



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Regular Meeting
November 13, 2023

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, Veenker

Present Remotely:

Absent:

Call to Order

Mayor Kou called the meeting to order. The Clerk took roll with all present. Mayor Kou called the meeting to order in honor of Lung Cancer Awareness Month.

Special Orders of the Day

1. Proclamation Honoring Police Records and Support Personnel Day

Council Member Lythcott-Haims read a proclamation recognizing November 14, 2023, as Law Enforcement Records and Support Personnel Day on behalf of Mayor Kou and the entire City Council.

Police Chief Binder thanked the Council for the recognition of the records personnel commending them for professionalism and their excellent interaction with the Community and the public.

Nicole Frazier, Deputy Director of Technical Services discussed the work the records personnel does and thanked the Council for the acknowledgement.

Closed Session

2. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY-EXISTING LITIGATION Subject: Hamilton and High, LLC, The Keenan Family Trust, et al. v. City of Palo Alto, et al. Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 20CV366967 Authority: Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Stone to go into Closed Session.

SUMMARY MINUTES

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Council went into Closed Session at 5:39 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 6:43 P.M.

Mayor Kou announced no reportable action.

Mayor Kou announced no reportable action.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

General Public Comment on items NOT on the agenda moved to the end of the agenda.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Council Member Burt shared his experience in being a speaker and panelist at a side conference to the APEC Conference in San Francisco early that day.

Council Member Veenker reported that she had just been appointed to the legislative action position representing Santa Clara County on the executive committee of the peninsula division of the California League of Cities representing Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties. She discussed being asked to help plan the Legislative Address Day Event. She also talked about recent Sibling Cities activities.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims announced that Wednesday, November 15 at 6:30 p.m., the Imagination Lab School would be visited by authors Richard and Leah Rothstein. The event will be open to the public and free.

Mayor Kou reported that the City of Palo Alto and Stanford University hosted the local Veteran's Day recognition on November 11 at 11 a.m. She described the organizations that participated in that. She also announced that Vice Mayor Stone, City Manager Shikada and she were invited to an opening ceremony for a new base for Japanese Startups in Palo Alto in collaboration with the Ministry of Economy Trade and Industry. She discussed their focus.

Consent Calendar

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Numbers 5-7.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mayor Kou registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 8.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Lythcott-Haims to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-8.

MOTION SPLIT FOR THE PURPOSE OF VOTING

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 3-4: 7-0

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 5-7: 6-1, Tanaka no

MOTION PASSED ITEM 8: 6-1, Kou no

Public Comment:

Aram J. felt that the AB 481 Meeting was under advertised and he was appalled it was not an agendized item.

Council Member Tanaka explained his no vote on Items 5, 6 and 7.

Mayor Kou spoke about her no vote on Item 8.

3. Approval of Minutes from October 23, 2023 Meeting
4. Adoption of an Ordinance Renewing the Police Department's Military Equipment Use Policy Under AB 481; CEQA status – not a project.
5. Finance Committee Recommendation to Maintain Current Service Delivery Model for Print and Mail Services; CEQA Status – Not a Project
6. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Negotiate and Execute Purchase Orders with a To-Be Determined Vendor(s) to Procure Thirteen (13) New Fully Electric Sedans And Five (5) New Fully Electric Vans for a One Time Purchase for a Total Not-To-Exceed Amount of \$985,000. CEQA Status - exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15061.
7. Approval of Second Amendment to Tenant Work Letter for the Roth Building at 300 Homer Avenue between the City of Palo Alto and the Palo Alto History Museum; CEQA Status--Not a Project.
8. Approval of proposed changes to the Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Hotline Administration Policy

SUMMARY MINUTES

City Manager Comments

City Manager Shikada presented slides discussing the Storm Preparedness Community Workshop and asked Council to encourage friends and neighbors to sign up for the alert system, the Breaking With the Law event with the Police Department, upcoming holiday events, Uplift Local Holiday Promotion Drive identifying local business promotions and upcoming City Council items for November 27 and December 4, 11 and 18.

Action Items

9. Public Hearing: Adoption of Resolution Amending the Land Use Element of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan and an Ordinance Implementing Program 1.1A and 1.1B of the Housing Element, Including: 1) New Chapter 18.14: Housing Incentives, and 2) Modifications to Base Zoning Districts Throughout Title 18. CEQA Status: An Addendum to the City's Comprehensive Plan Environmental Impact Report was Prepared for the Subject Comp Plan and Municipal Code Amendments.

Council Member Veenker Recusal on Stanford-owned properties & Housing Focus Area

Jean Eisberg, Lexington Planning Consultant, discussed slides outlining the meeting purpose and housing element status. She presented slides covering Adequate Sites Inventory, GM/ROLM Focus Area, Stanford Sites, Pasteur Drive with draft standards and El Camino Real Focused area including opportunities and context and draft regulations. She explained the effects of the proposed zoning changes and comprehensive plan amendments and PTC feedback and action. She demonstrated 3400 El Camino Real transitions.

Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services, asked for City Council's direction on some correspondence that had been received regarding this item which he shared. He then summarized the resolution and Staff recommendation.

Commissioner Akin, Planning and Transportation Commission, commented on recommendations from the PTC regarding step backs and setbacks from property lines and the minimum residential floor area for some opportunity sites.

Council Member Lauing mentioned recent rise in construction costs, high interest rates and ongoing interest in building office space in Palo Alto. Although there is 30+% vacancy in Palo Alto office space, developers believe that Palo Alto will be pulling companies of all sizes in to fill up the space and need more. He added there was a lot of interest in building townhomes. He stated the Ad-Hoc supported the suggestion to not expand the focus area of El Camino. He said that after debate a version of the zoning needed to be approved in order to stay on target for January 2024.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Vice Mayor Stone stated that there had been concern by some of the Community that some of the changes were too extreme but he felt if they do not act now to control their own destiny, local control would be further stripped away by the State.

Council Member Burt wanted to know if there had been any discussion about simply changing the zoning from commercial to residential with the understanding that would trigger amortization periods for existing uses but they would not be able to redevelop with new office but it would increase the land value for housing. He said that within General Manufacturing, there were some facilities still existing that are primarily hazardous materials and asked if it had been evaluated that saying they have housing by right adjacent to those areas would put by right housing up against an incompatible use.

Director Lait responded that from the adopted housing element, there was a program that would ask the City to explore reducing the amount of commercial floor area in the commercial districts as a further incentive for housing. It is an action they would take to the Planning and Transportation Commission then come to City Council with either an ordinance or recommendation on next steps. When identifying housing opportunity sites in the GM and ROLM areas, they cross checked that information and did not include those properties in their housing sites inventory on sites having hazardous material regulated from a zoning perspective or other means.

Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, noted there is a feature of housing element law where if mixed-use zones are in the sites inventory and have been identified as suitable for lower-income housing, they must be developed with 50% residential. The PTC recommended they increase that ratio to two-thirds residential.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims wondered where the Housing Ad-Hoc colleagues stood on the push back from a claim regarding the three matters raised in the letter. She noted the 3300 El Camino site has an approved entitlement for an office project at 0.4 FAR and a no-build PG&E easement reducing the sites inventory from 200 to 100. Given that, she wondered why the owner would be interested in adding housing. She asked if the concept of Program L2.4.1 was still in play. She asked for clarity on the nature of the decision “conversion to residential capacity should not be considered in Town and Country Village” in L2.4.4.

Council Member Lauing responded that he was encouraged that those items could be worked out collegially.

Director Lait answered that Staff and their consultants had conversations with property owners to validate the sites they were placing on their site inventory. They met with representatives of the long-term lease holder of that site and believed the standards incentivize additional housing at that site. That site did include a 0.4 office building and a 2.0 housing project. The proposal allowed for more FAR and height than was initially contemplated. They did think they would need to come back to City Council on that site to address the 50-foot setback that exists on Hansen. He stated Program L2.4.1 was from the comprehensive plan that was updated for

SUMMARY MINUTES

2015 going through 2030. He thought that program was somewhat inconsistent with the direction they received more recently with the housing element update. He felt that program needed to be looked at to see if it was still one they wanted to pursue because they were going in a different direction with the housing element they have. The decision to not consider conversion to residential capacity in Town and Country Village was to reinforce the neighborhood commercial uses.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to know what study needed to happen to figure out the idea of extending the Housing Focus Area.

Director Lait answered no analysis had been done yet with respect to those properties and outlined things that would interest them in making that decision. He said that Staff was not suggesting it was an inappropriate location but it was not a housing inventory site for the purposes of the housing element and was not bound by the same time limit they have for some of the other properties. They were not ready for that process.

Council Member Veenker requirements stated for general manufacturing and ROLM meant that all of it must be above the ground floor.

Ms. Eisberg answered that it created flexibility and could be on or above the ground floor.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked for expansion upon the Stanford Affiliate requirement. She wondered to what extent the potential for rezoning on Cal Ave to include mixed-use retail ground level housing up top should be a part of the conversation they were having or if they could make a plan to have that conversation at a subsequent date. She inquired as to where they stand on including certain language such as using local labor, apprenticeships, prevailing wages, health insurance, etc. being inserted into the housing element.

City Manager Shikada answered that the PTC noted the potential property tax loss as one of the rationales for that restriction. He noted that particular item was not time sensitive so was at the Council's discretion on whether to be included in the ordinance they acted on that evening.

Director Lait responded that they were not agendized in terms of any specific properties on California Avenue that night but they were making some adjustments to some of the base zoning in that area. He felt that tied into direction the Council has asked for related to a coordinated area plan or equivalent study of California Avenue. He deferred to the City Manager to get that scheduled. He stated they were in the process of amending the housing element to include the carpenter's language and it would come back to Council early next year.

Public Comment:

1. Ted O., Development Consultant and Project Manager, said it was a little too soon to put some of the restrictions on the creek side because the creek and the existing buildings and setbacks make the site focus different than the others.

SUMMARY MINUTES

2. Thomas A. spoke on behalf of the proposed multifamily development on the east side of El Camino. He spoke about a lack of housing in Palo Alto and his family's hope to extend the El Camino Real Housing Focus Area to the east side of El Camino and support the original recommendations.
3. Jean S., Associate Vice President of Real Estate for Stanford University, spoke on behalf of the University in support of the proposed zoning ordinance with one concern. They requested Council remove the language restricting Stanford's ability to provide affiliate housing on its land along El Camino Real.
4. Amie A., Executive Director of Palo Alto Forward, submitted a petition with 150 signatures from Palo Alto residents who support housing.
5. Bob M. expressed concerns about the height limits. He felt the 20-foot setback was reasonable. He mentioned the significant reduction in occupancy of offices since the pandemic and thought a lot of those would be converted to residential use which would reduce the lack of housing.
6. Kristi B., Land Use Planning with Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, spoke on behalf of Palo Alto Redwoods Homeowner Association to request City Council amend the ordinance being considered under Item 9. The proposed text amendments were detailed in a letter that was attached to the packet.
7. Reid K. thought the proposed zoning ordinance update was a good start but not enough. He hoped Staff would be directed to expand the housing focus area.
8. Emily A.R. spoke on behalf of SV@Home who had joined in a support letter of the zoning changes and urged Council to include in the motion to approve the changes to expand the scope of the upzonings. She added if the developer wanted to go with the State's density bonus program, introspection on how Palo Alto can incentivize their density bonus program would be good to make it more proper to the City and incentivize developers.
9. Peter G., part of the ownership of the El Camino focus area. He stated they are ready, willing and able to do development. The new focus area provides them opportunity to pursue housing without having to use State specific things and to have an open line of communication to work with the City.
10. Avroh S., freshman at Palo Alto High School spoke on behalf of Palo Alto Student Climate Coalition (PASCC) extending support in providing dense housing which would result in a decrease in air pollution and traffic congestion. They postulate that the new zoning regulations were insufficient and urged the City to consider the expansion of the impact of the zoning regulations.

SUMMARY MINUTES

11. Mark J., real estate developer, summarized three items that he would like to have reviewed regarding maximum height, the size of the setback and modification of the residential landscape requirement from 60% to 10%.
12. Michael Q. encouraged City Council to vote for a strong version of the zoning changes. He was concerned the City was too focused on commercial quarters and industrial areas. He encouraged Council to act boldly to maintain control and vote to broadly upzone Palo Alto in a geographically diverse way.
13. Anne M. (Zoom) read a paragraph from a letter sent from Palo Alto Redwoods Homeowner Association.
14. Liz G (Zoom) encouraged the City to zone denser underneath the canopy stating that poor people have a hard time getting to their jobs with few options for transportation, grocery stores, schools and libraries.
15. Scott O. (Zoom) had concern over the focus on theoretical proposals instead of realistic projects. He felt the City was parceling rather than zoning. He encouraged Council to approve the changes and give Staff direction to explore extending the ECR focus area to the shaded areas.

Veenker recuses to Stanford segment of Item.

Council Member Burt asked if Staff has evaluated the request to change step back height to 59 feet rather than 55 feet on El Camino and the fire safety issues with a 20-foot setback as opposed to 15 for the two upper stories. He asked if they could include in the language a 20-foot setback contingent on meeting fire safety standards. He asked about landscape going from 60% to 10%. On the creek side, he noted the orientation of the buildings intruded into the setback in corners at multiple locations. A reorientation of the building to run parallel to the creek would allow for greater setback distance without impeding on the footprint.

Director Lait answered Staff found that exempting parapets or guardrails would be a more appropriate exclusion from the height. He did not believe the setback would preclude meeting that requirement. He agreed on adding a 20-foot setback except as required for fire safety purposes. He stated the concern about landscaping was not relevant to the subject property.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims wondered what precluded them from suggesting they might be at 4 on some of the GM/ROLM sites.

Director Lait answered those are projects that are alternatives to the State Density Bonus Law. With the other changes, they are modifying the base zoning standards. In the GM and ROLM, where they are allowing 1.5 or 2.5, State Density Bonus Law could increase that floor area up to 50% so developers could increase the building height beyond what is being proposed. Through

SUMMARY MINUTES

the part of the housing element, they are proposing to develop a housing incentive program crafted similar to the model they have in the code as well as making refinements to the program where it exists in the code creating additional opportunities in the industrial area that would provide more advantageous than state law. That is where staff proposals consistent with the housing element to increase the height and floor area beyond the standards being considered would be expected to be seen.

Council Member Burt asked which height transition standard was incorporated within this proposal. He questioned if the existing height transition was a significant barrier to the project. He challenged housing advocates to appreciate that the issue was addressing a jobs/housing balance and not to feed regional growth. He talked about the five drivers causing housing to be expensive in the area. He expressed need for a focused program at the state level to invest in development of trades that would be locally focused and provide great paying jobs to provide equity for people in the modest-income communities to be able to stay in the region.

Ms. Eisberg stated everything defers to the base density district.

Director Lait said that the existing height transition was a challenge for that site based on the conversations he had with them. The context of that communication was interest to extend the housing focus area to the east side of El Camino and preserving what the Staff recommendation was for transitional heights and they were not ready to do that extension.

Council Member Veenker asked if Director Lait has a response to make about the nonvacant site analysis.

Director Lait said that is part of the housing element update and a number of changes had been made to the site inventory. He noted that the numbers are intentionally very conservative when it comes to the number of units they are projecting on any given development site in order to not over commit to certain areas being developed. He stated they do not agree with some of the commenters that some of the sites are infeasible consistent with the State's standard.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Stone moved, seconded by Council Member Lauing to approve the staff recommendation as it pertains to the Housing Focus Area and Pasteur Drive with the following additions:

1. Refer expansion of the El Camino Real Housing focus area to staff for further analysis and return to Council with a recommendation.
2. Exempt parapets and guardrails from height limits in the El Camino Real Housing Focus Area and Pasteur Drive.

SUMMARY MINUTES

3. Remove the 18.14.020(c)(5)(C) regarding Stanford affiliation, and refer to staff and the Stanford Ad Hoc for further dialogue.
4. Amend 18.14.020 Table 3, upper story stepback to state a 20-foot average stepback from the property line, with a minimum stepback of 15-feet, and any additional requirements identified by staff to meet this intent contingent on meeting fire safety standards and as an alternative to the 15-foot stepback direct staff evaluate for inclusion of a standard that would require an appropriate stepback from the front façade.

MOTION PASSED: 5-1-1, Kou no, Veenker recuse

MOTION: Council Member Lauing moved, seconded by Council Member Lythcott-Haims to:

1. Adopt a resolution amending the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element (Attachment A); and,
2. Adopt an ordinance amending Title 18 (Zoning) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) (Attachment B) to implement Program 1.1A and 1.1B of the Housing Element regarding the Adequate Sites Inventory.

MOTION SPLIT FOR THE PURPOSE OF VOTING

MOTION PASSED 1 & 2: 6-1, Kou no

MOTION: Council Member Lauing moved, seconded by Council Member Lythcott-Haims to:

3. Direct staff to review proposed amendments to PAMC 18.16.040(b) and 18.16.060 regarding Redwood residences as described in the November 7, 2023 letter from Kristi Bascom.

MOTION PASSED 3: 7-0

10. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 575 Los Trancos Road [21PLN-00196] Request for Major Site and Design Review to Allow the Construction of a new 7,110 sf single-family residence with a new 895 sf Accessory Dwelling Unit and Associated Site Improvements, Including a Swimming Pool, on a 5.38-acre Site. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the proposed project. Zoning District: OS (Open Space).

SUMMARY MINUTES

Emily Kallas, Planner, gave a slide presentation discussing the project and process overview, project timeline, prior Council comments and how they were addressed, environmental review and recommendations.

Council Member Lauing disclosed that in January when this issue came to Council, he was requested by the City Attorney to recuse because he had seen the project originally on the Planning Commission. He stated this project is now completely different so given it is a new project and he is considering it with an open mind, he does not need to recuse on advice of the City Attorney.

Leonard Ng, Project Applicant, provided a slide presentation discussing the proposed project in detail.

Council Member Burt disclosed he had a discussion with Shani Kleinhaus representing the Audubon Society. He questioned if the Council motion that asked that the project design provide for an approximate 50-foot setback interpreted that to include the pool as part of the project. He asked if Staff could comment on the difference between bird safe glass on all glass surfaces versus what the project is proposing. He expressed that they need to recognize how critical riparian corridors are to the natural habitat. He asked if the slats are at the height of the windows or closer to ground level.

Director Lait was not sure if that was the understanding going through the review of the Planning and Transportation Commission. Subsequent to that, there was Staff dialog about applicability of the Council Motion relative to the pool and that is when conversation occurred with the Applicant who responded with additional setbacks from the creek. Regarding the bird safe glass, he responded that there is not a lot of great guidance on a threat factor 15 and what the means for a residential project so they turned to the sources available to them which focused in on 20 and 25 as standards so they gravitated to that to have something to convey to the Applicant. In addition, more changes were made and discussed with the Planning and Transportation Commission who concluded that the measures the Applicant took were sufficient to significantly reduce the risk to bird safety.

Ms. Kallas stated that there are a variety of bird safe approaches being used. Part of Staff's hesitation to enforce the 15 as they reviewed what the American Bird Conservancy published, there were clear explanations of what qualified as a threat rating of 20 and 25. A link to that was included in the Staff report and 15 was not as clearly defined. There are options on the American Bird Conservancy website of materials that meet that but it would be limited to just what is on that website and additionally the consideration that this is a single-family house and more intense bird safety measures are more typically associated with larger office buildings and things with wider expanses of glass than what is being proposed here. She responded the slats are exterior fixed to the building surface and cover the entire window.

Mayor Kou questioned if the guardrails are still glass and considered bird safe. Regarding the American Bird Conservancy factor rating of 15, she wanted to know if the lower rating was less

SUMMARY MINUTES

threatening to birds. She wanted to know some of the impacts of the creek bank of the overhang over the pool and where runoff would go.

Mr. Ng stated that image was not updated. They were not proposing glass at the guardrail but would be using metal stanchions to promote bird safety.

Ms. Kallas answered the lower rating represented a surface birds would be less attracted to. She explained her understanding of the rating of the slats.

Director Lait did not believe there was any implication to the creek bank relative to the upper level projections and runoff had to be designed in a way that meets City standards for runoff including how it gets captured. He was not familiar with Public Works requirements for drainage.

Mr. Ng answered the runoff would not go to the creek but reversed away from the creek into a designated roof drain they designed with their civil engineer to be channeled to stormwater treatment facilities.

Council Member Lauing felt that the no recommendation signified that PTC was okay with the location of the pool. He wanted to know if the original motion asking for the pool to be covered and fenced was debated.

Commissioner Akin, Planning and Transportation Commission answered they were not able to achieve a real consensus. They had resolved that the pool was not considered a structure as far as the setback requirements and code were concerned. The original motion regarding the pool being covered and fenced was discussed and he recalled that the standards described to them were that the pool cover was sufficient to make sure no wildlife would drown so there was no need for a fence identified.

Director Lait understood that while there were opportunities in the building code to have a pool without a fence if certain criteria were met, locally there is a requirement for a fence. They received a note advocating for a fence with some base that would discourage salamanders making their way to the pool.

Council Member Burt was confused that Commissioner Akin said the clarification the PTC subsequently got was that the pool was not being treated as part of the project. He asked if the vertical slats were all the way around the building on all the windows or just on one side. He thought the recommendation from MidPen for modest fencing around the pool was appropriate. He asked if a motion could be made that would enable Staff to approve a relocated pool.

Director Lait did not think the discussion about the pool being a structure or not was relevant to the Council's deliberation on the project. They were evaluating a new home including accessory components to include the pool under the site and design standards. The PTC did have a conversation about whether the pool should be set back 50 feet from the creek or not. They

SUMMARY MINUTES

were not able to get to a decision on that so it comes to Council for consideration. He answered the motion to enable Staff to approve a relocated pool could be included as a condition.

Ms. Kallas responded the elevations in the plan set show which windows the slats are a part of. There is bird safe protection on all windows.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to hear the Applicant's thoughts of the motion in regard to the pool.

Mr. Ng thought there was confusion about the interpretation of the pool location and whether it was part of the project or part of the structure so they tried to pull the pool back further from when they first proposed. He was confident they could find a solution based on the motion to pull the pool back and try not to affect the building footprint.

Council Member Veenker asked where the pool is currently located.

Mr. Ng answered on average it is 52 feet back from the top of the bank.

Public Comment:

Shani K., Environmental Advocate for Audubon Society, stated the reason to ask for 50 feet was to protect the riparian corridor and it was for the project. She was disappointed in the decision not to include the pool in the structure. She asked for the pool to be at least 50 feet from the riparian corridor and not just from the top of the bank.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Mayor Kou to:

1. Approve the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan.
2. Approve the proposed project based on findings and subject to conditions of approval.
3. Applicant shall add fencing to surround the pool. Fencing shall be designed to prevent wildlife from entering the pool and shall comply with Building Code requirements.
4. Pool location be adjusted to approximately 50-foot setback from top bank subject to staff review by the Director of Planning and Development Services.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Public Comment:

SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Tim P. spoke about his case (15CV06117) in which he claims the video tape evidence had been tampered with. He asked for their full attention on this issue and requested the original video tapes.
2. Aram J. (Zoom) talked about a nonviolent demonstration by people with Palestinian flags calling for a cease fire at Anna Eshoo's office. He asked the City of Palo Alto to ask the Biden administration to withdraw U.S. aid to Israel and ask for an immediate cease fire in Gaza.
3. Randi R. (Zoom), Director of Performance and Quality Improvement with Bill Wilson Center, wanted to let the Community know that November is Runaway and Homeless Youth Prevention Month. She described their offered services in detail and offered a website to visit for more information and a call center phone number.
4. Cedric P. (Zoom), discussed the recent Zoom bombings City Council had experienced. He commended Council for how they handled the issue and for continuing to hold the meetings on Zoom. He hoped it would not be a habit to move the Zoom comments to the end of the meetings.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 P.M.