag clarified that in theory not every agency currently receiving HSRAP funding would receive an increase.

Council Member Holman referred to Attachment 8-A, a chart of requested funding amounts from two-year agencies. She asked how the HRC would review funding requests versus funding allocations for PACCC and Avenidas.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag advised that PACCC and Avenidas each requested \$40,000 more than they were allocated in the current six-year contract.

Council Member Holman agreed with Council Member Burt that the Finance Committee understood additional HSRAP funding would be a budgeted item. The Motion authorized the HRC to utilize additional funding up to \$200,000 and directed the HRC regarding a range of a few other things. She

suggested the Motion also direct the HRC to identify a funding amount to launch a rainy day fund for HSRAP funding.

Council Member Burt did not accept her proposal, because funding was the role of the Finance Committee. The HRC's role was to review programs.

Council Member Holman indicated the Finance Committee did discuss funding HSRAP in an amount equal to 1 percent of the City's total Budget. As the numbers clearly indicated, over 12 years HSRAP funding had declined.

Vice Mayor Kniss understood many of the HSRAP agencies received funding from the County as well as the City of Palo Alto.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag added that most agencies had a wide portfolio of funding.

Vice Mayor Kniss explained that while the City of Palo Alto reduced HSRAP funding, the County also reduced funding for many of the same agencies. The Proposed Budget for FY 2015 proposed withdrawing more than \$2 million from reserves to balance the Budget. At a recent Finance Committee meeting, Council Member Burt questioned the need to add 17 new personnel when the City had reduced staff over several years. Withdrawing funds from reserves in order to fund HSRAP seemed to deviate from the City's process. This would set a new precedent and would alter the City's overall policy. The correct time to consider additional funding for HSRAP would be in 2015. She would not support the Motion but would consider increasing HSRAP funding for FY 2016.

Council Member Schmid enthusiastically supported the Motion. Additional funding for HSRAP was great. Directing the HRC to review needs was a sign of the Council's confidence in the HRC. The homeless issue was exacerbated by the Council placing restrictions on vehicle habitation and use of parks. The Council established a public obligation to expend funds for training, mental health, outreach, shelter, and food. This was an opportunity for the HRC to help define the City's critical needs for the next cycle.

Council Member Klein would not support the Motion. He concurred with Vice Mayor Kniss' statements. The process was flawed. The Council instituted a two-year contract process with the concept that the approval of second year funding would be pro forma. This was not good policy. Funding increases for HSRAP should be more carefully considered. The \$200,000 amount was both a cap and a floor. The 1 percent test was interesting; however, no one could determine its origins. Any number should be examined as to whether it was an appropriate amount to spend on HSRAP beneficiaries. Since 2003

when HSRAP received 1 percent of the overall Budget, the City had identified other significant additional obligations. The obligation the City voluntarily assumed for the HSRAP process should be reexamined. With the addition of the \$250,000 allocation for homelessness, the HSRAP Budget amount exceeded 1 percent of the overall City Budget. The Council needed to reexamine HSRAP funding given that social welfare was not one of the City's primary obligations. The Council should direct the HRC and the Finance Committee to take a deeper look at the HSRAP process and where it should go.

Council Member Berman was intrigued by the idea of a rainy day fund. It was made more complicated by the Council's removal of PACCC and Avenidas from HSRAP funding. He inquired whether a reserve fund could be created for PACCC and Avenidas.

Mr. Keene replied yes. With two agencies, the Council would have a tendency to consider it as default funding.

Council Member Berman believed the purpose of the rainy day fund would be funding during an economic downturn. Perhaps it could be defined for senior and child services rather than for organizations.

Mr. Keene reported the Council could establish a sinking fund for the future, to be used to fill the gap if allocated funding fell short.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Berman moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Kniss to replace Number 2 in the Motion with: "not to exceed \$31,620 for both the two-year and six-year agencies for FY 2015."

Council Member Berman explained that \$31,620 was 2.6 percent of the total budget of \$1.216 million, which included both PACCC and Avenidas.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if the \$31,620 amount would override the \$200,000 amount.

Council Member Berman stated the Amendment would replace Number 2 in the Motion. The Amendment did not offer \$200,000, but a 2.6 percent increase. He was not comfortable with the \$200,000 amount. A decision to provide additional funding should be strategic. He was comfortable altering contract amounts mid-term. Additional funding should be given to PACCC and Avenidas, because the 2.6 percent amount was based on an amount which included both PACCC and Avenidas. This amount was reasonable for the City's Budget. The Council should have a future discussion about a rainy day fund.

Vice Mayor Kniss felt the Amendment was logical and specific. Offering \$200,000 would create friction among the agencies.

Council Member Burt noted the City was addressing the significant obligations mentioned by Council Member Klein.

Council Member Scharff called point of order.

Mayor Shepherd requested Council Member Burt address the Amendment.

Council Member Burt advised that the City had addressed current pension obligations and was in the process of addressing infrastructure investments. The FY 2015 Proposed Budget proposed adding 17 staff positions; however, it did not restore funding to HSRAP. He would support the Motion.

Council Member Scharff applauded the two Finance Committee members for rethinking increased funding for HSRAP. The Council's usual process was not being followed; therefore, he would support the Amendment.

Mayor Shepherd was concerned that the Council had not discussed the second half of the recommendation to the Finance Committee. She would support the Amendment, because it was measured. She had championed additional funding for HSRAP; however, the lack of a process to determine the amount was a concern. She wanted a rigorous discussion of the entire HSRAP process. The Amendment was a measured means to provide some funding for current applications.

Council Member Price would not support the Amendment. She felt Palo Alto had a social responsibility to be more generous and recognized the need for a detailed discussion of HSRAP funding. Community-based organizations worked very hard with limited funding. It was not appropriate to be so specific and constrained.

Council Member Holman also would not support the Amendment. While Council Member Berman had identified a rationale, the Motion also had a rationale. These organizations and individuals, if not properly funded, could actually cost the City money. It was embarrassing for the Council to debate \$170,000 when it regularly approved larger dollar amounts on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDMENT PASSED: 5-4 Burt, Holman, Price, Schmid no

Mayor Shepherd hoped the Council would approve the second year of funding for HSRAP agencies. She inquired whether Item 3 in the

recommendation to the Finance Committee regarding Avenidas and PACCC should also be included.

Council Member Klein understood Mayor Shepherd was referring to the Staff recommendation to the Finance Committee.

Mayor Shepherd indicated she was.

Council Member Klein advised Staff's recommendation was different from a Finance Committee recommendation.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether the Council should discuss funding the second year separately.

Council Member Klein explained that HSRAP allocations would be presented to the Council as part of the Budget process.

Mr. Rossmann reported the base allocations for all 14 agencies plus Avenidas and PACCC were included in the FY 2015 Proposed Budget.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 8-1 Price no

Ms. Van Der Zwaag asked if the Council wished to review recommendations for the \$31,620 as part of the Budget process or at some point in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Keene suggested the Finance Committee's review of the Community Services Department Budget could elicit public comment. When the Council adopted the final Budget, it could have additional information.

Mayor Shepherd requested Staff consult with the City Manager as to when to return to the Council.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to hear Agenda Item Number 11 prior to Agenda Item Number 9.

James Keene, City Manager, indicated Agenda Item Number 10 regarding Development Impact Fees would be continued to a future Council meeting.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

11. Discussion and Recommendation on the Proposed Santa Clara County Transportation Project Sales Tax Increase.

Richard Hackmann, Management Analyst, reported the goal of the item was to provide an overview of the proposed Santa Clara County transportation tax initiative. Staff did not expect the Council to make detailed recommendations but to provide direction as to a policy process. The Council's packet contained preliminary polling data.

Carl Guardino, President/CEO Silicon Valley Leadership Group, reviewed successful ballot measures led by the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) for transportation funding improvements within Santa Clara County. Traffic continued to be a major concern. The Federal Highway Trust Fund was expected to be bankrupt in August 2014. A State needs assessment demonstrated a \$298 billion funding gap in the State highway systems. In December 2013, SVLG shareholders approved the potential for leading another transportation funding measure to be placed on the ballot in November 2016. Four working groups comprised of regional transportation agencies; Public Works Directors and Transportation Directors from the 15 cities and towns and the County of Santa Clara (County); stakeholders; and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) professionals from SVLG member companies were meeting. Information compiled by the working groups was utilized in a survey of 600 registered voters in April 2014. Transportation professionals proposed six categories to help provide transportation improvements and traffic relief. All six categories of funding received more than two-thirds support in polling. The three categories for improvements were street maintenance and pothole improvements on the expressway system, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The three categories for transit were the second segment of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension, Caltrain commuter rail improvements in Santa Clara County, and improvements for senior citizens, the poor, and the disabled. An increase of 1/4 cent over 30 years would raise approximately \$3.2 billion conservatively or \$3.75 billion less A 75-word ballot question which captured all pertinent information received 73 percent support, 23 percent opposition, and 4 percent undecided. The previous five campaigns did not receive such a high level of support. SVLG proposed moving the measure from the November 2016 ballot to the November 2014 ballot, because the economy in 2014 was better known than the economy in 2016 and few tax or fee measures were proposed for the November 2014 ballot. Another poll of 800 residents would be performed later in the week. By early June 2014, SVLG would know whether the climate was right for a sales tax measure. He wished to hear

the City's ideas on the best way to proceed. Smart improvements along the system and throughout Santa Clara County could benefit all 2 million residents.

Vice Mayor Kniss noted the Chair of the California Transportation Commission (CTC) controlled a great deal of funding. She inquired about the percentage of the sales tax increase that could be allocated for Caltrain improvements.

Mr. Guardino hoped that 20 percent of all funds collected would be expended on Caltrain commuter rail improvements. SVLG knowingly decided to seek only a 1/4 cent increase because of the many needs that could be funded through sales tax revenues.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked when Caltrain and BART could realistically connect in Santa Clara.

Mr. Guardino advised that the first 10 miles of the BART extension was running \$100 million under budget and a full year ahead of schedule. The final 6.1 miles could be completed between 2023 and 2025. A yard and a platform-to-platform link and a people mover for Caltrain were needed in Santa Clara.

Vice Mayor Kniss felt a ring of rail or BART around the Bay was important.

Mr. Guardino believed key safety and speed improvements on Caltrain were essential to any future measure and the future of the region.

Council Member Burt referenced Mr. Guardino's statement that 20 percent of funding would be allocated to Caltrain improvements, and inquired about the dollar amount.

Mr. Guardino indicated the economist estimated a 1/4 cent increase over 30 years would generate between \$3.2 billion and \$3.75 billion. He corrected his previous statement in that Caltrain would receive one-seventh of revenues collected from the tax measure.

Council Member Burt inquired about the amount of funding allocated for BART.

Mr. Guardino reported the local share to finish the second segment of the BART system was short \$1.3 billion.

Council Member Burt inquired about the amount of funds allocated to BART and to Caltrain in the last transportation measure.

Mr. Guardino stated the 2000 measure was expected to generate between \$6.5 billion and \$7 billion in revenue. Approximately half of those funds would be allocated for BART capital expenditures. The 2000 and 2008 campaigns were passed solely because they included BART.

Council Member Burt inquired about the amount of funds allocated to Caltrain from the 2000 measure.

Mr. Guardino recalled the measure called for projects rather than dollar amounts.

Council Member Burt did not believe the 2000 measure provided many funds to Caltrain.

Mr. Guardino indicated the amount was not as much as he hoped would be collectively invested in a new measure.

Council Member Burt understood the plan for the Diridon station projected 10,000 BART boardings per day and 10,000 Caltrain boardings per day. Caltrain was more important for Silicon Valley than BART while its capital needs were less than BART's. That fact was the basis for a dialog concerning the portion of funding that should go toward Caltrain needs and address significant long-term capacity constraints. He hoped the ridership equation would be a major part of the discourse on the proportion of funding for Caltrain. Current polling showed a distinct shift in public perception in that Caltrain support was exceeding BART support. It was quite a change and hopefully would be part of the consideration in the funding proportions.

Mr. Guardino never quite understood the perception of one system versus the other. The two systems coming together would serve the entire region. Caltrain carried 53,000 weekday passenger trips with a fare box return of 60 percent. BART carried 400,000 daily passenger trips with a fare box return between 70 percent and 75 percent. The 16.1 mile extension of BART would carry 90,000 additional weekday passenger trips.

Council Member Burt agreed that BART was a strong system. Capital dollars expended per mile should be part of the funding equation. In that sense, Caltrain was a more efficient system even with future investments. Each system should be viewed in terms of the importance of the ridership increase and the real problem of capacity for Caltrain. Caltrain on the Peninsula would break down without adequate capacity.

Mr. Guardino remarked that electrification of Caltrain would increase safety, speed, and headways and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and noise. Funding was allocated based on actions that could be taken in a fiscally

constrained environment, that were the best for each system, and that brought the best of those systems to work together.

Stephen Rosenblum stated Caltrain was extremely important to the Peninsula. Easy access to BART was not available in Palo Alto. In order to move Caltrain to a mass transit system of the future and to implement High Speed Rail, grade separations were needed. Funds from a sales tax increase should be allocated to that purpose.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, commented that people who used and supported transit were concerned that funds from measures were not spent in accordance with measure requirements. These people would look for language that ensured funds were spent appropriately. Overcrowding of Caltrain passenger cars was limiting Caltrain's economic growth. Expansion of Caltrain capacity should be a priority. Grade separations would be needed to support increased frequency of trains.

Roland Lebrun wanted the City Council to request more specificity in any new transportation sales tax measure and recommended the Council ensure that any future Santa Clara County transportation tax measure clearly identify funding requirements for specific projects including expected sales tax revenue for each project. There should be legally enforceable guidelines for the reallocation of funds between projects.

Arthur Keller, speaking as an individual, noted BART did not serve the needs of the entire county. Caltrain ridership as a factor in funding should include ridership between San Francisco and San Jose, rather than San Francisco to Gilroy. He suggested funds be returned to Dumbarton rail; funding be provided for grade separations; and BART be placed underground in downtown San Jose only.

Stephanie Munoz felt the City should fund longer platforms, grade separations, and bike capacity for Caltrain whether or not the sales tax increase passed. High Speed Rail to San Francisco was a huge waste. She wondered whether electrification of Caltrain would be a panacea.

Omar Chatty, speaking as a member of the Santa Clara Valley Taxpayer Association and as an individual, reported the Santa Clara Valley Taxpayer Association Board of Directors voted to oppose the sales tax measure because it was undefined. The BART loop around the Bay should be extended to Palo Alto in a manner consistent with Palo Alto standards. BART provided better service and dual capabilities.

Council Member Price stated the concern for north and central Santa Clara County was improvements to Caltrain. The success of BART would depend

on timely and comprehensive upgrades to Caltrain to improve service, operations, safety, and connectivity. Caltrain improvements and connectivity to BART were critical. With respect to ballot language, she suggested SVLG review the last sales tax transportation issue in San Mateo in terms of identification of projects and flexibility in the utilization of funds. She inquired whether SVLG was considering a 35-year lifespan for the tax measure.

Mr. Guardino had not heard the possibility of the sales tax extending 35 years.

Council Member Price remarked that transportation design and technology would improve significantly over 30 years. She questioned whether SVLG could draft ballot language that would allow for unanticipated technology or modifications that could occur in the future. She asked if SVLG could draft language that would identify the parties responsible for designing a process to allow that kind of flexibility.

Mr. Guardino reported SVLG was eager to explore Dumbarton rail until cost estimates exploded in the north and ridership projections plummeted in the south. Dumbarton rail was not an affordable project with a high return on investment (ROI). Electrification funds had not been diverted to Mountain View light rail. With respect to the Santa Clara Valley Taxpayer Association's opposition on the basis of a lack of definition, there was no ballot measure yet and, thus, no specificity. If SVLG decided to proceed, the tax measure would have a high level of specificity. Balancing specificity with flexibility was difficult. SVLG had tested a tax measure spanning only 30 years.

Council Member Price felt grade separations were very important to operations and safety. She recognized that the estimated cost for grade separations was \$100 million to \$150 million per grade separation.

Mr. Guardino understood that not all locations for grade separation had been scoped. The ones that had been scoped fell into the \$100 million to \$150 million range.

Council Member Berman believed Palo Alto residents would want to ensure language in the proposal restricted the ability to reallocate funds; however, some flexibility would be needed to modify funding within areas. Voters would want to know funds would be expended where promised. He asked if jurisdictions and the public would be given an opportunity to comment on specific information before any proposal was finalized.

Mr. Guardino explained that in the five previous measures, the quickest SVLG put together a measure was six months, and the longest time was 16

months. The current measure would consume approximately 10 1/2 months from start to finish. SVLG wanted to be as transparent as possible and to draw in as much feedback as possible. A city council could always take action; however, that was not part of SVLG's request.

Council Member Berman inquired whether the proposal would be complete when first presented to the public for comment.

Mr. Guardino would need to have a finished proposal by the end of June 2014 in order to meet with the County Board of Supervisors and the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) prior to the Registrar of Voters' deadline for placing a measure on the ballot.

Council Member Berman asked if SVLG intended to provide specific information regarding allocation of funding.

Mr. Guardino indicated past successes were quite specific. Voters in Santa Clara County preferred a high level of specificity.

Council Member Klein believed Palo Alto's perceptions were that it had not received the appropriate share of funds and that funds had been transferred from projects for the area. Statistics lauding BART would not necessarily persuade Palo Alto residents, because the number of Palo Alto residents riding BART was relatively small. Goodwill for Caltrain improvements would disappear if Caltrain crossings worsened traffic congestion. Palo Alto residents felt the City should have a greater voice in Caltrain governance through a Palo Alto or Mountain View representative to the Caltrain Board of Directors. Residents wanted assurance that Caltrain funding would be sufficient for daily operations.

Mr. Guardino reported approximately ten core areas were feasible for grade separations. If grade separations cost as much as \$150 million each, they were not feasible. He could not recall if grade separations in Palo Alto had been scoped for cost. Some scoping had been performed for locations in Mountain View. If City Staff had those types of figures, he requested Staff provide him copies for his information. SVLG never attempted to include governance in measures it drafted.

Council Member Scharff believed there was a great deal of angst concerning Caltrain capacity. Changes required a lengthy time period to implement while ridership increased rapidly. If he understood correctly, \$1.3 billion would be allocated to BART. He inquired whether one-seventh of \$3.5 billion would be allocated to Caltrain.

Mr. Guardino wanted Caltrain to receive as much as one-seventh of total funding.

Council Member Scharff indicated one-seventh was not a great deal, given the systems were equal with respect to the benefits they provided. The costs of making Caltrain work were much less than the amount required for BART. To obtain the north county's support, SVLG would have to assure voters that Caltrain would receive one-seventh of funding.

Mr. Guardino suggested a 1/2 cent tax increase was feasible; however, it would still not be sufficient to fund all needs. The commitment to Caltrain was strong. SVLG members wanted a measure with a strong ROI, accountability, transparency, and that would help as many local communities and the region as much as possible.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer this to the Policy and Services Committee for discussion and recommendation to Council.

Council Member Scharff felt the discussion was important for the Council. He inquired whether the Council or Staff could contact Mr. Guardino for additional information.

Mr. Guardino replied of course.

Council Member Burt encouraged the Policy and Services Committee to closely review the issues of Caltrain capacity. Friends of Caltrain had performed a great deal of work on the issue. Caltrain capacity was the critical yet least discussed issue for the City.

Council Member Schmid remarked that the connection to San Francisco was critical to Palo Alto's future; therefore, Caltrain was important to Palo Alto. There was a conflict between capacity and grade crossings. Enhanced Caltrain service challenged Palo Alto connectivity. Grade crossings should be an explicit goal in any project for Palo Alto. Palo Alto's interests were clearly enunciated, and residents would expect to see a proposed measure that clearly expressed those interests.

Mr. Guardino reported SVLG's commitment was to sound policy. Tax measures that had run their course delivered on their promises. Tax measures in progress were showing strong delivery of promises. SVLG hoped to fashion equally sound policy.

Council Member Holman concurred with comments regarding assurances for Caltrain funding. Nothing was more critical than those assurances. She

suggested the Policy and Services Committee discuss specificity of grade crossings. She suggested the Motion state "for discussion and recommendation to Council."

Mr. Guardino advised that grade separations would be vital, to the extent SVLG had fresh data regarding project scope, costs, and schedule. The sooner that type of data was available, the better informed everyone could be.

Council Member Holman asked if data meant description.

Mr. Guardino indicated the data would include a timeline and the history of work. SVLG would need as much information as possible regarding scope, costs, and schedule.

Council Member Holman would focus on the word scope in Mr. Guardino's comments.

Mayor Shepherd would look for specific language that addressed capital improvements necessary for Caltrain in Santa Clara County. Modernization of Caltrain would enhance service; however, capacity problems would be a result. The City was performing a grade separation study. She inquired whether Staff had any information regarding the study.

Mr. Hackmann hoped the study would be complete in two months.

Mayor Shepherd noted the study concerned feasibility only. Grade separations were a primary concern for Palo Alto residents. She inquired whether riders from Gilroy would have to transfer from diesel trains to electric trains.

Mark Simon, Caltrain, advised that Caltrain favored overhead wires, because diesel trains could operate beneath them. Some Gilroy trains would operate the full distance and some would have transfers.

Mayor Shepherd wanted Caltrain to have the ability to prepare strategies for periods longer than five years.

Mr. Guardino thanked the Council and Staff for allowing him to speak to the Council. SVLG's purpose was to be a positive and proactive force.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

9. Resolution 9415 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Calling a Special Election to Modernize the Telecommunications Provision of the Utility Users Tax Ordinance."

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported the item was returning to the Council regarding outreach to large users. Staff sought Council direction regarding deletion of the large user discount for gas, electric, and water utilities. The Council requested additional information regarding costing.

Jeff Hoel commented that the modernization language broadly covered the transmission, conveyance, or routing of voice, data, audio, video, or any other information or signals. He inquired whether that included internet service and movies. He hoped the language would be described with sufficient clarity that voters would understand the measure.

Robert Moss suggested the language be very clear in describing what would be taxed. Otherwise, voters would not support the ballot measure. He was pleased with the proposal to eliminate the large user discount. Everyone should pay the same rates.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to adopt the Resolution calling a special election to modernize the telecommunications provision of the Utility Users Tax Ordinance and eliminate the Discount Tax Rate for a small number of commercial customers who use large volumes of water, gas and electric utilities.

Vice Mayor Kniss believed the Utility Users Tax (UUT) had been a useful tool for any number of good projects in the City. The change was relatively benign compared to some other taxes. Because large volume users had agreed to deletion of the discount, the measure was ready to be placed on the ballot.

Council Member Scharff felt modernizing the UUT language and deleting the large user discount were good ideas.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to provide a modest reduction from 5 percent to 4.75 percent.

Alternative 2 (rate reduction; eliminate large user discount)

Shall the City of Palo Alto adopt an ordinance to reduce the tax rate for the telecommunications portion of the Utility Users Tax (which helps fund basic City services and projects) from 5 percent to 4.75 percent; modernize its provisions to ensure equal treatment of taxpayers regardless of

telecommunications technology used; and eliminate a discounted tax rate paid by a small number of commercial large users of gas, electric and water services.

Council Member Scharff referred to Staff's point that the only modernization measures that had failed did not include a modest rate reduction. Because the Council chose to delete the large user discount, it could afford a modest rate reduction in order to pass on savings to everyone.

Council Member Berman noted the City would collect an additional \$550,000 annually by deleting the large user discount. This was an opportunity to benefit residents without reducing City revenues.

Ms. Stump advised that if the Council approved the Amendment, Staff would modify the ballot question. She took the liberty of providing the modification to the Clerk so that the Council could review the ballot question prior to voting on it.

Council Member Holman inquired about the effect of decreasing the rate from 5 percent to 4.75 percent.

Joe Saccio, Administrative Services Assistant Director, indicated the 1/4 percent reduction would result in a reduction of revenue between \$140,000 and \$160,000. Elimination of the large user discount would result in an increase of approximately \$550,000.

Council Member Holman was not in favor of reducing the rate to 4.75 percent. The Council's discussion earlier in the evening highlighted the difference \$150,000 could make.

Mayor Shepherd felt the 5.0 percent rate was benign and would not support the Amendment.

AMENDMENT PASSED: 5-4 Holman, Kniss, Price, Shepherd no

Council Member Burt referenced page 213, Section D, regarding information or signals to a point. He understood the internet of things, which was not yet fully defined, would be a multitude of signals that would provide information or signals to points. He did not believe the City intended to tax that. He inquired whether Staff was familiar with the internet of things.

Ms. Stump reported taxing internet service was not lawful under Federal law. The details of the Ordinance stated that. The Ordinance would not be applied in an unlawful manner.

Council Member Burt indicated "things" did not move on the internet. They were signals and information to a point.

Ms. Stump advised the language was crafted by specialists in tax law who were familiar with the applicable Federal regulatory schemes. The language was intended to be broad enough to capture current technologies and to be flexible into the future. The old language had some archaic features which needed to be eliminated. The modernization language was intended to update the language of the Ordinance.

Council Member Burt was concerned that the proposed language could soon be archaic.

James Keene, City Manager, stated parking and location technologies and Smart Roads would operate over Bluetooth or wireless networks.

Ms. Stump inquired whether Council Member Burt was asking if cars would be taxed.

Council Member Burt was confident the intent was not to tax cars. The language should be consistent with and reflect the intention.

Ms. Stump reported the City administrative agency was charged with enforcing the Ordinance, collecting the tax, and working with telecommunications companies to apply the Ordinance lawfully and consistently with the Ordinance's purposes. The City could issue administrative regulations if needed.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the Council would have time to consider the issues prior to a second reading of the Ordinance.

Ms. Stump indicated the Ordinance did not require a second reading. Staff could return to the Council with responses to specific questions and concerns. Perhaps Staff needed to better understand the issue.

Mr. Keene suggested Staff confer with the Chief Information Officer regarding future technologies and whether the Ordinance was applicable to future technologies.

Council Member Burt would accept the City Manager and City Attorney's determination that his concerns were not well founded without the item returning to the Council. He questioned whether the item should be continued in case his concerns were well founded.

Mr. Keene conferred with the City Attorney and determined if there were valid concerns founded Staff would return the item to Council for further explanation.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0

10. Proposed Changes in Development Impact Fees: Implementation of New Public Safety Facility and General Government Facilities Fees.

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Holman recalled Mr. Balin's comments regarding the proposed grocery at College Terrace Center. She requested Staff present an item describing that proposal for Council comment.

James Keene, City Manager, reported Staff received one proposal and returned it with a request for a great deal of additional information. That information had not been submitted.

Council Member Holman asked Staff to present the proposal to the Council once the additional information was received.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, advised Staff would typically provide information to the Council through an email or other notification.

Council Member Holman hoped for an Action Item so that the Council could provide comment.

Mr. Keene requested time to determine the status of the matter so as to better inform the Council's direction to Staff.

Council Member Holman did not wish to receive an information item after the fact.

Mr. Keene assured her that would not happen.

Council Member Schmid was struck by the use of "equal" in the requirement for the ownership of a grocery to be equal to that of JJ&F. He was interested in a Staff response to the use of the word "equal."

Mayor Shepherd lobbied with Council Member Scharff and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group in Sacramento the prior week. The Silicon Valley Leadership Group advocated for initiatives which did not always correlate with the City's interests. While in Sacramento, she met the Development Center's software contractor who complimented the City's achievements with the Development Center.

Council Member Price attended an affordable housing workshop the prior Friday. The workshop was informative and underscored the need for affordable housing in Santa Clara County.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 P.M.