



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Special Meeting
June 3, 2024

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers and by virtual teleconference at 4:00 P.M.

Present In Person: Burt, Kou, Lauing, Lythcott-Haims, Stone, Tanaka, Veenker

Present Remotely:

Absent:

Call to Order

Mayor Stone called the session to order. The clerk called roll and declared six present.

Special Orders of the Day

1. Proclamation Recognizing C-SPAN StudentCam 2024 Palo Alto Winners

NO ACTION

Mayor Stone read the proclamation honoring Brendan Giang, Emily Tang, and Max Reiter.

Vice Mayor Lauing read the proclamation honoring Ethan Lee.

Council Member Kou read the proclamation honoring An Nguyen, Liam Johnson, and Annelise Sailer.

Rachel Katz, C-SPAN Affiliate Relations Manager, expressed appreciation for the recognition.

Closed Session

- AA1. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS Authority: Government Code Section 54956.8 Property: 4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto (Informally known as the Cubberley Site) Negotiating Party: Palo Alto Unified School District City Negotiators: (Ed Shikada, Chantal Cotton Gaines, Kristen O'Kane, Sunny Tong) Subject of Negotiations: Purchase, Exchange, and/or Lease Price and Terms of Payment

MOTION: Council Member Lythcott-Haims moved, seconded by Council Member Veenker to go into Closed Session.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0-1, Tanaka absent

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council went into Closed Session at 4:21 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 5:40 P.M.

Mayor Stone announced no reportable action.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Ed Shikada, City Manager, remarked there were no changes.

Public Comment

1. Kshama K., speaking on behalf of (6): Marilyn M., Jill B., Ken H., Leti J., Doug A., represented Living Wisdom High School. She expressed the distress of learning that the rooms that have been empty for the last four years at Cubberley will be opened only for hourly use. Living Wisdom High School asked Council to reconsider opening one room, K4, next to them.
2. Anna R. talked about how Living Wisdom shaped her life. She asked Council to consider the profound impact the school has on its students and its potential to reach more.
3. Eric M. urged Council to please rent K4 to Living Wisdom High School in order to reach more students.
4. Noel S. discussed the racism displayed two weeks prior asking what the point was.
5. Fariha H. declared that when attending the last City Council meeting, she did not feel respected or safe as a member of the Muslim community in Palo Alto due to the racist remarks that were made and felt the Mayor did not prevent it.
6. Mona spoke about the racist remarks made at the last Council meeting and did not appreciate the lack of rebuttal or show of support from Council. She requested to meet with each Council member to discuss ways to prevent it happening again.
7. Sarita P. expressed safety concerns about the proposed bike and pedestrian tunnel to cross Alma. She recalled a sexual assault that occurred in the Cal Ave tunnel last year and gave reasons that this tunnel would be even more dangerous.
8. Lea demanded that the Council vote for a ceasefire to end the genocide in Palestine. She read a poem from an individual in Palestine who is experiencing the bombing.
9. Michele G. asked City Council to rescind the Seale Avenue proposal for the underground tunnel immediately stating her reasoning that it would not be beneficial.
10. Jackie S. provided reasons she opposed the proposal for the bike/pedestrian tunnel on Seale Avenue.

SUMMARY MINUTES

11. Barbara M. made some proposals regarding the tunnel that she opined would be better alternatives.
12. Aram J. detailed how he would respond to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict if he was president.
13. Jenn W. spoke about AbilityPath and requested Council to support and fund a matching grant for the Mitchell Park community project on the ground floor of the new project on East Charleston.
14. Linnea W. spoke in support of the City grant to kickstart the AbilityPath Mitchell Park Place Community Center.
15. Judith R. talked about the importance of City Council reconsidering their support for the \$250,000 matching grant for AbilityPath.
16. Laurie J. pointed out the longtime support of the Palo Alto City Council and City of Palo Alto by the developmentally disabled living and working in the community.
17. David R. was confident that every dollar AbilityPath receives would return in greater measure to the Palo Alto community.
18. Carrie D. remarked that any potential gift the City bestowed on enabling the programs to happen in the new Mitchell Park Community Center would enable AbilityPath to further its inclusiveness mission.
19. Bryan N. described ways AbilityPath has benefited the City.
20. Michelle H. remarked that the unanimous vote to make no further statement on foreign policy was not a mutual decision.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Council Member Lythcott-Haims spoke about having attended the Sibling Cities Second Anniversary Celebration. She congratulated Council Member Veenker and everyone at the Sibling Cities' Organization.

Council Member Veenker accepted the recognition and expressed appreciation. She discussed the mission of the Sibling Cities Organization.

Consent Calendar

Council Member Kou registered a no vote on Agenda Item Numbers 13, 14, 15.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Numbers 6, 10.

Council Member Burt, Lauing, & Stone requested to pull Agenda Item Number 11.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Mayor Stone to approve Agenda Item Numbers 2-10, 12-15, and to pull off Consent Agenda Item Number 11.

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 2-5, 7-9, 12: 7-0

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 6, 10: 6-1, Tanaka no

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 13, 14, 15: 6-1, Kou no

Public Comment:

1. Nancy C. (Item 11) was surprised they were talking about something that had already been decided on. She thought it was about parklets and not about reopening a previously decided closed street. She wanted to make clear that parklets are just part of the equation in restaurants. She would like Council to consider grandfathering the previously built parklets.
2. John S. (Zoom) hoped Council would fully support Staff's request for direction and encourage and support them to keep progressing on a vision for the University Avenue area.

City Manager Shikada commented the agendas coming forward are impacted and there are a number of elements to Item 11 that are time sensitive. Staff recommended taking it up the following week and starting the meeting at 4 p.m. He noted that the specifics bear some additional preparation by Staff and requested to have questions sent to him this week.

Council Member Kou provided her reasons for submitting a no vote on Items 13, 14, and 15.

Council Member Tanaka gave his reasons for voting no on Items 6 and 10.

2. Approval of Minutes from May 13, 2024 Meeting
3. QUASI-JUDICIAL. 810 Los Trancos Road [23PLN-00147]: Request for Site and Design Review to allow removal of an existing pool and construction of a new lap pool, removal of three (3) and planting of ten (10) new 24-inch box trees, and associated site improvements. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of CEQA per Section 15303.
4. Approval of Contract Amendment No. 4 to Contract No. C15159248 with Geodesy in the Amount of \$495,000 (for a new not-to-exceed of \$2,425,00) and Extend the Term for Three Years for Encompass GIS Software Maintenance and Support. CEQA status - not a project.

SUMMARY MINUTES

5. Approval of Contract Amendment No. 3 to Contract No. C15152204A with Questica to Increase Compensation by \$168,635 (for a new not-to-exceed of \$1,227,659) and Extend the Term for Two years for a total term of 12 years for the Budget Software System, Support and Maintenance. CEQA status – not a project.
6. Approval of Cost-Sharing Agreement with Santa Clara Valley Water District for Guiding Principle 5 Program funding for Future Projects at the Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant; CEQA Status – Not a project
7. Approval of General Services Contract No. C24190163 with Musson Theatrical in a Total Not-to Exceed Amount for \$101,927 for the Refurbishing of the Stage Rigging System at Lucie Stern Community Theatre; CEQA status – categorically exempt (Regulation 15301).
8. Recommendation to Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager or Their Designee to Execute the Transmission Owner Rate Case Program Agreement With Northern California Power Agency; CEQA Status: Not a Project Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a)
9. Approval of Construction Contract Number C24189247 with Bear Electrical Solutions, Inc. in the amount Not to Exceed \$600,000 to provide On-Call Services for Traffic Signal and Electrical Services; CEQA status – categorically exempt (CEQA Guidelines Section 15301).
10. Approval of Professional Services Contract Number C24188409 with ACME Technologies in the Total Amount Not-to Exceed \$838,623 for a New Software Ticketing System for the Palo Alto Junior Museum & Zoo for a Term of Five Years; CEQA Status – Not a Project
11. Approve New Pre-Approved Parklet Designs; Approve Amendments to the Ongoing Parklet Regulations; and Adopt an Ordinance and Resolution Extending the Interim Parklet Program to the Car-Free Portion of Ramona Avenue through March 2025; CEQA Status – Categorically Exempt.
12. CONSENT: Adoption of an Ordinance extending the Term of Ordinance No. 5517 by an Additional 12 Months from June 16, 2024 to June 30, 2025. Ordinance 5517 Amends Title 18 (Zoning) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Update Definitions, Broaden Permitted Uses and Provide Limits on Certain Uses through Updates to the Conditional Use Permit Thresholds. Environmental Review: CEQA Exemption 15061(b)(3)
13. SECOND READING: PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 800 San Antonio Road [23PLN-00010]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for a Rezone from Service Commercial to Planned Community/Planned Home Zoning (PC/PHZ). The Project Includes Construction of 75 Residential Condominium Ownership Units Including 15 Below-Market Rate Units (20% of the Units) in a Five Story Building with Two Levels of Subterranean Parking. A Subdivision Map will be Required. An Addendum to the

SUMMARY MINUTES

Previously Certified Environmental Impact Report for the Housing Incentive Program Expansion and 788 San Antonio Mixed Use Project (SCH # 2019090070) was Prepared. Zoning District: CS (Commercial Service). (FIRST READING: May 6, 2024 PASSED 6-1, Kou no)

14. SECOND READING: Adoption of an Ordinance Updating Chapter 18.15 (Density Bonus) of Title 18 (Zoning) to Reflect Recent Changes in State Density Bonus Law and Revising Regulations for Provision of On-Site Affordable Rental Units Under the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance; Recommended by the Planning and Transportation Commission March 13, 2024. CEQA Status: Exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3). (FIRST READING: May 6, 2024 PASSED 7-0)
15. SECOND READING: Amendments to Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Chapter 2.27, Historic Resources Board, Section 2.27.010 to Reduce Required Members from Seven to Five, Reduce the Required Number of Professionals from Three to Two, and Expand the Professional Fields Consistent with Certified Local Government (CLG) Requirements for Historic Resources Boards; and to PAMC Section 2.27.030 (a) and (b) to Reduce Regular Meetings to Once per Month and Reduce the Size of a Local Quorum to Three Members (FIRST READING: May 13, 2024 PASSED 6-1, Kou no)

City Manager Comments

City Manager Shikada provided a slide presentation discussing a heat and air quality advisory in anticipation of a heatwave and moderate air quality, City Council 2024 priorities and community update series, new pricing and better seamless service of the advanced heat pump water heater program, a Human Services Needs Assessment, and notable tentative upcoming Council items.

Council Member Kou thought adding the IDD community into the description of all the people involved to the Human Services Needs Assessment.

Action Items

16. Receive an Update and Provide Direction on University Avenue Streetscape Improvements Project Vision, Design, and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

Ashwini Kantak, Project Manager, provided a slide presentation update about the University Avenue Streetscape Project and seeking Council direction feedback including an agenda, project background, engagement process to date, vision, project goals, balancing various interests across goals, Council direction: December 18, 2023, University Avenue as a destination, project area initial boundary, long-term improvements concept sketches, images and site plan, on-street parking considerations, lower cost alternatives, bike lanes, near-term improvements,

SUMMARY MINUTES

stakeholder engagement strategy, stakeholder working group, tentative project timeline, next steps, Council discussion vision, goals, and balancing goals, and recommendation.

Public Comment:

1. Claudia (Zoom) discussed issues in Downtown Palo Alto including vacancies due to high rent, harassment by the homeless, and the lack of bicycling amenities on University Avenue.
2. Cedric (Zoom) encouraged Council to reduce the travel lanes on University, put a buffer area between the travel lanes and parked cars to delineate the door zone, and put sharrows on University.
3. Lynn C. (Zoom) did not see anything that would draw her downtown and thought Council should find out what would make it more fun and less expensive.
4. Megan K. (Zoom) expressed concern about the parking situation, crime, homelessness, and dirt on University Avenue. She agreed with Lynn C. that there is not much to do downtown.
5. John S. (Zoom) hoped Council would realize that the City and the property owners have aligned interests and the goal is safe and professionally designed streets and sidewalks. He suggested the Civic Center was underutilized and might be the performance center. He urged Council to empower Public Works to continue down the path.

Council Member Burt wanted to know Staff's thoughts about evaluating having a three-foot stripe buffer between parallel parking, sharrows, and cars. He thought there needed to be a way to encourage businesses to identify needs for bike racks now and that should be included in outreach. He also saw a need to reexamine the transformation and needs for short-term parking. He talked about a need for a crosswalk at Centennial Alley. He wanted to reach out specifically to the businesses between Cowper and Webster as to whether the parking changes should extend that far. He spoke about the uncleanness of City Hall Plaza. He mentioned the rent rates and vacancies for retail. He felt there was a problem with the conduct of a portion of the unhoused downtown. He asked for comparisons in other locations and found it to be disproportionate in Palo Alto and felt that needed to be understood and addressed.

Ms. Kantak answered there would be sharrows. Staff had talked about having a three-foot space but it would need to be looked at. Staff's recommendation was to have at least an 11-foot wide travel lane which would leave 2 feet. They need to look at the curb and gutter to see if just striping would be okay.

City Manager Shikada pointed out that is just paint so can be addressed as the project progresses.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Vice Mayor Lauing thought that retail needed to be brought up more in the objectives. He appreciated the sidewalks being addressed. He was concerned about the number of times gathering spaces and bulb outs are talked about with the warning about losing parking spaces. He did not think the balance was correct on that. He agreed with a need for retail parking and said the question was how much. He wondered if moving to parallel parking might be a disadvantage and thought more feedback was needed regarding that.

Council Member Veenker thought it would be helpful to put who is on the ad-hocs in the staff reports and wondered if the ad-hoc members had additional comments beyond what was provided in the report. She wanted more information about the difference between class 2 and 3 bike lanes. She asked if they are just at the conceptual stage for Lytton and Hamilton. She did not see the Council direction 3 section in the staff report. She thought the cheap and quick were upgrade and facelift in the next five years and wanted thoughts on that.

Ms. Kantak explained class 3 has no separate bike lane and class 2 looks at having a separate bike lane but going through the master planning process. Class 1 is a completely separate bike lane. She pointed out direction 3 was briefly mentioned in the background and what had been discussed with the Retail Committee was looking at improving the cleanliness and making minor infrastructure investments knowing that this project was only a five-year timeline.

City Manager Shikada stated they are at the very early planning stage. It is part of the citywide Pedestrian/Transportation Plan. There has been no determination on what specific class should be pursued other than the existing plan. He explained the presentation and report reflects if the goal is to address the environment and provide a greater pedestrian experience, then the real options come down to phasing of how expenditures happen but that there is not a low-cost way to replace the diagonal parking with parallel parking.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims agreed with the importance of Centennial Alley becoming fully realized as the connector between University Avenue and King Plaza, to the more frequent cleaning of public spaces that smell like urine, and to the concern about rents being too high and too many vacancies. She wondered what they could do to use this process to attract more businesses. She felt the vision statement and project goals did not speak to business. She suggested adding a sentence saying something like, “by creating a vibrant, visually attractive streetscape that attracts businesses and supports them in thriving”. She was interested in what the City could do to incentivize landlords to bring a more creative approach to rents. She queried if the theoretical striping that would protect bikers from being doored would still give them the 26 feet they need for the Fire Department regulations. She asked if she was correct in her understanding that the removal of 48 spots would still leave them with vacancies in the garages at all times of day. She wondered about the indication of removing parking from 193 to 145 would leave a need for only 5 disabled parking spots. She thought removing too many accessible spaces would be a mistake.

City Manager Shikada thought that was a good topic for them to engage with the stakeholders on to see if there are creative solutions.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ms. Kantak described that with the striping, the access would still be 26 feet wide. She confirmed that her thoughts on the removal of 48 parking spaces was correct and an important strategy was to continue to monitor the adequacy of parking. She clarified that moving from angled to parallel parking, they would lose the 48 and would need to do that if they want wider sidewalks. Of the remaining 145 parking spaces, they have to set aside 5 as accessible spaces which means they are wider and longer.

Council Member Kou stated they are so focused on the infrastructure, services and design for the immediate fixes but the programming and businesses are not finding their way there. She agreed that rent was very high. She thought it would be interesting to see what other cities have done in terms of instigating a vacancy tax on properties. She would like Staff to explore that and understand what it entails. She suggested transforming the centerpiece in the middle of King's Plaza into a stage. She wanted a visual of how the street would look with and without the bike lanes. She wanted to consider giving businesses that want bicycle racks three or four designs that would be consistent throughout town and they could choose to get a permit to install them. She thought Palo Alto TMA should be reaching out to all of the businesses to encourage more people to have different alternative transportation and to contribute to that service. She encouraged bringing a presentation on some of the immediate things the City has helped on to the Retail Committee.

Mayor Stone questioned the significance of bulb outs at intersections and the potential of bulb outs mid intersection. He thought it made sense to have some of them but the way the report described it they would be everywhere and he did not know if that was necessary. He wanted to better understand what Staff was envisioning with those spaces and if there really was a demand for as many as are being proposed. He thought more intentionality was needed around the strategy for the unhoused. He asked if there was anyone who filled the role of ambassador for the unhoused at the City, Opportunity Center or county level. He thought they should continue to reimagine how policing works in a way that can address those problems moving forward.

Ashwini Kantak explained they had heard maximize gathering spaces and they wanted to show that these could happen at intersections or midblock but they would have to be programmed. She appreciated the feedback they were receiving about them and they would find the balance on where they would make sense.

City Manager Shikada responded there are contract case workers that are somewhat limited but available resources. There is an officer that has previously been paired with a PERT clinician that is a limited but available resource.

Council Member Tanaka remarked at how slow the project has moved. He thought the unhoused issue was serious and they should empower the police to enforce the laws they have. He agreed with the comments regarding the lack of cleanliness. He believed they should just do the originally planned parking garage if they were going to take away street parking.

SUMMARY MINUTES

City Manager Shikada pointed out that this item was a piece of the puzzle. He agreed they need to continue to focus on the immediate issues of cleanliness and safety. He suggested focusing on the Streetscape and how they will proceed in their next steps while being mindful of the other items on the agenda.

Vice Mayor Lauing asked if he understood correctly that each block will take between \$800K and \$1.5M. He felt if they did a little bit less they would be able to get it done faster.

Ms. Kantak answered if they go with the full scope as envisioned right now it is 9 blocks and is about \$5.3 million and \$20 to \$30 per block. If they keep the alignment as is it will be about \$800 thousand to \$1.5 million per block. Eighty percent of the costs are associated with realignment. She explained when they look at the \$45 million, a majority of the cost is related to the utility and sidewalk relocation. If they look at reducing the scope, it would still involve redoing some of the intersections and would be about \$800 thousand to \$1.5 million per block.

Robert Stevens, Consultant, stated the reduced scope of work is a very rough estimate that if they were to add some additional landscaping, remove some hardscape and replace it, add some additional benches, and widen some bulb outs, it could cost anywhere from \$800 thousand to about \$1.5 million a block depending on what type of amenities were installed. The \$45 million projected to construct the project assumes complete reconstruction of the street.

City Manager Shikada added if comparing to the \$45 million, the total would be \$7 million to \$13 million. He suggested what was needed was to allow Staff to move to the next phase which would be to apply these principles to specific blocks and work with the stakeholders to see where the options are to reduce costs where possible.

Council Member Veenker thought it seemed as if they were expected to solve the funding source with an assessment district. She wondered if that was news to the business community or if that would be part of reaching out. She asked if the intent was to explore the per business cost depending on the size alongside the visioning and other aspects. She felt they needed to make sure the theme worked for the stakeholders and the visitors.

City Manager Shikada said that had been a part of the conversation from the beginning of the project. The specifics of that are yet to be determined. They recognized it would not be 100 percent assessment district because there are general public benefits in addition to benefits that would occur to specific properties.

Ms. Kantak explained they have already heard from some stakeholders about looking at an expanded area. This is where the project started which is why they talked about initial boundary as they engage with the stakeholders. Once they have a preferred concept, they will be going into the feasibility analysis of the assessment district.

Council Member Kou put a plug in for wider sidewalks. She emphasized having immediate visions of enticing businesses to come in. She asked how they would address the near-term

SUMMARY MINUTES

improvements that the stakeholder groups would be bringing forward. She wanted a thought process actually defining what is immediate, near, mid, and long with the working group.

Ms. Kantak explained near-term would be looking at the next four to five years before the Streetscape improvements are done. Stakeholder groups will be addressed by getting feedback on what needs to be tweaked as they roll out pilot programs.

City Manager Shikada thought Council Member Kou raised a critical point on actually getting the project done. He said they hear and recognize the interest of what happens today, tomorrow, next week. In order to get this long-term project moving and into reality, they need to manage the amount of time spent with the stakeholder working group on the near-term interests in comparison to getting this longer-term project into its next phase. They will need to manage expectations for how a stakeholder working group focused on this long-term project is involved in anything shorter term.

Council Member Burt believed that they needed to make more rapid progress on near-term measures. The buy in from the community, property owners, and businesses would be greater toward the investment in the long-term if they see progress happening.

MOTION: Mayor Stone moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Lauing to approve the balancing of goals and next steps (design concepts and stakeholder engagement) as reflected on the Staff Presentation slides 37 and 38 and direct staff to pursue the short-term and near-term projects and goals on an expedited basis and return to Council with preferred concept by Fall of 2024:

1. Balance desire for outdoor dining and gathering spaces with on-street parking for retail customers:
 - a. Retain at least 1/3 of on-street parking to support retail, capping number of parklets, and use wider sidewalks for outdoor dining, retail, and gathering spaces.
2. Reduce congestion and enhance pedestrian and bicycle experience while maintaining vehicular access:
 - a. Maintain existing width of travel lanes on University Avenue, expand sidewalks, and encourage the use of Hamilton and Lytton Avenue as bike routes.
3. Balance desire for special events while minimizing negative financial impacts on businesses from temporary road closures:
 - a. Seek additional stakeholder feedback to determine number and duration of events.
4. Balance desire for wider sidewalks, gathering spaces, and enhanced streetscape with direction to explore lower cost alternatives:

SUMMARY MINUTES

- a. Do not reduce scope significantly as that does not support the vision. If phasing is desired, implement in no more than two phases to minimize total costs and negative impacts to businesses.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

17. PUBLIC HEARING: FIRST READING: Ordinance Amending Chapter 16.14 (California Green Building Standards, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt the 2022 Green Building Standards Code, Along With Local Modifications Related to Electrical Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Requirements and Building Electrification Requirements and an Ordinance Amending Chapter 16.17 (California Energy Code, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt the 2022 California Energy Code, Along with Local Modifications to Increase Energy Efficiency Standards for Buildings, Mandate Electric-Ready Requirements and Incentivize All-Electric New Construction. CEQA Status: Exempt under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15308 and 15061(b)(3)

Jonathan Abendschein, Assistant Director, Utilities, gave a presentation explaining the two ordinances being proposed amending two parts of the Palo Alto Municipal Code that are local amendments to the state's energy code and green building code. They sought Council direction on gas grills, stoves and barbecue appliances.

Public Comment:

1. Susan C. (Zoom) asked Council to incentivize all-electric homes in additional ways including publishing how all-electric new homes are more affordable, easier, and faster to build and developing and implementing a policy to fast track building permits for all-electric homes.
2. Hilary G. (Zoom) encouraged Council to think creatively about potentially accepting this proposal after the first reading and to maintain the bans on outdoor barbecues and other gas users in backyards.
3. Cedric (Zoom) suggested adding additional fees for people who want to do new gas hookups.

Council Member Veenker was not prepared to remove the prohibition on the outdoor gas appliances. She supported the Staff recommendation.

Council Member Burt supported staying with the current prohibition on the outdoor gas appliances.

Council Member Kou asked what kind of engagement with the business community has occurred. She wanted an explanation of the Hourly Source Energy and asked if it is continuous monitoring. She was neutral on prohibiting outdoor gas appliances.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Director Abendschein explained they have not reached out to the Restaurant Association as they have been moving quickly. The focus of these ordinances are on space and water heating, not on cooking. They have more outreach to do but thought they were likely in a favorable position with respect to those concerns and that is something they can speak to in the future. He explained that applicants will typically use a specialized energy modeler to calculate the Hourly Source Energy. There are preapproved sets of modeling software with preapproved factors that help with that modeling. The Hourly Source Energy standard takes into account the emissions of the energy sources being used.

George Hoyt, Chief Building Official, responded these requirements will be in the design and construction phase.

Council Member Tanaka opined that prohibiting outdoor gas appliances would cause more people to use wood or coal which is more noxious than gas. He suggested allowing outdoor gas appliances and banning wood or coal.

Council Member Veenker advised that the Air District was looking into additional rules on wood smoke and things like that. She thought banning wood and coal would take more study and analysis than they could do at that time.

Director Abendschein suggested that because Item Number 3 was included in the ordinances, it might not be necessary to include it in the motion.

Caio Arellano, Assistant City Attorney, announced that for clarity they do have the draft ordinances and language that does reflect the motion being discussed in the packet as it would apply to both residential and nonresidential construction.

Mayor Stone wondered if there had been a chance to analyze how the One Margin is going to compare to the former all-electric design code as far as the 80 by 30 goals are concerned.

Director Abendschein explained if they are seeing over 75 percent of homes already going all electric and they start to see very significant increases in all-electric space and water heating adoption, even if there is still some gas line hookups with appliances that are all all-electric ready, he would expect it to reduce the emissions from new housing by approximately 90 to 95 percent.

MOTION SPLIT FOR THE PURPOSE OF VOTING

MOTION: Vice Mayor Lauing moved, seconded by Council Member Veenker to:

1. Introduce an ordinance amending Chapter 16.14 (California Green Building Standards, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to adopt the 2022 Green Building Standards Code, along with local modifications related to electrical vehicle charging infrastructure requirements and building electrification

SUMMARY MINUTES

requirements and finding that such modifications or changes are reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological or topographical conditions (Attachment A).

MOTION PASSED: 6-1, Tanaka no

MOTION: Vice Mayor Lauing moved, seconded by Council Member Veenker to:

2. Introduce an ordinance amending Chapter 16.17 (California Energy Code, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to adopt the 2022 California Energy Code, along with local modifications to increase energy efficiency standards for buildings, mandate electric-ready requirements, and incentivize all-electric new construction and finding that such modifications or changes are reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological or topographical conditions (Attachment B).

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

18. Approval to Operate the City-owned Building at 445 Bryant Street as a Community Center with Part-Time Use by La Comida de California for a Senior Nutrition Program; CEQA Status – Not a Project

Council Member Kou Made a public disclosure on Agenda Item Number 18.

Sunny Tong, Real Property Manager, provided a slide presentation discussing 445 Bryant Street including an outline, background, review of options to date, and proposed part time senior nutrition program.

Kristen O’Kane, Community Services Director, resumed the presentation including the proposed City community center, fiscal/resource impact, and Staff’s recommendation.

Public Comment:

1. Nancy C. read a letter addressed to Mayor Stone from Congresswoman Anna Eshoo in support of La Comida’s petition to use 445 Bryant Street to distribute lunch to seniors in Palo Alto.
2. Charlie W. spoke on behalf of the Chamber in support of Council allowing the part-time use of 445 Bryant Street for La Comida’s Senior Nutrition Program.
3. Jasmina B. asked Council to consider the possibility of housing senior and youth bridging programs and a UNAFF office in the same building.
4. Bill B., La Comida co-president, described the need for a permanent downtown serving location for La Comida and how 445 Bryant Street would be the ideal location. He pointed out that many cities provided rent-free locations for senior programs and believed Palo Alto should do the same.

SUMMARY MINUTES

5. John S.C., La Comida co-president, spoke about the proposal for the use of 445 Bryant Street and that they are open to sharing the space. He asked that Council keep in mind that their volunteers are all seniors and if the chairs and tables are moved around that they be put back. He explained they would like a long-term, nonexclusive lease with the City. The hope is for Council to specify a low monthly rent realizing they will only be there for a few hours Monday through Friday and provide a valuable service to the City and its residents.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims queried if the total operating cost would be \$490,000 annually and asked where the revenue was expected to come from. She mentioned in Santa Clara County there are 59 senior nutrition sites and only one serving Palo Alto, which is La Comida. She would like to see the City offer the same rental terms to La Comida as they do to Avenidas, which is \$1 per year, as well as a long-term lease. She wanted to know what members of the teen leadership groups think of this idea. She further questioned if they would be willing to engage the teen leadership groups going forward around their thoughts.

Director O’Kane responded that was correct. She explained that revenue would be generated by charges for programs and services. As a community center, they propose to program the space with different classes when La Comida is not there. She did not think the idea had been discussed with the teen leadership groups directly. Working with the Mayor’s mental health task force, they have heard from both teen and adult participants that having more safe spaces for kids to go after school and on weekends is a high priority. They have also heard that one of the teen leadership groups did a survey among their peers unrelated to youth mental health and some of the survey results indicated needing places to hang out. She confirmed they would be willing to engage the teen leadership groups going forward around their thoughts

Mr. Tong answered the charge to La Comida was to be negotiated. He stated they charge Avenidas \$1 per year.

Council Member Kou talked about the finances provided to Avenidas by the City and pointed out the lease for Avenidas agrees to use the premises for senior citizens to carry out services and no other purpose; however, there is a for profit Redwood Café which is open to the public. She provided reasons that allowing La Comida to relocate to 445 Bryant Street would be advantageous. She asked her colleagues to direct Staff to work with La Comida to come up with a long-term lease and take into consideration what Avenidas is getting and what La Comida does provide. She also encouraged looking at the programs Avenidas is providing and how much cost it takes. She was fully in support of the teen and community centers.

Council Member Veenker supported housing La Comida at 445 Bryant and negotiating a lease on fair and equitable terms. She asked if they could accommodate ensuring the tables are kept in place for La Comida. She supported the Staff recommendation that the City run it for now. She liked the idea of it being an overnight warming location and asked if it could also be for cooling or a clean air refuge. She wondered if the possibility of filling space with summer camps was in relation to additional camps or relocating existing camps. She asked if it would be

SUMMARY MINUTES

possible to go back to put out an RFP for nonprofits for the space La Comida is not using if it does not work out.

Director O’Kane explained they would have facility attendants on site and part of their job is to putting tables and chairs up, take them down, and setting up AV equipment and they could work with the seniors. She thought it was a possibility that it could be more than a warming location. She stated the goal would be to add additional camps there.

Mr. Tong agreed it would be possible to go back to put out an RFP for nonprofits for the space La Comida is not using if it does not work out.

Council Member Burt queried what the intentions are for the upstairs space. He spoke about the services UNAFF provides for the City. He wanted to see if his colleagues were interested in asking Staff to explore UNAFF being a community partner tenant in the upstairs space where they ask them to present a number of films per year on a timely basis and do programming at that location.

Director O’Kane responded all the spaces would be flexible spaces so it would be programming for classes.

Vice Mayor Lauing asked for an example of programming on the teen center. He wanted to know why the space was so good for the teens from her perspective. He wanted to know why the price went up. He wondered if seven years was too long.

Director O’Kane commented their staffing plan was to hire two full-time positions and six 0.48 FTE positions and provided details on those. They would work around the 10 to 2 timeframe La Comida needs. She stated this was a good location because it is central and would be easier for teens to access. She described renovations needed to get the facility up to community center use which drove the price up.

Council Member Tanaka asked how much money was being taken out of the reserves for the planned year. He questioned what the total cost would be after factoring in everything. He saw the community benefits of the proposal but expressed concern about piling on to the deficit. He pointed out that Mountain View is doing well because they rent their property out at market rates.

Lauren Lai, Chief Financial Officer, advised based on the recent Finance Committee deliberation, they are presenting a balanced budget. With a two-year strategy, they will use about \$7,000,000 of uncertainty reserve.

Director O’Kane answered the one-time capital cost was estimated at \$930,000. They expect to pay for those out of the Community Center Impact Fund, which has increased since June 30, 2023. The operating costs are expected to be \$490,000 offset by an estimated \$225,000 in revenue.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mayor Stone supported the Staff recommendation. He wanted to be sure there would be consistent hours with the teen center. He asked Staff's thoughts on how giving space to UNAFF would impact the other uses.

City Manager Shikada thought it was a trade-off among perspective uses which is what led Staff to the conclusion that the general community center use provided the greatest flexibility for meeting programming needs that will vary over the course of the day or week. Any space dedicated to other uses would take away from that flexibility. He noted that given that they have had one other nonprofit put in a proposal on space, their recommendation would be having some form of fee involved in order to evaluate alternative uses that would be dedicated space. Space for nonprofit organizations is at a premium and high demand.

MOTION: Council Member Kou moved, seconded by Mayor Stone to direct staff to operate the City-owned building at 445 Bryant Street as a community center with part-time use by La Comida de California for a senior nutrition program; and to start negotiations with La Comida de California with a \$1 year lease agreement and take into consideration what other senior centers agreements are and what services are being provided.

MOTION PASSED: 6-1, Tanaka no

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:36 P.M.