



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Special Meeting
April 22, 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, Lythcott-Haims, Stone, Tanaka, Veenker

Present Remotely:

Absent: Lauing

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Stone called the meeting to order.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

1. Recognizing Youth Living in Palo Alto or Enrolled at PAUSD Who Have Received The President's Volunteer Service Award (PVSA) As Certified by Youth Community Service (YCS) This Academic Year Between July 1, 2023 – Feb 15, 2024.

Mora Oommen, Executive Director Youth Community Services, was excited to recognize students in the community who have received the President's Volunteer Service Award. She described the history and impact of YCS and what the PVSA is and who can apply. There were 75 students in middle and high school recognized by President Biden, having dedicated over 11,750 hours of service to 152 community organizations. She presented slides of some of the participants, thanking them.

Emma, PVSA Silver Level Award Winner, described that she volunteered about 180 hours. She discussed participating in the YCS Summer of Service Program to plan their National Day of Service event, working at Walter Hayes Summer School with a class of second-graders, and participating in several robotics events over the summer.

Jabron, PVSA Award Winner, noted that participating in community service has been incredibly rewarding. He explained that one of the activities he participated in over the summer was to go on a global leadership camp to a school in Kenya to teach students with disabilities.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Jack Miller, Silicon Valley Bicycle Exchange, stated he had the pleasure of hosting students from Palo Alto high schools and congratulated all the students who won awards. He felt these programs provided experiences the students do not get in high school and explained how the program also benefited Silicon Valley Bicycle Exchange.

Monica S., Marine Mammal Center, spoke about the organization and the activities volunteers participate in, including feeding and caring for animals, mentoring other students, and educating the public. She gave information on how to volunteer.

Mayor Stone congratulated the students who participated and won this award. He stated the award was a testament to selflessness, compassion, and willingness to give back to the community.

Council Member Kou congratulated the students and was interested in hearing more about what all of the students did.

NO ACTION

CLOSED SESSION

2. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS City Designated Representatives: City Manager and his Designees Pursuant to Merit System Rules and Regulations (Ed Shikada, Kiely Nose, Sandra Blanch, Nick Raisch, Tori Post, Molly Stump, and Jennifer Fine) Employee Organization: Service Employees International Union, (SEIU) Local 521, Utilities Management and Professional Association of Palo Alto (UMPAPA), Palo Alto Peace Officers' Association (PAPOA), Palo Alto Police Management Association (PMA), International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) local 1319, Palo Alto Fire Chiefs' Association (FCA); Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6 (a)

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Veenker, to go into Closed Session.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0-1, Lauing absent

Council went into Closed Session at 5:50 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 6:45 P.M.

Mayor Stone announced no reportable action.

SUMMARY MINUTES

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Ed Shikada, City Manager, stated there were no changes to the agenda. He noted Staff issued a supplemental report on Item 10 on the Consent agenda, available online.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Stone reviewed the expectations for public comment.

1. Yazan spoke on behalf of Michelle H., Uzma M., Fariha H., Lubna Q., and Tuba S. He shared a recent personal experience in which a woman shouted at him and his young daughter, calling them terrorists and blaming them for the actions of Palestinians in Gaza. He stated what is happening in Gaza is also a local issue. He believed that not calling for an end to the conflict was divisive.
2. Talha spoke on behalf of Yasa B., Hadi S., Moiez B., Taha A., and Humza S. He described his experience in organizing and participating in recent protests and felt a double standard was applied to the protestors. He stated his movement is against the taking of hostages and the deaths of Israelis and Palestinians alike and that it was false to conflate being pro-Palestinian with being pro-terrorism or anti-Semitic. He asked for the Council to call for an end of this violence.
3. Julia Z. spoke on behalf of Caitlin H., Nrieka I., Deven S., Floyd N., and Susan C., members of the Palo Alto Student Climate Coalition, representing three of the major high schools in Palo Alto. She described a recent climate justice rally. She urged the Council to recommit to climate this Earth Day, moving with greater urgency, intensity, and dedication to sustainability. She listed three major concerns the PASCC members continue to hear and presented recommendations to achieve climate goals.
4. Phoebe M., adding to the previous speaker's presentation, noted that through One Margin implementation and an end-of-life mandate closely vetted by the City's legal team, the City can get closer to achieving 80 by 30 and reclaim its place at the forefront of sustainability as a trailblazer of climate progress.

SUMMARY MINUTES

5. Hamilton H. requested that City Council not unnecessarily abbreviate the duration of public comment for agenda action items.
6. Noel S. noted that East Palo Alto passed a ceasefire resolution and believed the residents there understood what the Palestinians were going through. He asked for a ceasefire resolution.
7. Deborah G. thanked the Council for the police presence at the recent rally. She stated that the war in the Middle East is all about oil and would like to see a resolution that everyone rides their bikes, which would also mitigate climate change.
8. Deborahlise stated the planet's warming emissions generated during the first 60 days of the bombing of Gaza were greater than the annual carbon footprint of more than 20 nations. She asked for a ceasefire resolution.
9. Aram J. (Zoom) felt that calling pro-Palestinian supporters anti-Semitic was censorship and should not continue.
10. Nicole C.-W. (Zoom), Executive Director of Dreamcatchers, was grateful for the volunteers and YCS's support. She praised YCS for making volunteering less about completing hours and more about learning and the way to serve the community.
11. Elaine E. (Zoom) stated it was not too late for Palo Alto's voice to be heard in condemning government funding in the destruction in Gaza.

Mayor Stone clarified that given the volume of recent public speakers, 10 or fewer speakers are given 3 minutes; 10 to 20 speakers, 2 minutes; and above 20, 1 minute.

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Veenker explained that she was traveling on behalf of the City last week. She was in Washington, DC, for the Northern California Power Agency, jointly held with the Northwest Public Power Association. There were presentations on various issues affecting power supply, including cyber security threats to the grid, and there were also meetings at Capitol Hill. She then went to Sacramento for the League of California Cities City Leader Summit with conference sessions on housing, governance, and more.

Council Member Kou noted that the Palo Alto Youth Council held their Inaugural Civic Impact Summit on Saturday with very interesting speakers.

SUMMARY MINUTES

She also stated that SB 9 had been struck down, which was a win for charter cities.

STUDY SESSION

3. Race and Equity Update: Assessment Report from Ivy Planning Group on City Workplace Culture and 2024-2025 (Calendar Years) Equity Action Plan

Ed Shikada, City Manager, explained this was the product of a several-month effort following up on prior Council direction related to race and equity as a Council priority.

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Deputy City Manager, provided an overview of this topic and of Ivy Planning Group. She read the City's Equity Mission Statement

Janet Smith, Co-founder & President Ivy Planning Group, gave further background on Ivy Planning Group. She then discussed the assessment that was done, including the objectives and the assessment methods. There were five key themes identified, each of which she discussed in depth. Those themes were the City of Palo Alto has some infrastructure in place that can enable Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) success; employees often feel they are treated poorly by the public and would like more support to navigate difficult interactions; the City is missing a structured approach to DEIB; some people processes encourage while others inhibit the advancement of DEIB; and the lack of follow-through and the history of exclusionary practices has made people question the City's dedication to DEIB. Using those themes, the consultants built a draft DEIB blueprint with four key goals: DEIB infrastructure, workforce, workplace, and community. She highlighted actions to take in each of those four areas.

Deputy City Manager Cotton Gaines noted that Staff developed three categories to be carried year over year as broader themes within Palo Alto's DEIB work, cultivating experiences and appreciation, fostering an inclusive environment, and applying an equity lens, all with a focus on people, purpose, and practice. She further reviewed the Equity Action Plan in each category, all included in the meeting packet.

Council Member Veenker stated she enjoyed the interview she had during this process as it forced her to think through these issues more deeply. Noting that participation was voluntary and there was only 29% participation, she questioned how that might have skewed the results and

SUMMARY MINUTES

why that happened. She described that one thing done at the January retreat was to change the Council's priority Community Health and Safety to Community Health, Safety, Wellness, and Belonging. She hoped that was a step in the right direction along with the plan outlined. She also commented on the importance of mentoring as a link between equitable hiring and promotion.

Deputy City Manager Cotton Gaines explained the focus groups were done at the end of July last year, which was a difficult time of year and impacted the ability of Staff to participate.

Ms. Smith felt the study had balanced perspectives with multiple voices. She felt communication was important to make changes so that people understand it really matters. It is critical to allocate resources around this matter, and once the action plan is laid out, anything that supports accountability is important.

Gary Smith, Co-Founder of Ivy Planning Group, agreed that mentoring was one aspect of ensuring the entire employee life cycle is performing the best it can.

Mayor Stone asked if the responses of the various participants were similar across different job classifications. He noted the uniform grievance that staff members felt mistreated by the public was disturbing and wondered if it was a more systemic issue. He liked the recommendation to include DEIB performance metrics in employee evaluations and asked if that has worked in other cities.

Ms. Smith responded there were similarities in the themes and that Staff who were more public facing had stories about what it felt like to be a city employee. Employees at the lowest levels or younger employees cared more about being developed. Demographics drove some of the variants, and some job functions were disproportionately one demographic more than another. She noted not everyone felt they were being mistreated, but it was more than you would want. Mistreatment was primarily talked about as from the community, not peer-to-peer or from bosses. She explained the DEIB performance metrics work when there is a culture of accountability.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked if there were specific recommendations for the campaign design to increase public awareness of Staff. She asked how Palo Alto is doing compared to other clients or employers and whether there was anything either novel or concerning. She noted the focus groups were described around race, gender, and tenure and questioned how to get at the root of more subtle distinctions around class, education, and perceived worth stemming from one's job. She also

SUMMARY MINUTES

mentioned LGBTQ and disabled individuals had to self identify in the focus groups and wondered how the other characteristics were not considered self identified. She pointed out that if any members of the Staff were interested in having a Pride event, she was interested in that conversation.

Mr. Smith explained that a big part of it is creating a sense of connection. People treat people differently when they feel connected to them. He felt that if this study were repeated today, the participation rate would be different as people see that the City is still committed to this idea.

Ms. Smith noted that Palo Alto's location makes the City different. The socioeconomic differences of residents and Staff cause questions of belonging. The Council and City continuing to engage around and speak for DEIB will demonstrate its importance.

Deputy City Manager Cotton Gaines noted the information on Staff regarding race, tenure, and gender is held within an employee's file, but LGBTQ and disability status are not. Those options had to be self selected.

Council Member Kou asked if the City included employees with developmental disabilities. She felt that was another group to include.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Aram J. (Zoom) wanted to know the cost of the Ivy Planning Group consultation. He was offended that the police department claimed not to be appreciated, as he believed the department had a history of racism. He wondered if the citizens were asked how they felt about law enforcement.
2. Elizabeth G. (Zoom) underscored that housing was critical to feeling included and feeling like there is equal access. She felt housing and the wage component were missing from this discussion.
3. Winter D. (Zoom) was unsure how to make the analysis and suggestions concrete. She was glad the review was done. She felt things were going in the right direction after the Independent Police Auditor's report, partly thanks to the cooperation, new leadership, and new policies of the Palo Alto Police Department.

NO ACTION

CONSENT CALENDAR

SUMMARY MINUTES

4. Approval of Minutes from April 1, 2024, and April 8, 2024, Meetings
5. CONSENT: 261 Hamilton Ave: Upgrade Historic Inventory from Category 3 to Category 1
6. Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager or Their Designee to Execute an Amendment to the Power Purchase Agreement with Ameresco Half Moon Bay LLC for the Purchase of up to 60,000 Megawatt-Hours per Year of Biogas Energy Over a Term of up to 20 Years for a Total Not to Exceed Amount of \$147.2 Million; CEQA Status: Not a Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a)
7. Approval of Construction Contract Number C24190641A with Valhalla Builders, Inc. in the Amount of \$460,900 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 \$46,090 for the Performing Arts Venues Seat Replacement Project at Lucie Stern Community Theatre, Capital Improvement Program Project AC-18000; CEQA Status – Exempt Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301
8. Approval of Professional Services Contract No. C24190042 With BKF Engineers in a Total Not-to-Exceed Amount for \$283,250 for Land Surveying Services for One Year; CEQA – Not a Project.
9. Approval of a Five-Year Technical Assistance Agreement with the United States Geological Survey in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$924,745 for Scientific Monitoring Services at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant Outfall and Horizontal Levee Pilot Project Site (WQ-22001); CEQA Status- Categorically Exempt Section 15306
10. QUASI-JUDICIAL. 739 Sutter Avenue [22PLN-00201 and 24PLN-00005]: Appeal of the Director's Decision to Approve a Streamlined Housing Development Review Application to Allow Deconstruction of An Existing 8 Unit Residential Rental Development and Construction of 12 Three-Bedroom Condominium Units. The Project Also Includes a Request for Approval of a Vesting Tentative Map for a Condominium Subdivision. Zoning District: RM-20. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act per CEQA Guidelines Section 15332. For more information contact the Project Planner at [HYPERLINK "mailto:Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org"](mailto:Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org) \h Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Carolyn G. of the San Carlos Court Neighborhood Association, asked to pull Item 10 from the Consent Calendar due to Palo Alto Municipal Code violations by the 739 Sutter Project: inadequate landscape screening, unfair parking privileges, and inadequately spaced trash carts.
2. Richard W., resident of San Carlos Court, requested to withdraw Item 10 from the Consent Calendar. He asked that the trees in the plan be tall enough to protect the privacy and safety of the neighborhood and to bring this plan to code.
3. Jeff L. also asked to pull Item 10 from Consent. Palo Alto objective design standards were created to guide new developments that could be legally enforced, one of which mandates protective planting screenings between a new project and existing residential ones. The 739 Sutter project does meet even these minimal standards and allowing this would create a precedent in which this privacy standard and perhaps others may not be enforced in future projects.
4. Elizabeth G. (Zoom) commented that Item 10 would provide 4 additional condominiums for sale but was taking 8 rental units off the market when rental housing is desperately needed. She noted the objective standards are applied more to building rental housing and are more relaxed with housing for sale. She asked to consider pulling this item to discuss inclusionary and equitable housing more fully.
5. Kristen V.-F. (Zoom), speaking on behalf of Ellsworth Place residents, asked that Item 10 be removed from Consent because the rear property line screening does not follow the City's municipal code and the trash collection plan depends on restricting public parking along Sutter to accommodate 36 trashcans rather than using shared containers to preserve parking.
6. Alan L. (Zoom) spoke in support of Item 10. He believed these condos would be perfect new starter homes for young people like himself who are getting priced out of almost every part of Palo Alto. He felt the City should be supporting development of new housing.
7. Milan S., representing a group of residents on Sutter Avenue, also wanted Item 10 removed. He felt the planning process bypassed community engagement and desired a reevaluation of the process to ensure it was inclusive and reflective of the residents' voices. He believed that preserving the identity of the neighborhood should be taken seriously.

SUMMARY MINUTES

8. David W. reiterated the other neighbors' concerns. He felt there was a lack of transparency and that the concerns were not addressed. He believed the project was a huge fire hazard and a traffic hazard and that there should be more study done before approving it.

MOTION: Council Member Lythcott-Haims moved, seconded by Mayor Stone, to approve Agenda Item Numbers 4-10.

Council Member Kou and Council Member Burt requested to Pull Agenda Item Number 10.

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

Council Member Kou registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 10.

Council Member Burt registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 10.

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 4-5, 7-9: 6-0-1, Lauing absent

MOTION PASSED ITEM 6: 5-1-1, Tanaka no, Lauing absent

MOTION PASSED ITEM 10: 4-2-1, Kou no, Burt no, Lauing absent

Council Member Kou stated there are currently affordable rental units at the site, which is what is needed for the housing affordability crisis. She felt it was egregious to have 36 trash bins taking away parking space. She noted if screening and privacy was part of the objective design guidelines, there should not be benches in places where there is no screening. She believed that the residents were not being heard and that it was a problem to talk about DEIB and then do something different.

Council Member Tanaka noted that Item 6 was \$147M to buy very expensive energy over a long term of 20 years in a time when people are struggling. He felt there were other alternatives and also stated it was unclear as to whether there was a minimum amount required each year.

Council Member Burt supported the project on Sutter but was concerned about the issues raised on the objective standards.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

Ed Shikada, City Manager, noted that Staff had issued a supplemental memo on Item 10 that addressed a number of the issues raised in public comment. He explained the City has designated use of the Civic Center Plaza as a site

SUMMARY MINUTES

for political demonstrations except when conflicting with civic and governmental uses, being mindful of the responsibility to ensure public safety and protect community members' First Amendment rights to peaceful demonstration. Staff reviewed the previous rally on March 30 and concluded that no charges were warranted. All reports on the additional rally yesterday were positive. He acknowledged the City has received a number of emails related to Palo Alto Airport. He noted that FAA guidelines and design criteria for the planning process require the airport consider runway changes, and ultimately it will come back to City Council for review and approval. He acknowledged Earth Day and the Earth Day Festival. He stated the City is in the process of posting additional updates regarding the Council's priorities. The Palo Alto libraries will be closed Wednesday, May 1, for staff development training, reopening on their next regularly scheduled day. He discussed the May Fete on May 4. He listed notable upcoming Council items, including a special transportation workshop next week with a BPTP update and discussion on rail grade separation.

The Council took a five-minute break.

ACTION ITEMS

11. Review and provide input on Concept Plans for Quarry Road Transit Connection to the Palo Alto Transit Center and Adoption of a Resolution of Intention to Undedicate a portion of El Camino Park; CEQA status – statutorily exempt per Pub. Res. Code § 21080(b)(12).

Ed Shikada, City Manager, discussed various agencies interested in this proposal and presented a map showing the project orientation. He described the alignment of the project with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the El Camino Park is 10.75 acres of land leased by Stanford to the City and has been dedicated by the City for recreational and conservation purposes. The removal of that use requires a majority vote of the electorate, leading to this proposal.

Lesley Low, Stanford Director of Transportation and Planning, reviewed the project need and concept plans. The proposed project would directly improve congestion and safety for all modes of transportation in this key regional gateway. Designs are in the very early stages, and all feasible options are under consideration. The preliminary concept design shows a full access intersection for transit and would require about ¼ acre of land within the El Camino Park. Voter approval would look to discontinue use of about 1/3 acre of land to allow a minor shift as plans are finalized with a 10-foot buffer around the concept design. Any land not ultimately utilized for the project

SUMMARY MINUTES

would later be rededicated by the City for park purposes. The project also includes multiple pedestrian and bicycle improvements within El Camino Park adjacent to the transit connection as well as in the intersection of Quarry Road at El Camino. There would be secondary benefits to the University Avenue and University Circle area by eliminating the need for some buses to make constrained turning movements in the corridor, reducing congestion, and reducing emissions and noise. There is an estimated 59% avoidance of University Circle and a reduction in run time by 5 to 8 minutes.

City Manager Shikada noted it appears the project qualifies for CEQA exemption and thus an expedited review and approval could be done by City Council. He then reviewed the two-step process for undedication of park land. First is the Resolution of Intention before the Council this evening, and then on June 10, the Council would review any written protests and decide whether to place the measure on the ballot for the November election. He described several issues that will be resolved as the project proceeds and presented the Staff recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Herb B. believed it was premature to vote on this Resolution of Intention as this is part of a larger project and the exemption therefore does not apply. He also felt the appropriate time to bring this to Council was when the design was finalized
2. Navi D. of Caltrain expressed support for the resolution to undedicate a passive section of El Camino Park to enable significant transit and safety improvements. She explained this project would reduce congestion within University Circle and along University Avenue and enhance bicycle and pedestrian paths at the intersection of Quarry Road.
3. Charlsie C. voiced support of this project on behalf of SamTrans. She noted more direct routing to El Camino and Quarry Road would allow time savings, creating a better experience for riders.
4. Elizabeth G. (Zoom) felt this was a great concept idea with amazing connectivity, enhancing infrastructure prior to planned housing. She asked if Amtrak was involved with this.
5. Elizabeth A. (Zoom) spoke on behalf of Friends of Caltrain to strongly support the Staff recommendation. She noted this project should be a two-way rather than one-way street, which would have a marginal additional impact to the park space with something close to twice the

SUMMARY MINUTES

benefit. She felt that even with the somewhat improved bike access, the bike and pedestrian access was still poor.

6. Aram J. (Zoom) agreed that he would like the full plan to be complete before being asked to vote on it. He wanted to see if the same goals of less congestion and more bikes and pedestrian pathways could be accomplished without undedicating one inch of the park.
7. Winter D. (Zoom) believed the need for park land would be critical given the amount of housing needed over the next eight years. She felt that with a good plan, this project could be done with no net loss of park land, perhaps with Stanford providing an equivalent amount of park land somewhere else in town.
8. Eduardo H. (Zoom) stated he bikes to work through that area and navigating through that area is a little dangerous. He requested the Council to place the resolution on the ballot.
9. Joshua G. (Zoom) described his commute and supported the resolution.
10. Petya K. (Zoom) stated she is a public transit user who finds it challenging and dangerous to navigate the Quarry Road intersection currently. These proposed improvements will help people go to and from the hospital and transit center and will enhance connectivity to the larger bicycle and pedestrian network. She encouraged the Council to put the resolution on the ballot.
11. Jason K. (Zoom), on behalf of VTA, expressed support for the Staff recommendation for the Quarry Road connection as a key location for making transit successful in Santa Clara County. He requested to approve the Staff recommendation and add it to the ballot.

Council Member Burt described that this intermodal center has the second highest boardings of all Caltrain stations in the system and is the largest bus terminal in Santa Clara County but has bad circulation. This would be a big step in the right direction of improvement. All the involved agencies, Stanford, Caltrain, the City, VTA, need to work together. There needs to be an easement for the roadway from Stanford as a precondition for going forward. Addressing the concerns the community has over the small amount of park land undedication, he noted it was about 1/3 of an acre and across the street was just dedicated the Tower Well Park site, about the same amount of acreage. More importantly, there are many locations in the City that are eligible to be dedicated as park land. He stated he was working on a

SUMMARY MINUTES

colleague's memo in regard to this and hoped to have a parallel proposal in the same time frame for significantly more park being created than the small amount proposed to be undedicated here.

Council Member Kou felt the unresolved issues of tree replacement and landscaping plan, construction funding, maintenance and operational responsibilities needed to be discussed ahead of time, not after, especially the relationship to the El Camino Park lease. She felt it was too early for even a Resolution of Intention at this point. She stated it was a good project for connectivity and to address housing coming forward but would feel more comfortable once the other issues were resolved.

City Manager Shikada explained there was a very compressed time frame to potentially get this on the ballot for November, which is why this is on the agenda at this point. He also described that because the property is owned by the University, the City is not seeking fee title or ownership. To have the property intertwined as part of the lease as opposed to separated through an easement presents some risk as to what happens in the future. There should be further discussion with the University to achieve what the City needs to proceed with the project.

Council Member Kou added that the El Camino Park lease with the University is going to end in 2042 with necessity to renegotiate on a lease, which concerned her. She was also concerned about maintenance and operational responsibilities for the future as it will most likely be on the City with the City's funding applied toward that.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims described that while this is technically park land, it is more like wild land with a big utility box on it. She was not sad to lose this land and repeated that there is more park land to dedicate. She stated the concept was good for rail and bus commuters, cyclists and pedestrians, the economics of bus transit, and the environment.

Council Member Veenker agreed with the goal of encouraging greater use of mass transit and enhancing bike and pedestrian access and felt the area needed a facelift anyway. She stated the area is already cut off from the rest of the park and believed this was an opportunity to upgrade it. She questioned how the area would be maintained. She asked if it was possible to get a preliminary approval with Caltrans before going through the entire process.

City Manager Shikada anticipated there would be memoranda of understanding between any parties involved.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Director Low answered that in preliminary conversations with Caltrans, they were supportive of the project and have encouraged pedestrian and bicycle connections on both sides.

Council Member Tanaka questioned if the City was able to sublease this property. He felt the City should be compensated for relinquishing this asset.

City Manager Shikada did not believe the land could be subleased. There was discussion about the history of this lease.

Mayor Stone asked if there was data available on how dangerous the Quarry Road and El Camino Real intersection is. He questioned if there had been conversations with Stanford about the suggestion of a land swap. He felt it would be an uphill battle to pass a measure undedicating park land and that being able to show the other agencies were helping with the lift and sacrificing as well would go a long way. He thought the benefits outweighed losing the park land in this instance.

Rafael Rius, City Engineer, noted he did not have the safety information but could research it. He did not particularly recall it as a dangerous intersection.

Director Low stated she would defer to the Real Estate team but believed Stanford saw it as a public project and a benefit to the public.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Lythcott-Haims, to adopt a Resolution of Intention to Undedicate a portion of El Camino Park that is necessary for the new transit connection (Attachment E).

Council Member Burt explained that a significantly improved transit center is a real public benefit, resulting in less traffic, less parking demand, and fewer greenhouse gases and emissions and supporting economic development. He felt the issues about bike and pedestrian circulation needed to be worked out as part of the plan and not an afterthought.

Council Member Kou agreed that everything Council Member Burt said was exactly why this should happen but stated she would prefer to be reassured in terms of ownership.

MOTION PASSED: 5-1-1, Kou no, Lauing absent

12. Addition of 16 properties to the City's Historic Resources Inventory based on Owner interest. CEQA Status: Pursuant to Public Resources

SUMMARY MINUTES

Code Section 21065, the Historic Designation of Properties is not a Project Subject to Environmental Review.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, gave an overview of this item. The purpose was to receive the HRB's and Staff's recommendations and place 3 City properties and 13 privately owned properties in the Palo Alto Historic Inventory. She listed the properties involved, including some photos.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. John B. stated his property was on the eligible list but chose to object to being placed on the inventory. He appreciated the process set up to review the results from the 2000 survey and renew that in 2023. He suggested that going forward the Council direct the HRB to be more explicit in the requirements they have for placing properties on the list and to affirm it would take owners' approval to be placed on the list. He also felt the City should review what incentives might be offered to properties agreeing to be on the list because a lot of owners feel it reduces the property value and they are giving something up.
2. Darlene Y. requested Council direct Staff to update the ordinance that applications for historic listing must have owners opt in. She also asked that if Staff is directed to continue outreach, objecting properties be removed from the eligible list as they have already opted out.
3. Amy S., speaking on behalf of Nancy G., Umang S., Arti M., and Don J. and speaking as a local realtor, was pleased the recommendation was not to add the homes objecting to being included. She explained that in her professional experience, a historic designation, even a potential designation, creates a huge gray area and can reduce a property value by 10% to 20%. She stated private homes are not museums to be preserved
4. Jennifer B. supported the previous speaker.
5. Mala N. stated this has been a process of a lot of uncertainty. She felt this listing serves no useful purpose for owners who objected to being on the list. She believed the eligible list was an example of government overreach and urged the Council to remove the eligible list.
6. Michael D. (Zoom) was concerned that by limiting this agenda item to the people that agreed to historic status, the Council was ignoring

SUMMARY MINUTES

the process that is trying to force homeowners into historic status. He stated this arbitrary designation with no real guidelines was affecting people's lives.

7. Lin (Zoom) noted she has decided to opt out of the list and echoed the previous speakers, asking the council members to reconsider the project integrity as there were 83 objections out of 88 properties.

Council Member Kou questioned why those owners who have already opted out were not included in this report so they can be removed from the eligible list. She felt this warranted further understanding and discussion because even being on the national list was still a concern.

Chief Planning Official French responded that there was no local eligible list but there was no change to the national register eligible property list, which is not maintained by the City. She further explained that there was a potentially eligible category of unevaluated properties built before 1948. This causes some confusion in the community.

Council Member Tanaka shared Council Member Kou's concerns. He suggested the list should be opt-in and require owners to proactively submit for approval rather than needing to complain to get off the list. He was in agreement with accepting the 16 properties that have affirmed interest.

Jonathon Lait, Planning and Development Director, gave further background on the intention of this item and clarified that the idea of potential eligible properties was not a part of this discussion. He suggested based on comments from council members that there should possibly be a discussion on what could happen to those properties, but that is a separate item.

There was further discussion about the difference between the various lists being questioned. The list for local designation does not live on after this process.

Council Member Veenker supported the Staff recommendation with the list not living on after the completion of the process.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Veenker, to:

1. Adopt the attached record of land use action (Attachment A) to add 16 properties meeting specified criteria to the City's Historic Resources Inventory, based on expressed owner interest; and,

SUMMARY MINUTES

2. Direct Staff to continue outreach to eligible property owners among the properties discussed in this report and to place future additions to the Historic Resources Inventory with expressed owner interest on the Consent Calendar; and,
3. Direct Staff to study the possibility of a process for removing the properties as shown as potentially eligible in the parcel reports and return to Council with evaluations on any alternatives.

Council Member Tanaka asked how much the City was paying the consultant for the process.

Director Lait stated he would come back with the exact cost.

There was discussion about the wording of the motion.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0-1, Lauing absent

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 P.M.