



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Special Meeting
April 15, 2024

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers and by virtual teleconference at 5:30 P.M.

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

Present Remotely: Veenker

Absent:

Call to Order

Mayor Stone called the meeting to order. The clerk called roll with six present.

Special Orders of the Day

1. Proclamation Honoring National Animal Control Officer Appreciation Week - April 14-20, 2024

NO ACTION

Vice Mayor Lauing read the proclamation honoring National Animal Control Officer Appreciation Week.

Police Chief Andrew Binder spoke in appreciation of the community's animal control officers.

2. Proclamation Honoring National Public Safety Telecommunicators' Week - April 15-19, 2024

NO ACTION

Council Member Kou read the proclamation honoring National Public Safety Telecommunicators' Week.

Police Chief Binder spoke in appreciation of the community's dispatchers.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Agenda Changes, Additions, and Deletions

None.

Public Comment

Mayor Stone set ground rules for public speakers.

1. Sarit speaking on behalf of (8): Miriam, Eric, Rotem, Jennifer, Henriette, Susan, and Itai spoke about the hostages held by Hamas. She discussed the upcoming Passover celebration and compared the plight of the hostages. She urged the condemnation of Hamas.
2. Alan, speaking on behalf of (8) Shira, Einav, Gary, Maya, Erik, Allyson R., and Avner, talked about a protest held two weeks prior in Palo Alto that violated the peaceful protest permit. He outlined actions the City could take to prevent further incidents such as this. He mentioned an upcoming similar event that has been granted a permit and his fear of the risk of violence. He asked Council to consider if groups with a history of violating the law be allowed to demonstrate in the future without providing assurances that they will adhere to permits and laws. He wanted to know what the City and law enforcement was doing to prepare for the upcoming event.
3. Estee G. demonstrated how the war of Hamas is a complicated international issue beyond the jurisdiction of the City of Palo Alto.
4. Loren T. raised concerns with the way the Palo Alto Police Department handled her father's case who died in April 2017 from a traumatic four-story fall while he was checked in as a patient at Stanford Medical Center. She believed this to be a cover up by the Police Department that the City Attorney supports.
5. Noel S. commented about problems with organizations conflating criticism of Israel and Zionism.
6. Sheira (Zoom) discussed the average combatant to civilian death ratio in Gaza at 1 to 0.7 which is 13 times less than the UN reported average ratio in urban warfare.
7. Liz G. (Zoom) wanted to know the neighborhood designation of Mayfield Place affordable housing. She expressed having difficulty identifying her household address.
8. Martin W. (Zoom) talked about the requests trying to force the Council to pass a ceasefire resolution. He remarked it was important to realize this was part of a national movement meant to bring down our institutions.

SUMMARY MINUTES

9. Lori M. asked Council to take action to make things better in Palo Alto by starting antisemitism training and enforcing laws.
10. Ali discussed ways that calling for a ceasefire resolution is a local issue.
11. Deborah G. explained how the requests for a ceasefire are about a culture war.
12. Aram J. (Zoom) expressed disdain for what he referred to as white supremacist Jews.
13. Yazan (Zoom) brought attention to events in the West Bank. He commented supporting a ceasefire would mean supporting a ceasefire in the West Bank as well as in Gaza and across all of the region.
14. Tal S. (Zoom) urged City Council and Palo Alto Police to take proactive measures to block any unacceptable and unlawful behavior at the upcoming protest rally.

Council Member Veenker Joined City Council Meeting by teleconference at 5:57 P.M. She invoked AB 2449 and provided the address from which she was attended. She declared there was no one over the age of 18 present with her.

Council Member Questions, Comments, and Announcements

Council Member Kou spoke about the Palo Alto Emergency Services Volunteers performing an emergency drill by simulating an earthquake and discussed the importance of communication during the event.

Mayor Stone talked about his experience visiting the sister city of Tsuchiura, Japan. He announced an ad-hoc committee addition and change. He also announced that he and Vice Mayor Lauing agreed to issue \$812 from the Council Contingency Fund to cover the rental fee at Lucie Stern Community Center for a children's day event being organized by a local Turkish-Americans Association. He spoke about the many comments and emails the City Council has received related to the events in the Middle East, including requests regarding for and against adopting a ceasefire resolution. He explained how cities do not have jurisdiction over international affairs. He remarked that they do believe the City has an interest and responsibility to ensure that residents feel heard, respected, and safe. To this end, he agreed to meet with some of the more vocal public commenters, with Council Member Veenker, a professional mediator, joining in facilitating the conversation. He described three meetings held at City Hall that afforded these residents with diverse perspectives a chance to be heard and have their viewpoints respected and are hopeful the participants will follow the suggestions made during the meetings to plan and carry out community programs to build relationships and community.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Consent Calendar

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 6, 8.

MOTION: Council Member Lythcott-Haims moved, seconded by Council Member Kou to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-12.

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 3-5, 7, 9-12: 7-0

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 6, 8: 6-1, Tanaka no

Council Member Tanaka described the issues he had with Items 6 and 8 resulting in his no vote.

3. Approval of Minutes from the March 18, 2024 and March 25, 2024 Meetings.
4. Approve the Reliability and Resiliency Strategic Plan as Recommended by the Utilities Advisory Commission; CEQA Status: exempt, not a project
5. Approval of Construction Contract C24190225 with Graham Contractors, Inc. in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$1,594,195 and Authorization for the City Manager or Their Designee to Negotiate and Execute Change Orders for Related Additional but Unforeseen Work that may Develop During the Project Up to a Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$159,420 for the Fiscal Year 2024 Streets Preventive Maintenance Project, Capital Improvement Program Projects PE-86070, and PO-11001; CEQA status – exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(c)
6. Staff Recommends Increasing the Budget for the Advanced Heat Pump Water Heater Pilot Program by \$846,000 to Increase Participation with Higher Rebates, and Amend the Fiscal Year Budget Appropriation for the Gas Fund; CEQA Status: Not a Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(5)
7. Approval of Contract No. C24189918 with BKF Engineers, through December 31 2025, in an Amount Not to Exceed \$109,583, for Professional Design and Engineering Services for the Foothills Nature Preserve Improvements Project (PE-21000); CEQA Status – Exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301
8. Approval of a Blanket Purchase Order With Eaton (Cooper Power Systems, LLC) for the Purchase of Pad-Mounted Electric Equipment for the Utility's Electric Distribution System Not to Exceed \$750,000 per Year for a Total Not-To-Exceed Amount of \$5,250,000 for 7 Years; CEQA Status – Exempt Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301

SUMMARY MINUTES

9. Approval of Professional Services Contract Number C24189405 with Tetra Tech, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$300,000 for On-Call Emergency Management Support Services for a Period of Six Years; CEQA Status – Not a Project.
10. Approval of Contract Amendment Number 2 to Seven On-call Consulting Contracts to Increase in the Amount by \$500,000 to a Total Not to Exceed to \$3.5 Million and Extend Term by Three Months to Provide Expertise for Long Range Planning Projects, Application Processing, Environmental Review, and Other Planning Analysis in the Planning and Development Services Department.
11. Approval of: (1) Contract No. 4524000393 with StarChase, LLC for GPS Vehicle Tracking Implementation for a three-year term in an amount not to exceed \$224,657; and (2) StarChase GPS Vehicle Tracking Technology Surveillance Use Policy; CEQA status – categorically exempt.
12. Authorization to Execute Amendment to Legal Services Contract S24189355 with Allen, Glaessner, Hazelwood & Werth to Increase Amount by \$50,000 for Total Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$135,000; CEQA Status – Not a Project.

City Manager Comments

City Manager Shikada provided a slide presentation detailing construction updates, openings for volunteers on the historic resources board, the upcoming Palo Alto Earth Day Festival, and notable tentative upcoming Council items.

BREAK (5-10 MINUTES) / CONVENE CITY COUNCIL and PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION MEETING

The City Council and Planning and Transportation Commission of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers and by virtual teleconference at 6:46 P.M.

PTC Commissioners Present In Person: Summa, Hechtman, Reckdahl, Templeton, Lu, Akin

PTC Commissioners Present Remotely: Chang

Action Items

13. Joint City Council and Planning and Transportation Commission Meeting to Adopt a Resolution Amending the Comprehensive Plan by Adopting a Revised 2023-31 Housing Element. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): The City Council adopted a

SUMMARY MINUTES

Revised Addendum to the Comprehensive Plan Final Environmental Impact Report on December 18, 2023 that, in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan Final EIR, fully analyzes the impacts associated with adoption of the Revised 2023-2031 Housing Element.

Jean Eisberg, Principal Consultant Lexington Planning, provided a slide presentation to include stating the purpose of the meeting, recent milestones, public comments received, HCD comments, August 3, 2023, HCD comment letter, work completed in response to comments, affirmatively furthering fair housing, sites inventory, constraints, programs (key changes – modifications and additions), CEQA: environmental review – addendum, CEQA analysis – conclusion, non-CEQA: traffic level of service analysis, next steps, staff recommendations and meeting sequence.

Jonathan Lait, Planning and Development Services Director, added they could incorporate and adjust any minor changes Council proposed. Any substantive changes would take more time to understand the implications and return back to the Council for action.

Public Comment:

1. Deborah G. provided some pictures of traffic in and out of the JCC from her bike. She was not in favor of the plan.
2. Hamilton H. described how HCD was overreaching the cause of the state. He asked Council to pass this latest version of the Housing Element and asked HCD to certify the Housing Element so the City could focus on implementing these programs.
3. Lisa M.
4. Adam S. felt it was imperative to build a lot more houses immediately at all income levels to rectify the housing crisis. He spoke about a letter in the record that makes specific suggestions which he endorsed.
5. Emily R., SV@Home, expressed concern with the current draft of the Housing Element and outlined some key requests and recommendations.
6. Scott O. encouraged Council to ask City Staff to focus on delivering a strong hip to add into the package that would move the needle in a way the ECR focus area does not.
7. Liz G. (Zoom) spoke against the overreach of putting 2000 units of housing in the industrial area of Fabian and San Antonio. Her suggestion was to put housing within the R1 zones.
8. Aram J. (Zoom) expressed his disappointment in the progress of the Housing Element. He pushed that at least 20 percent of housing go to African Americans in reparations.

SUMMARY MINUTES

9. Michael Q. talked about lawsuit in another town regarding a Housing Element. He opined the best way to avoid interference from Sacramento was to pass a good Housing Element that would keep them certified in the future.
10. Amie A. urged Council to replicate the projects approved as part of the El Camino Real focus area. She described why she supported housing.
11. John K. (Zoom) associated himself with the remarks of Adam S., Emily R., Scott O., and Amie A. He emphasized that ADUs appear to play a much more consequential role in the City's overall assessment of its RHNA targets and represent the entire buffer the City has going forward. He thought it was important that the City act now before submitting this to the HCD to address the inequities and impact fees the City Staff has acknowledged.

Planning and Transportation Commission

PTC Commissioner Templeton asked how Staff would respond to the public comments suggesting they would get rejected again.

Director Lait answered they believed the document would meet HCD's state law requirements. They had met with their reviewer and his supervisor five to six times in the last three months and were able to provide direct edits that were shown in the review, which seemed to be in line with the expectations. He noted that even though they had gone through that process, it was not an indication of HCD's support of the document.

PTC Commissioner Lu discussed comments made by HCD about timelines asking for color on what was said and if it had been thoroughly addressed. He was concerned about specific mandates given by HCD not being addressed. He wanted to know if there were any particularly important HCD concerns that Staff did not feel comfortable editing a program on but that PTC or Council feedback would be useful. He asked what areas of Alma are referred to in the "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" update and asked for details about the selection of the neighborhoods referenced.

Director Lait answered there are a number of programs in the Housing Element and part of the Staff's sensitivity throughout the process is their ability to deliver on those items and policy initiatives within the timelines that have been estimated. He explained there has been a back and forth with HCD to reconcile the staff capacity, resources and projects to implement the Housing Element while taking all the other City Council priorities into consideration. They were able to talk to the HCD supervisor and identify which ones had a higher effect toward housing production or preservation. He explained their approach in addressing the timeline. He stated they felt they took their first cut of trying to understand what HCD was asking for in their comment letter, got as far as they could, and wanted to initiate direct conversations with the reviewer and supervisor to make sure they were not missing anything. Through those meetings, they were able to ask any ambiguities they had from the comment letter and get specific

SUMMARY MINUTES

responses back. Edits and changes were made based on that feedback and those revisions sent back to HCD for a courtesy review.

Brenna Weatherby, Principal Rincon Consultants, remarked HCD Staff was comfortable with the language submitted. She explained that the neighborhoods were being referenced in those programs because they were called out in the AFFH analysis as areas of concern or special needs. She clarified Alma Street was a vague reference in those programs because the areas that have concentrated pockets of individual populations varies so HCD was comfortable with just referring to Alma Street.

PTCC Vice Chair Chang asked for information about how many municipalities are in a similar boat. She wanted to know how much Staff time has been spent thus far and how much more will be needed.

Director Lait did not have information on hand regarding other municipalities in a similar boat. He recalled there were 20 percent that were outstanding for certification and almost every jurisdiction has had more than one review. He explained there was not a list of hours spent on this particular project. They believe they have the Housing Element certified. As part of City Council's annual review of priority objectives, they submitted a list of Housing Element related implementation tasks. He believed they are resourced to meet those timelines.

PTC Commissioner Hechtman referenced a statement "All 10 of these sites have been identified by the City for rezoning to accommodate higher unit capacity," and suggested referring to that as "had been rezoned".

PTC Commissioner Akin found the new site selections and realistic capacity analysis more rigorous. He liked the representative sites documentation. He found the distribution of low- and moderate-income units by racial minority population is equitable and noticeably better than the last iteration. He felt Staff had addressed HCD's concerns adequately.

PTC Commissioner Reckdahl thought defending GM and ROLM was compelling. He spoke about the demand of housing near the Googleplex and the North Bay Shore development which he thought could be played up.

PTC Commissioner Templeton remarked that the plan was imperfect, but the most important thing was to move forward.

PTC Commissioner Hechtman thought the timeline was interesting and informative. He was hesitant to substitute his judgement after his limited hours of study with the hundreds of hours their staff and consultants had put into building this and took comfort in their results. He was ready to move forward with the recommendation of Council.

PTC Commissioner Lu called out a concern about prioritizing their analysis, funding, and resources for affordable housing to build more affordable housing on the other side of

SUMMARY MINUTES

Embarcadero and, to a lesser extent, South Ventura where there are not good resources. With that concern flagged, he would move this forward.

MOTION: Commissioner Akin moved, seconded by Commissioner Templeton to recommend City Council adopt the Revised 2023-31 Housing Element.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked Commissioner Lu to what extent there is truth about not putting housing on the northeast portion of 101 and to what extent the future informed by this Housing Element could contain housing there that is affirmatively furthering fair housing.

PTC Commissioner Lu talked about the number of market-rate housing proposed in an office complex close to the Geng Road site, which he believed was the only site they added in their site inventory in that area. He did not think there were any other sites that address how to affirmatively further fair housing in that area. He explained 2.1C references affordable housing overall. There is also mention in Program 6.1 where special needs housing will be prioritized in those three areas. In Program 6.2, there is also mention of how encouraging family housing would be prioritized. In 6.7, there is community outreach through those areas.

PTC Commissioner Templeton said there were a couple of considerations they talked about in the past for that space regarding suitability for housing and it had to do a lot with the surrounding nature area and amount of light might interfere with their intent for that space.

PTCC Vice Chair Chang remembered a discussion PTC had about housing either close to 101 or the other side. There were concerns about flood risk, being too close to the freeway and proximity of the wildlife corridor.

Council Member Burt added that over the years they have looked at what could be done in the East Bay Shore area and in addition to the lack of schools and safe and reasonable access to schools, there was a lack of services, the density has been minimized as it is natural land and there is one level F intersection that basically serves that.

Council Member Veenker recused herself due to conflicts of interest.

Council Member Burt recalled a public comment concerned about the existing office towers being demolished in order to have housing at Palo Alto Square Properties, but it was his understanding that the housing would be additive on the vast amount of surface parking.

Director Lait confirmed that and noted that Palo Alto Square is not a housing opportunity site in the Housing Element. He added the conversation about that site is about additive parking and nothing to do with removing existing office square footage. He stated there are a lot of properties not listed as housing opportunity sites that will benefit from additional zoning the City Council has authorized. This goes to the conversation about the buffer.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Burt opined that goes to a concern raised whether a specific site might need to be removed from the housing inventory, but it is anticipated they will be able to add more sites than prospectively removed.

Director Lait agreed there would most likely be scenarios where it may not align with what was envisioned in the Housing Element. They have a program to monitor that on an annual basis. If they need to identify another site, they believe there will be adequate capacity to make that change.

Mayor Stone was curious how ADUs accounted for the various income categories. He asked for detail on Program 4.5.

Director Lait explained there is a projection for ADUs for the RHNA cycle that is based on actual permits they have issued over an average of three years. They think they will exceed that projection by the time they reach the planning horizon. As far as how those units are designated into different income categories, ABAG has put together a technical assistance document that examined cities throughout the region. Based on their survey, they found that a certain percentage of ADUs tend to be income restricted at the different affordability levels they need to plan for in RHNA. It was not an exhaustive survey. His understanding was that HCD was relying on that guidance from ABAG and allowing that to be used as jurisdictions are allowed to use those thresholds that are defined in that technical assistance document and apply that to the housing element.

Ms. Weatherby added that HCD does like to see that look back at three to five years' worth of data on existing ADU and construction trends. They were told those numbers were conservative, but it does not mean that additional ADU units cannot be constructed.

Director Lait noted as a part of their programs they would do a survey of ADUs that they can begin to get some local data about affordability for ADUs that they would look at in the upcoming years. He explained Program 4.5 was added directly in response to City Council's direction. They were putting together information on the website to help guide developers to that. They would take that opportunity to make them aware of this program, direct them to the website and encourage them to consider hiring in accordance with this program objective.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked Director Lait what he would add to make this draft stronger in the realm of reducing governmental constraints on the construction of housing.

Director Lait thought they had covered all that is needed to meet the state requirements. He described it as a key program related to the housing incentive program, which is intended to allow them to look beyond the statutory obligations to see how they could further housing production in Palo Alto. They have a program timeline to complete that by December if not sooner. He gave examples of what the HIP Program will enable.

Ms. Eisberg explained the Housing Incentive Program is a local alternative to state density bonus law. It applies to just a few zoning districts. It stipulates a small menu of options for how

SUMMARY MINUTES

to increase densities and provide modifications to certain development standards. She described the geographic expansion. She opined it is buried in the code so with the recent rezonings, they have created a new section of the code to consolidate the Housing Incentive Program into the new chapter and develop new standards to make sure it is a feasible program. They are looking to bring that forward to the ARB and Planning Commission for study sessions early this summer with the intent to have an ordinance before the end of the year.

Director Lait advised there would be public hearings and an opportunity for the public to examine the proposals being made and evaluate it to the programs they have in the Housing Element making sure there is alignment in what the stated objective is and what they are doing from an ordinance perspective.

Council Member Burt followed up on the local workforce issue commenting that their ability to provide adequate housing as a region economically is very constrained by the available skilled workforce, yet they have many residents in neighboring communities who would welcome opportunities for high income skilled workforce jobs. What lacks is a strategic plan at the state and regional level. For the housing advocates, this can move the dial on housing. He thought an important correction was the fact that they would be moving to a square footage-based fee program which would also apply to the ADUs which would result in exceeding ADUs. He questioned if there was a plan to address the separate utility hookups on ADUs.

Director Lait explained the process of prorating the ADU fees. He needed to dig more into the issue of separate utility hookups for ADUs and would follow up on that. He did not think it require a change to the Housing Element in terms of programming. He pointed out these were the things not getting done because of having to keep working on the Housing Element.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked if they should revise the Housing Element further to say it has been done.

Director Lait answered they have a deadline in the program by the end of the year to complete it. He would not hold up submitting the document to HCD.

Vice Mayor Lauing mentioned that many sections in this Housing Element are being requested for the first time in state history so had to be created from scratch. The process required additions and deletions and a number came from the public. He felt like it was a community effort. He pointed out that the process with HCD has been a massive time and dollar investment by the majority of the Planning Department and these resources are scarce and as a result a lot of other important things are not getting done. He mentioned other programs coming up that were more numerous than the old Housing Element. He detailed some programs that the public has commented should be added and he stated they are working on those now. Doing these additions to the plan are not necessary to get this certified and meet their quotas. They still have plenty of sites and the buffer is liberal. He felt it was time to act and urged his colleagues to approve the plan.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Lythcott-Haims recalled the discussion about how the area northeast of 101 has historically tended to be an undesirable area for housing yet they seem to have four programs that contemplate putting either very large families, low-income folks, female-headed households, seniors, homeless and people of special needs. She felt concern that could effectively be a segregation of people who need to be closer to transit, grocery, amenities and quality of life stuff unless they plan to build a brand-new neighborhood there. She asked why not instead build a new village residential out there at a variety of affordability levels.

Ms. Weatherby explained there is a small cluster of homes out there now. Because of that, that area is included in the AFFH analysis. When HCD takes a look at the AFFH analysis, they use data from their viewer. The information is available online. That is the information they pull into the AFFH analysis because HCD does not know every community by heart and rely on the data presented there. They did detail in Appendix C that there were some small pockets of special needs populations in that area. Because of that, HCD requires those geographic targeting to affirmatively further the fair housing within that area. This could be new housing, but it could also be other things to be done to further fair housing. She described what the programs spoke to. Not all programs that call out that area are related to the development of new housing. Even ones that do could be speaking toward rehab. She pointed out the reference to housing that is located there in Appendix C.

Director Lait noted that except for one site east of 101 they are not proposing other properties as a housing opportunity site. The programs they have are state mandated requirements they are needing to respond to based on an existing condition.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims registered her concern, hope and expectation that they will not choose to put special populations with greater needs on the edge of town. She was interested in why they would not extend the El Camino focus area that they knew would bring forth projects which would result in the new units sprinkled throughout the City. She was curious to what extent does the team engage with developers and try to move past the thread of Builder's Remedy to a place of cooperation. She wanted to understand why they would not relax the Retail Preservation Ordinance at Cal Ave and downtown.

Director Lait agreed that could be done and would be a policy decision for the City Council. He noted they have already directed Staff through their objectives discussion on priorities to begin that work and they have a timeline to complete that by June of next year. If they want to have Staff draft program language to memorialize work they have already directed them to do, they can include that in as a program in this Housing Element if there is majority support. He explained they have a number of Builder's Remedy applications on file that are being processed like any other application. There are outstanding legal questions related to that that will need to be addressed at the appropriate time. He added they have seen the results of some of the early conversation with developers in the form of the housing focus area development standards. He noted it was not correct to conclude that the Builder's Remedy projects coming in represent what needs to be built in order to have an economically viable project. These are projects that have no limits and are being proposed at standards that exceed any reasonable

SUMMARY MINUTES

return. It is not a baseline by which to measure future zoning regulations. He spoke about the core of University and California Avenue where they have ground floor protection zoning in place to protect the walkable experience. This could change as a policy from City Council if they get that direction. Where they have talked about an abundance of retail and an abundance of retail square footage as reported in the Street Sense document that the Council has reviewed, it may not be that they want to reduce the excess retail square footage in the core commercial retail areas but on the periphery or in areas that do not have the same walkable convenience or other amenities to support that retail. Their approach has been protecting the retail where it exists today on the ground floor of these two downtowns and allow for some flexibility to modify or reduce the retail preservation standards elsewhere. For the past three months, the PTC has been having conversations related to retail including the Retail Preservation Ordinance and hope to come to City Council before they go on summer recess to seek guidance on specific policies they recommend, and Council would like to see advanced.

Council Member Kou wanted to know if there was any program that says sales tax of materials purchased by developers would come to the City. She explained how she did not see the City becoming more inclusive through this effort and did not support it.

Director Lait did not think there was any program related to sales tax and would be governed by state law.

City Manager Ed Shikada was familiar with the sales tax issue Council Member Kou referred to, but he was not sure about the specific application and how it fit. He offered to take it as a referral for Staff to follow up on and report back on any issues with implementation.

Vice Mayor Lauing opined this would be outside of the jurisdiction of what HCD was evaluating for compliant Housing Element. It would be more like a program or policy they would put in effect in the City.

Council Member Veenker asked Director Laid if he felt they had the flexibility to respond to certain items or comments from HCD without coming back to the Council with this motion.

Director Lait answered that was embedded in the resolution that is included in the motion.

There was discussion regarding the wording of the motion and the revisions.

Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney

Molly Stump, City Attorney

Council Member Tanaka

Council Member Veenker recused on Stanford University related properties/programs and First Congregational Church portions of the Item.

SUMMARY MINUTES

City Council

MOTION: Vice Mayor Lauing moved, seconded by Council Member Lythcott-Haims to adopt a Resolution (Attachment B) making the findings required under CEQA and Housing Element Law, and adopt the Revised 2023-31 Housing Element as an amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan, and direct staff to:

1. Add new program to align with Council's direction to extend the Housing Focus Area along El Camino Real; and,
2. Reexamine the existing housing conditions East of Bay Shore subsequent to the submittal of the Housing Element and make any adjustments accordingly.

MOTION PASSED: 6-1, Kou no

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 P.M.