



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Regular Meeting
March 4, 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, Veenker

Present Remotely:

Absent:

Call to Order

Mayor Stone called the meeting to order. Roll was called with all present.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Ed Shikada, City Manager, announced no changes to the agenda.

Public Comment

Mayor Stone set some ground rules for public comment. He made everyone aware that there would be some disturbing videos shown.

1. Naiema D. speaking on behalf of (8): Tuba O., Michelle H., Noel S., Sarah, Fariha, Sara, and Uzma, shared a video her husband sent her from Gaza where he is on a medical mission. The video depicted two injured children that had been orphaned by the war. She stated these children and others that have been injured did nothing to deserve this. She hoped everyone could see the pain and suffering the patients are going through and asked them remember those children as they hear the rest of the stories.
2. Talha B. speaking on behalf of (8): Tuba S., Yasa B., Moiez B., Taha A., Hadi S., Aziz S., and Humza S., commented that these issues deeply affect people here, especially children. He provided a video depicting civilians injured or displaced by the war. He declared it is time to speak up to save the lives of the Palestinians and the Israeli hostages who are starving.

SUMMARY MINUTES

3. Sophia speaking on behalf of (10): Sarit S., Adele, Estee, Avner G., Maya, Scott, Yaron G., Gary M., and Jennifer F., spoke about resolutions that councils and school boards are considering passing regarding Israel stating they will be dangerous and divisive for the communities. She discussed the situation in Israel and described Hamas as a terror organization looking to transform the Middle East and the entire world into an Islamic state. She read a religious edict that had been issued by the Islamic Fatwa Council against Hamas. She mentioned the upcoming month of Ramadan and suggested taking this opportunity for unity.
4. Itai speaking on behalf of (8): Avivit S., Yishai S., Rick F., Sarith H., Andi, Michal L., and Rebecca S., provided a slide presentation entitled "Debunking the Myth of Israel as a Settler Colonial State".
5. Victor O. encouraged everyone to vote no on proposition 1 in the election being held the following day. He stated it would rob money from and change the structure of the Mental Health Services Act that was passed in 2004.
6. Michael M. provided updates about the Bay Area Urban Eagles.
7. Elaine E. discussed the massacre in Gaza and the need for a resolution from Palo Alto to join cities across America in the cries for an immediate cessation stating that their silence implies support for genocide.
8. Susan H. (Zoom) spoke on behalf of the Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter's Plastic Pollution Prevention Team, urged the City of Palo Alto to join the cities of Millbrae and San Moreno in prohibiting the use of artificial turf within its jurisdiction. She discussed ways in which it is harmful to the environment.
9. Lori M. talked about the hate and division that even the discussion of ceasefire brings to the City. She begged the Council to make a peaceful coexistence possible.
10. Aram J. (Zoom) stated the purpose of having a ceasefire resolution on the agenda is a safety valve in a democracy. He discussed a public records request he made regarding the circumstances under which new restrictions for signage were put in that he called a form of collective punishment.

SUMMARY MINUTES

11. Debbie M. (Zoom) quoted a New York Times article describing suicide and danger of the train tracks. She asked what the City is doing to remove that danger in order to protect its young people.
12. Sue (Zoom) discussed the health risks and adverse environmental impact associated with artificial turf. She mentioned SB 676 passed by California State Legislature which restored the authority of local governments to ban artificial turf and urged Council to use that power.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Council Member Kou commented on the overnight warming locations and thought that in the future there should be discussion with the neighbors prior to opening them.

Council Member Tanaka had been informed that smoking was allowed in the downtown library when it was used as a homeless shelter and wanted to know why. He agreed there should be more public discussion about the shelter and it should be added to the agenda.

City Manager Shikada noted that smoking was not allowed in the library.

Study Session

1. Study Session to provide early feedback about the proposed redevelopment of Buena Vista Mobile Home Park at 3980 El Camino Real.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Preston Prince, Executive Director of the Santa Clara County Housing Authority, discussed the commitment of the City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County and the Housing Authority to bringing Buena Vista Park up to code and modernizing the infrastructure to provide affordable homes for all the current residents of the park.

Flaherty Ward, Director of Real Estate, Santa Clara County Housing Authority, provided a presentation talking about the design, program and plan for the Buena Vista Mobile Home Park redevelopment project outlining project goals, resident engagement process, phase 1/listening and reassuring, phase 2/envisioning change and phase 3/education and choices.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Fred Pollack, Architect Van Meter Williams Pollack LLP, took up the slide presentation with phase 4/co-creation, phase 5/accountability, site context, proposed development, overall site plan and current design and a visualization of Buena Vista Commons.

Ms. Ward continued with slides discussing mobile home sizing and apartment unit sizing.

Mr. Pollack returned to present slides discussing building massing and orientation, color and material preferences, resident privacy, landscape design, community amenities for community and teen room, site design, site safety, property management and services and entitlements.

Ms. Ward pointed out they are proposing a hybrid redevelopment scenario with an apartment and mobile home park. The apartment falls under the City's purview and the mobile home park under the state. She proceeded with slides outlining a vesting tentative map, regulatory agreement with proposed changes, design solutions to lower cost, relocation plan and a milestone schedule.

Public Comment:

1. Amanda S. discussed her current poor living conditions and asked Council to approve the construction as soon as possible.
2. Dich T. wondered why everything was being done in rental and felt many people could benefit from affordable housing.
3. Jonathan G. (Zoom) requested in the redesign that Main Street be moved closer to El Camino as the entrance to Buena Vista is opposite to Villa Vera and the residents drive through their complex often at unsafe speeds and their complex streets are paid by their HOA dues so the wear and tear on the streets comes out of their money.
4. Esmeralda A. did not feel the residents were receiving clear information and their needs were being rejected from Housing Authority. She asked Housing Authority to consider current residents who want to split in two apartments or have a mobile home and apartment.
5. Liney B. felt like she was forced to move from Buena Vista as a renter. The management company promised she would be able to become an owner. She did not feel she had been given that opportunity. She

SUMMARY MINUTES

asked Housing Authority to take the resident's needs into consideration.

6. Winter D. expressed concern about the situation that HCD will have purview over two-thirds of what is now a property and the City will have purview over one-third which is the apartment part. She thought the City should have a larger voice in the entire property. She asked City Manager Shikada to work with the Housing Authority to sift through issues.
7. Pepe R. stated that when he requested a three-bedroom house because a two-bedroom house was not big enough with two children, he was advised to put up a plastic sheet for privacy.
8. Naomi G. felt that the needs of the park's residents were not being met. One concern was the hybrid apartment/mobile home rehabilitation they are trying to implement which displaces a lot of mobile home owners.
9. Rebeca L. shared her experience during the advisor meetings with the residents and Housing Authority stating they were not productive in listening to the resident's needs.
10. Aram J. (Zoom) discussed a bad experience his son, who presents as African-American, had in attempting to obtain housing at Buena Vista. He referred to the NAACP data that showed African-American's in Santa Clara County to be disproportionately unhoused. He called for a set-aside for African-Americans at this complex.

Council Member Veenker questioned if the issue of shifting the apartment building, tuck-under parking and what happens during the construction when residents have to be off the property has been shared with the residents. She expressed concern about the sale and downsizing issues.

Ms. Ward answered they have let the residents know that a relocation plan will be coming. The next step would be to finalize the redevelopment draft plan and meet with households individually to go over what the impacts are for them. The impact depends on where the people are currently located in the park and where they will end up at the park. She stated they are about 60 to 90 days away from having that information ready. She shared that she was unable to publicly comment on individual household issues. She stated the majority of households have affirmed their housing decision. There are households that remain undecided for a variety of reasons. Some are still not happy with their housing options for various reasons. She discussed

SUMMARY MINUTES

budget, space and equity issues that limit their ability to meet every resident's request.

Council Member Veenker asked how she saw this resolving itself and on what timeline.

Ms. Ward said there will be more engagement with the residents in the coming month. The relocation plan would provide an opportunity to meet more directly with residents. There will be more specifics around the relocation plan for households. She hoped that by the time they reach the point where construction needs to start that they have those households onboard.

Vice Mayor Lauing queried what having only one-third of the approval area meant in terms of overall actual tasks and time management. He asked if the City would get involved with the mediation matters. He asked for clarification on the proposed changes to the regulatory agreement.

Claire Raybould, Senior Planner, responded when they review a project under the California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act they look at the whole of the action. That will include the mobile homes, apartments and all the related actions.

Melissa McDonough, Assistant to the City Manager, did not think the mediation matters was a role they anticipated participating in. She said she would get back to them with that question as they were meeting the following day.

Ms. Ward clarified the proposed changes to the regulatory agreement stating it is meant to make the rent levels more consistent.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims wanted to hear where resident's needs and requests have been met and three areas they felt they were not there yet. She referred a concern expressed by a resident about having a certain number of children in the home such that a two bedroom did not afford privacy for the adults. She asked if the Housing Authority thought it was a reasonable condition of privacy to put up a plastic sheet between adults and children in a living circumstance.

Ms. Ward reiterated two-thirds of the park residents have affirmed their housing decision. Areas that lack improvement are availability to discuss concerns of the residents, the relocation projects and a funding gap on the apartments. Ms. Ward stated that she had not heard of a situation where a resident was instructed to use a plastic sheet for privacy. She asked Rebeca Lasso to elaborate on her concerns whether residents have had reasonable

SUMMARY MINUTES

time to meet with Housing Authority Staff, the relocation plan and what one thing she would ask of the Housing Authority in order to move things forward to resolution.

Rebeca Lasso, Law Foundation Community Advocate, explained that communication is a problem between the Housing Authority and residents, the housing being provided is too small and the appraisal provided is not accurate. She stated clear, respectful and non-adversarial communication is what she would ask of the Housing Authority.

Council Member Kou thought questions such as relocation expectations needed to be answered before moving forward. She asked about the AMI changing to up to 80% after 75 years. She asked if a number has been allocated for each AMI bracket and if so has the number been provided to them. She wanted to know how they would make sure there would be sufficient and safe parking. She asked if there is a TDM plan and they had looked at introducing it to the residents so they understand they can perhaps participate in something like that. She asked if these dwelling units will qualify for their six cycle RHNA accounts with the new zoning change and subdivision especially for the lower income categories. She commented there needed to be Staff available to speak to the resident's concerns. She added she would like to see more trees on the property.

Ms. Ward clarified they did not know what people's incomes were before they bought the park. The regulatory agreement is set to assume that there are households that do not income qualify. Because it was in the City, county and Housing Authority's best interest to make sure everybody living there could stay, the regulatory agreement was written in a way where those families can stay on site but upon that unit vacating, an income-eligible household has to move in. She confirmed there is a number allocated for each AMI bracket. She stated there would need to be a parking plan per unit. She provided that they do not have a TDM plan but could talk about that.

Ms. Raybould stated the number allocated for each AMI bracket was provided in the Staff report. She added the units have already been counted under the RHNA in a previous cycle.

Council Member Burt queried if it has been evaluated whether the students will be able to be relocated approximately in the boundaries of the schools they are attending and if the school district has been engaged regarding transportation if any students have to be moved outside of their local school boundary and if not he encouraged them to specifically address that issue. He asked how many mobile home units are currently in the park. He

SUMMARY MINUTES

expected they would have an understanding of the contentious issue so Staff would be acting as ombudsman to be able to provide to the Council their perspective and understanding of those issues. He touched on the Transportation Demand Management Programs and talked about a VTA program called Smart Passes and stated he would like to see all residents have that available to them. He opined the City could contribute to that.

Ms. Ward answered they would need to overlay the school boundaries with the market study that was done. They will prioritize making the units that are closest to the school available for those households. They have not specifically engaged with the school district on transportation. One of the stakeholders they intend to reach out to with the draft relocation plan is the school district so they are in touch with them. She stated there are currently 72 mobile homes in the park.

Mayor Stone wondered if the Housing Ad-Hoc Committee could establish mediation with senior Staff from the City, Housing Authority and key leaders from Buena Vista to find solutions to get through some of the impasse. He discussed some of the residents frustration of going from home ownership to no longer having that option and if there is a way to be able to provide that for those who currently own their homes.

City Manager Shikada thought that referral would need to be in a motion.

Ms. Ward stated she could not specifically speak to the ownership issue. She said it is important to remember that the Housing Authority owns the property these mobile homes live on. The residents own the mobile homes and are responsible for the maintenance and upkeep. Through their Housing Quality Inspection Standards, if they find issues that put residents' safety at risk, they have to deal with them. Unfortunately a lot of households have limited means and they have limited options they can provide people. They do their best to inform people of their options to allow them to remain at the park but this underscores and highlights the need to move the redevelopment forward because they will continue to have these issues at the park with people's coaches failing and becoming health and safety issues if they do not redevelop the park.

Consent Calendar

Council Member Tanaka requested to pull Agenda Item Number 2.

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 2.

SUMMARY MINUTES

MOTION: Vice Mayor Lauing moved, seconded by Mayor Stone to approve Agenda Item Numbers 2-5.

MOTION PASSED ITEM 2: 6-1, Tanaka no

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 3-5: 7-0

Public Comment:

1. Aram J. (Zoom) hoped there was a way to reduce the number of matters that are on the consent calendar and for items over \$100,000 or \$200,000, they should not be at stake without Council having a fuller understanding.

Council Member Tanaka voted no because several people were concerned about the location due to heavy traffic on Middlefield as well as safety concerns for a preschool and elementary school. He thought it needed more consideration.

2. Approval of a Purchase Order with Mobile Modular Management Corporation in the Amount of \$244,850, including \$222,591 for Basic Services and \$22,259 for Contingency, to Provide and Install a Modular Building at 4000 Middlefield Road to Serve as a Temporary Fire Station During Construction of the Fire Station 4 Replacement Capital Project (PE-18004); CEQA Status - Exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303
3. Approval of Office of the City Auditor FY2024 Task 4 Task Orders (CEQA Status - Not a Project)
4. Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor's Quarterly Status Report for the Period of October - December 2023
5. Approval of Professional Services Contract Number C24189371 with Kimley Horn and Associates in an Amount Not to Exceed \$178,559 for the Quiet Zone Study Services for railroad crossings at Churchill Avenue, Meadow Drive, and Charleston Road for a term ending December 31, 2025; CEQA - not a project.

City Manager Comments

City Manager Shikada provided a slide presentation discussing board, commission and committee recruitment, career opportunities for the City of

SUMMARY MINUTES

Palo Alto, upcoming community events, notable tentative upcoming Council items.

Action Items

6. Adopt a Park Dedication Ordinance for the Tower Well site, 0.19 acres of land (8,437 square feet) at 201 Alma Street and approve the proposed name "Tower Well Park" as Recommended by the Parks and Recreation Commission. CEQA status - not a project.

Kristen O'Kane, Community Services Director provided a presentation on the Tower Well Park Dedication item discussing the recommendation, park dedication, tower well site location and features and Palo Alto Historical Association – park name.

Public Comment:

1. Herb B. summarized a letter he had sent supporting the recommendation to dedicate this site for park land. He believed the name should be the Fred Eyerly Tower Well Park. He urged Council to initiate the process for adding the site to the California National Register of Historic Properties. He noted that the signs had not been maintained. He stated he provided supporting information for the issues he discussed.

Council Member Kou asked if the name Fred Eyerly Tower Park had been discussed by the naming parties or PAHA. She wanted to know how maintenance would be addressed if the park was dedicated. She wondered who would design the signage.

Ms. Kane answered there was a meeting with the PRC Ad-Hoc and Staff with PAHA to discuss the name. It was her understanding they did not discuss naming it after Fred Eyerly. There was a dedication of the tower that was captured in an interpretive sign that specifies the Tower Well itself is dedicated in honor of Fred Eyerly. She stated maintenance is included in the maintenance contract and described what that includes. She needed to check with Development Services Group regarding the signage.

Amanda Brown, Parks and Recreation Commission Chair, stated this was not brought up by the Historical Association. They were told the park was referred to as Tower Well Site or Park. The only name brought up was Charles Marx that was already on the interpretive sign and it was suggested by PAHA. PAHA ultimately suggested to go with Tower Well Park, as the park is generally referred to.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Burt opined they might want to consider Fred Eyerly's involvement after reading the articles. He suggested referring it back for that consideration. He stated there is a context that there is other perspective park land in the City that they may have an obligation to dedicate under article 8 of the charter. He said there is an asymmetrical circumstance where the Council can dedicate but only the vote of the people can undedicated. The reason he brought this forward was that this location is across the street from El Camino Park. In the coming months, a proposal that Stanford has been advocating would be coming before Council to look at a bus-only access from an extension of Quarry Road from El Camino into the bus staging area. That access would shave off a piece of dedicated park land.

Vice Mayor Lauing asked for clarification if the Quarry Road extension went through, up to a half an acre of park would have to be undedicated. He asked if the bus would be crossing on the land.

Council Member Burt clarified looking at a map where Quarry Road goes, if it were to continue in a narrow Quarry Road into the bus staging area, that is dedicated park land. There would be a roadway crossing the land.

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

1. Adopt a Park Dedication Ordinance (Attachment A) for the Tower Well site, 0.19 acres of land (8,437 square feet) at 201 Alma Street, and;
2. Approve the proposed name "Tower Well Park", and;
3. Referral to the Historic Resources Board and Parks and Recreation Commission to consider the naming of it to be Fredrick Eyerly Tower Well and to refer to the Historic Resources Board adding the site to the California and National Historic Registry.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

7. Public Hearing: Second Reading Planned Community Ordinances for 2901 Middlefield Road and 702 Ellsworth Place. CEQA Status – Categorically Exempt

SUMMARY MINUTES

Jonathan Lait, Planning Director, provided slides discussing 702 Ellsworth Place key issues to include fence design, sight triangle, the truck delivery sign and recommendations.

Public Comment:

1. Kristen V.-F. speaking on behalf of (7): Carolyn G., Robyn Z., Bill P., Chin C., On C., and Sheri F. discussed the sight triangle getting changed to a three-foot fence added at a place that is not working for the neighborhood and a shortened sight triangle. She provided slides showing why this is a problem and showing the requests they are making. She provided a map showing serious injuries and deaths due to the low visibility in the area. She outlined a comparison of line-of-sight with the driver's range of view. She asked if the issue could not be resolved that night that it be sent to the Architectural Review Board to be resolved. She showed why the delivery truck sign is fine and delivery plan requirements. She discussed where cars would park in the future.
2. Bill R. respectfully suggested appointing a representative for each owner, a Staff representative and a representative from Ellsworth to agree on all the language including the development plans to provide consistency between the ordinances and development plans and have it brought back on consent. He suggested substantially modifying changes proposed by Staff so it would be a hearing on the first ordinance.
3. Paul B. expressed gratification that the delivery space issue has been resolved and believed they could move forward by speaking directly with one another to achieve a useful compromise.
4. Bhanu I. thought the fence would need to be pulled back to be in line with the creek fence in order to provide visibility when exiting and entering Ellsworth.
5. Jeff L. did not think the three-foot tall wrought iron or cable fence proposals would provide sufficient visibility. He asked Council to approve a taller fence set far enough back or add more rigor to the visibility requirements. He suggested Staff study the sight lines through the fence from the perspective of drivers and have the ARB review those studies.
6. Jake M. (Zoom) wanted to emphasize that Council make amends to allow the full delivery spaces be approved by UPS and ensure them to be asphalt.

SUMMARY MINUTES

7. Andrea (Zoom) discussed safety concerns with the placement of the orange fence. She asked Council to make the area safer by removing the fence or moving it back for an appropriate line of site.
8. Jeff C. (Zoom) stated that the standard 35-foot sight triangle was not adequate and the language in the draft order was too vague to be meaningful. He suggested the only meaningful way to specify visibility would be to require a specified open area at a given small angle and that a cable fence may be the only solution. He agreed with the suggestion of appointing representatives to resolve this issue.
9. Nitin H. tested the visibility with the demo fence from his car and said it was crystal clear. He added that the fence they plan to install would be even more transparent than what is there. He understood that this meeting was called because somebody felt there was a discrepancy between what Council decided and what Staff wrote. He did not believe there was a discrepancy. He supported removing the sign for the truck.
10. Ken H., Hayes Group Architects, spoke on behalf of RLD Land, LLC and the owner of 2901 Middlefield. He urged Council to support Staff's first recommendation. He took no exception to the removal of the fence or the 24-foot truck sign. He stated the draft ordinance should read RLD Land, LLC.

Council Member Burt expressed concerns about the visibility through two angles of the fence and questioned if that has been evaluated by Staff. He thought the cable rail provided much better visibility and was the best choice.

Director Lait answered the ordinance has been drafted with the language Council had given them. The Transportation Staff has looked at it and will look again during plan review. He added if City Council wants to add more prescriptive language this would be the opportunity to do so.

Council Member Kou expressed disappointment that the words "extend to the southernmost corner of the property along Middlefield Road" had been included crossed out from ordinance they did in December and she wanted it put back in. She thought it was upon Council to make sure there is safety at this place and the existing neighbor's rights are not reduced. She made a motion to explicitly state that the delivery space is a required public benefit for all delivery vehicles that serve the neighborhood, no signs limiting size of delivery vehicles, reinclude that the sight triangle at the southeast corner of

SUMMARY MINUTES

the intersection of Ellsworth Place and Middlefield shall extend to the southernmost corner of the property along Middlefield Road and shall not be obstructed the impediments taller than one foot, require all easements that grant ingress and egress be recorded with proof delivered to City and Ellsworth parcel owners, the delivery space is a benefit prior to issuance of 708 Ellsworth Construction Permits, require that both sides of Ellsworth be clearly marked as no parking with red paint as appropriate except for driveways and the delivery space, require ADA tactile service added to the Middlefield sidewalk to mark Ellsworth Place and maps show in front of 702 Ellsworth that it is asphalt and not pavers so that the width of the street is at 26 feet. There was no second.

Council Member Veenker asked the significance of the delivery space being a required public benefit. She asked for clarification about the language in the ordinance not specifying what type of fencing and asked if that was to strike a balance between prescriptiveness and functionality. She thought this was premature and when the owner came back with a fence they would ensure it complied with the two-angle visibility standard.

Director Lait answered the intent is that the loading zone is meant to serve the property on Middlefield and 702 Ellsworth as well as the other properties on Ellsworth. Being identified as a public benefit is an opportunity to be explicit about that. Regarding the language of the ordinance, he agreed it was meant to strike a balance between prescriptiveness and functionality. He noted that by being specific with the requirement, they had clear expectations for the neighbors and the developer.

Caio Arellano, Chief Assistant Attorney, responded to the question posed about the sight triangle. He outlined the issues coming into it to include the delivery space, width of the additional easements on either side of Ellsworth, the fence height and the sight triangle. Over the course of discussion, they were able to resolve the width of Ellsworth Place, Council decided on the delivery space proposed by the neighbors and the fence and sight triangle were what were proposed by the owner of 702 Ellsworth Place. That proposal depicted a sight triangle with the 35-foot sights. Council's discussion reflected that and intent to adopt the property owner's proposal with respect to the sight triangle and fence. That is why the ordinance was amended.

AMENDMENT: Mayor Stone moved, seconded by Council Member Kou to restore the sight triangle specified in the December 11, 2023 ordinance, to

SUMMARY MINUTES

"extend to the southernmost corner of the property along Middlefield Road and shall".

AMENDMENT PASSED: 5-2, Lythcott-Haims, Tanaka no

AMENDMENT INCORPORATED INTO THE MAIN MOTION

MOTION: Council Member Lythcott-Haims moved, seconded by Council Member Tanaka to adopt the draft ordinances amending the Planned Community Ordinance 2343 to rezone 2901-2905 Middlefield Road and 702 Ellsworth Place as prepared for the February 5, 2024 City Council meeting with the following amendments:

1. Require maximum 3-foot-tall cable rail fence within the sight visibility triangle area that maintains visibility through the sides of the sight triangle adjacent to Ellsworth Place and Middlefield Road, and;
2. Remove signage that limits the size of delivery trucks on Ellsworth Place, and;
3. Restore the sight triangle specified in the December 11, 2023 ordinance, to "extend to the southernmost corner of the property along Middlefield Road and shall".

MOTION PASSED: 6-1, Kou no

8. Approval of the 2024 City Council Priority Objectives and Finance Committee and Policy & Services Committee Workplans

NO ACTION TAKEN - ITEM CONTINUED TO MARCH 11, 2024 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Lupita Alamos, Assistant to the City Manager, gave a presentation to go over the 2024 City Council priority objectives and review of the standing committee workplan specifically addressing the Finance and Policy and Services Committee workplans. She noted there was one additional objective that was not included in the packet and it is in the economic development section. The slides included an introduction to 2024 Council priorities and objectives, discussion facilitation, 2024 Council priorities and objectives (76 projects), Council priority: Economic development and transition (12 objectives), climate change and natural environment (23 objectives), housing for social and economic balance (21 objectives), community health, safety and wellness and belonging (20 objectives). She stated these slides

SUMMARY MINUTES

will be used to reference once the discussion has started and after approval of those objectives they would move on to the Finance and Policy and Services Standing Committee workplans. She noted there was a referral for public art from Council in 2023 that was not in the packet but has now been included in the Policy and Services workplan. She discussed a summary and potential Council direction.

Public Comment:

1. Bryan Neider, speaking on behalf of (9): Laurie J., Tracey J., Ty K., Linnea W., Per M., Cassy C., Matt M., and Kim M., gave a slide presentation detailing AbilityPath, its impact, its opportunities and services, its programs, affordable housing project at Mitchell Park Place collaboration and what would be offered, the community art program and other community programs. They are seeking support from the City of Palo Alto to be able to extend and expand their programs as part of health, wellness and belonging. He provided a story about one of AbilityPath's participants.
2. Richard H. spoke on behalf of Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce and the Government Affairs Committee. They feel the Chamber has a role in advancing all of the priorities presented that night by promoting a sustainable, equitable, healthy and safe economic environment. The Chamber's goal is to better understand opportunities and challenges facing the business community and advocate for policy to support its members. This year they are focused on continuing and enhancing outreach to the business community including specifically the retail business communities located along University Avenue, California Avenue and El Camino Real who face proposed changes to the current streetscape. They hope to establish guiding principles for each of these areas. They encourage City Council to keep the business community in mind, especially small businesses.
3. Ken H. advocated if an agreement with PAUSD could not be reached for more land and space, they should move on and build a community center on the 8 acres and forget the wellness center.
4. Aram J. (Zoom) asked Council to make a ceasefire resolution one of the priorities for this year. He declared the First Amendment calls out for this type of issue to come before City Council.
5. Kristi B. (Zoom), land use planner with Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, spoke about the Palo Alto Redwoods Homeowner's Association. Her organization submitted a letter last fall when the City was considering zoning ordinance amendments related to the housing element asking

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council to consider an additional amendment that would help protect residential uses from the impacts of commercial uses. On November 13, 2023, City Council unanimously passed a resolution directing Staff to review the proposed amendments from PAR. In February of this year, they followed up with Director Lait to find out when the proposed amendments would be considered and learned that Staff did not plan to address them in the coming fiscal year. The planning director suggested that if PAR wanted to see this happen, they needed to make those requests to City Council. PAR is asking for their proposed amendments to be processed along with the housing related zoning amendments planned for the coming year.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 P.M.