



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Regular Meeting
November 6, 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, Stone, Tanaka, Veenker

Present Remotely: Lythcott-Haims

Absent:

Call to Order

Mayor Lydia Kou convened the meeting. Roll was called by the Clerk with all being present.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims announced she would be invoking the just cause provision of Assembly Bill 2449 which allows remote attendance without giving prior notice due to receiving a COVID diagnosis the day before. She added there were and would not be any adults 18 years or older in the room with her.

Special Orders of the Day

1. Proclamation Honoring Olenka Villarreal

Vice Mayor Greer Stone read the proclamation honoring Olenka Villarreal on behalf of Mayor Kou and the entire City Council.

Olenka Villarreal thanked Mayor Kou and the Council.

Closed Session

2. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS Authority: Government Code Section 54956.8 Property: 1175 North San Antonio Road, Palo Alto (Informally known as the former Los Altos Treatment Plant site) Negotiating Party: Santa Clara Valley Water District City Negotiators: (Ed Shikada, Brad Eggleston, Karin North, Sunny Tong) Subject of Negotiations: Lease Price and Terms of Payment

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

SUMMARY MINUTES

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Council went into Closed Session at 5:46 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 7:05 P.M.

Mayor Kou reconvened the meeting and announced no reportable action.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

City Manager Ed Shikada did not report any changes.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Council Member Veenker reported she attended the ceremony celebrating 10 years of ministry by Reverend Kaloma Smith, the Human Relations Commission Chair the prior day. She lifted up Lilly Zhang, world class table tennis player, as she will be the flag-bearer at the Pan American games for the US team. She invited everyone to the Sibling Cities USA Townhall on Sunday at 1 p.m. at the Mitchell Park Community Center where they will be connecting with residents in Bloomington via Zoom to discuss race and belonging.

Consent Calendar

Public Comment:

1. John H. – Item 4 – referenced a letter including photos that had been sent to Council regarding a concern with the bulb out installed on East Crescent and Southwood that included photos. It was felt to be ugly, unsafe and unacceptable. He requested Council to direct Staff to replace the bulb with something more suitable.
2. James G. – Item 4 – asked Council to reject the proposal by the Planning Department regarding the bulb out.
3. Greg W. – Item 4 - stated that these were temporary installations put in place at low cost to gather data to test the efficacy of the concept which overwhelmingly showed the concepts to be valid and the majority of residents support the permanent design in response to the City's survey. He encouraged Council to grant approval for the

SUMMARY MINUTES

Transportation Department to move forward in taking the concept designs from test to fully fleshed out.

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 4.

Mayor Kou registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 4.

Council Member Greg Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 7.

Council Member Julie Lythcott-Haims recused on Agenda Item Number 8.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Stone moved, seconded by Council Member Pat Burt to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-8.

MOTION SPLIT FOR THE PURPOSE OF VOTING

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 3, 5-6: 7-0

MOTION PASSED ITEM 4: 5-2, Kou, Tanaka no

MOTION PASSED ITEM 7: 6-1, Tanaka no

MOTION PASSED ITEM 8: 6-0-1, Lythcott-Haims Recuse

Council Member Tanaka felt more discussion was needed on Agenda Item Number 4. Regarding Agenda Item Number 7, he did not understand why they would go with the company that has previously had issues with paying their workers.

Mayor Kou believed Agenda Item Number 4 required more discussion.

3. Approval of Minutes from October 16, 2023 Meeting
4. Approval to Proceed with Design of Improvements for Permanent Installation of the Traffic Calming Pilot Project in the Crescent Park Neighborhood
5. Approval of the Acceptance of State of California Citizens Options for Public Safety (COPS) Funds of \$194,400 and a Budget Amendment in the Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Fund (2/3 vote required) for front-line law enforcement expenses
6. Approval of First Amendment to the Santa Clara County Recycling and Waste Reduction Commission Technical Advisory Committee Memorandum of Agreement. CEQA Status - Not a project.
7. Approval of General Services Agreement Contract C24185703A with SWA Services Group, Inc. for a five-year term in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$19,327,547 for Janitorial

SUMMARY MINUTES

Cleaning and Maintenance Services, and Approval of a Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Amendment in the General Fund; CEQA status – Not a Project.

8. CONSENT: Second Reading of Electrification Equipment Ordinance adopted October 2, 2023 amending the Palo Alto Municipal Code Title 18 (Zoning) Chapters 18.04 (Definitions), 18.10 (Low-Density Residential), 18.12 (R-1 Zones), 18.13 (Multiple Family Residential Zones), 18.40 (General Standards and Exceptions), and 18.54 (Parking Facilities Design Standards) and Title 9, Chapter 9.10 (Noise) to Further Facilitate the Installation of Electrification Equipment in Residential Neighborhoods. CEQA Status – Exempt under CEQA Guidelines sections 15061(b)(3) and 15301.

City Manager Comments

City Manager Shikada presented slides regarding the Veterans Day Recognition Event, Homekey Palo Alto Groundbreaking, Winter Storm Preparation Workshop, New Water Heater Savings announcement and Notable Tentative Upcoming Council Items.

Action Items

9. Approval of a Contract with Urban Field Studio (C24188179) for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$384,990 for the Car-free Streets Alternatives Study; Adopt an Interim Ordinance Continuing Parking Lot and Sidewalk Dining through March 2024 and On-Street Dining through December 2024; Adopt Resolutions Extending the City Manager's Authority to Temporarily Close Portions of California Avenue and Ramona Street through December 2024; Provide Direction on the Street Configuration of California Ave. and Ramona St. during the Study Period; and Approval of a FY 2024 Budget Amendment in the General Fund. CEQA Status - Categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 (existing facilities) and 15304(e) (minor temporary use).

Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official, discussed the Car-free Streets Alternatives Study. He stated the two priorities for this year were to select a consultant to conduct a study informing the development of a permanent car-free streets ordinance and to extend a temporary closure of the car-free streets. Three high-level actions were being sought in order to deliver on those priorities which he outlined with a slide presentation.

Ozzy Arce, Senior Transportation Planner, presented slides detailing an overview of the Car-free Streets program with stakeholder perspectives. A mini-survey was conducted asking what people liked about the flexible community spaces and overwhelming support and feedback was received. He discussed the Alternatives Study. He talked about the 2024 Staff recommendations during the Alternative Study.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Steve Guagliardo, Assistant to the City Manager, discussed sales tax data trends from 2018 to present.

Mr. Arce returned to speak about alternative street configurations that were laid out in the report to include the reversion option, the seasonal and hybrid option and the one-way option. He detailed a meeting with Cal Ave and Ramona Street business owners discussing the project's next steps in which a "compromise" proposal was devised. Aside from the scope of Car-free Streets, Staff also recommended the extension of other outdoor dining uses outside of car-free environments until December 31, 2024, to match the sunset date for the temporary parklet program to allow time to determine next steps. Approval is being sought for a contract to study the long-term configurations of the street, obtain direction on the street configuration during the study period and administrative actions to move forward on the efforts.

Council Member Burt queried if they were assuming the numbers for the non-research park were similar. He wanted to know whether they ever had much percentage of parking actually on Cal Ave. He asked if he was correct in assuming it would be a three-year process, at best, for the long-term construction to be complete. He questioned how long it would take to go out for a design, environmental approvals, the bid and construction to do another interim experiment.

Mr. Guagliardo answered they were making that assumption.

Mr. Kamhi stated a small percentage of parking was on California Avenue parking district. He stated the long-term construction would be in the one to three-year range following the consultant study depending on the alternative selected. He stated the length of another interim experiment would also depend on the complexity.

City Manager Shikada agreed with Mr. Kamhi that it depends on how extensive any capital improvements are anticipated.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked how many other meetings had been held with Cal Ave business owners in 2023 and if there is any data from other jurisdictions that have already implemented this design. She wanted to know if they know that there are a set of main streets that did not become car-free but have seen the same economic downturns.

Mr. Arce responded that there was one preliminary engagement meeting with Bruce Fukuji in the spring of 2023. The alternative study includes its own unique set of robust community engagement plan that includes separate meetings with business and property owners on Cal Ave and Ramona Streets. There was a virtual validation meeting with about a dozen Cal Ave business owners with Mr. Fukuji in the spring. He would let her know how many showed up at a later time.

Mr. Guagliardo stated many cities experimented with creating spaces for outdoor dining during the pandemic. The retail districts offering a compelling experience to patrons did the best. The Stanford Shopping Center was an example of what they have seen succeed. He added that the engagement started with participants of University and California Avenue with the Summer

SUMMARY MINUTES

Streets Initiative in 2020 became the springboard of participants they have continued to engage with throughout the process. They are trying to grow their outreach and the conversation.

Vice Mayor Stone asked if they were looking at just six months or so while they have the one-lane option open before having to close the street again for the permanent restructuring of California Avenue. He inquired if there was any sales tax data pre and post University Avenue reopening. He wanted to know if there had been a chance to speak with economic development managers or their equivalent what other communities that have had a street closed and reopened have seen as far as their retail and restaurant businesses. He was interested in knowing if there had been a chance to talk to businesses on California Avenue regarding implications of a seasonal or hybrid option and was curious how that would work with requiring business owners to store their outdoor furnishings during the time of temporary closure.

Mr. Kamhi noted on the six months they would be working hard to expedite the process. It would depend on the complexity but they believe it can be done in six months or less. Six months later, Council would make the decision whether to close the street for further changes.

Mr. Guagliardo replied they have the sales tax data pre and post University Avenue reopening and he would get that information. He explained what he and his economic development colleagues throughout Santa Clara County communicate about but there is no clear answer regarding opening or closing the streets. The preferred compromise of the businesses if an alternative to the current configuration were pursued would be the one-way opening with a bike lane year-round if not a two-way version.

Council Member Veenker wanted more detail about the one-way street. She thought that the default option would be for the street to reopen as agreed on in May 2022 by Council and that they were being asked whether or not they would like to reverse that decision and extend the closure. She wondered if that possibility had been mentioned to the California Avenue business owners at the meeting in the spring or if October 31 was the first they heard of it. She asked why the restaurants were not given sooner notice of the intent to reopen by default.

Mr. Kamhi brought up the “Compromise” Proposal Exhibit and explained it in detail.

Mr. Arce responded they knew the whole time December 31, 2023, was the sunset date for the current authorization. What had been described to the businesses at the springtime meeting was that they would take the feedback received as part of this engagement to shape up the demonstration projects as well as the scope of work for the RFP. There was never any indication about what direction they were going to head at that time other than going through the cycles of implementing the direction from Council. With the deadline approaching, they are asking to continue the street configuration as is to allow for the study to happen in 2024.

Mr. Kamhi highlighted the Council priorities and noted this was always planned in quarter 4 of 2023. The Council priority was to extend the temporary closure for Car-free Streets.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Ed Lauing inquired if the City could move forward on some of the street improvements when Council comes to a decision on one of the alternatives. He was surprised to see that there was only one bid from 46 consultants.

Mr. Kamhi responded that signage had already been ordered. Branding takes more work but if Council directed them to do so, they would need to figure out how to resource that. He added they spoke to some of the vendors that did not bid and had documented reasons in the report. Some vendors skip bids from Palo Alto because it can be a challenging place to work.

Council Member Tanaka wanted clarification as to why the data for University Avenue was not available. He felt it was an oversight as they would have to make a decision without that information. In speaking to various retailers and residents about the closures, one common thread was curiosity as to why more experiments had not been done in the past year.

City Manager Shikada did not believe conclusions could be drawn from the information being referenced as not available. He reminded them that Mr. Guagliardo planned to provide that information to Council. He believed Staff covered the experiments that occurred over the last year well. They wish they could do more but it does reflect what the City has been able to accomplish and established some areas of success that could be built on.

Mayor Kou asked if the meeting with Mr. Fukuji had come back to the business community with what was discussed. She wanted to know if Urban Field had outlined what their engagement with the Community would look like. She queried if the Business Registry had been updated.

Mr. Arce answered that as the spring online meeting where the results were validated and next steps were discussed. He stated Urban Field's engagement with the Community was outlined in the contract and discussed what that entailed.

Mr. Kamhi noted that Exhibit A, Scope of Services, in Attachment A outlined the outreach.

City Manager Shikada answered they continued to keep the Business Registry updated. Multiple channels had been used to reach as many businesses as possible. He believed the Business Registry was less useful for that purpose.

Public Comment:

1. Michael E., speaking on behalf of (7): Ben L., Sven T., Katja S., Dedra H., David L., and Stephen G., presented slides outlining the vision they had for California Avenue. His next slide revealed the disorganization of California Avenue. He provided a timeline of the history of California Avenue. He outlined planned demonstration projects and the results that he opined were unimpressive. He stated there is need for something to show that California Avenue is open for business and for parking signage. He talked about empty store fronts. He encouraged Council to pass an ordinance for blight abatement.

SUMMARY MINUTES

2. Pep C. was in support of keeping the streets closed as it builds strong communities and is safer for pedestrians.
3. Peter B. felt the City should take advantage of this opportunity to make a place where community can happen and that could not be achieved with cars.
4. Robert S. had concerns about closings affecting the area.
5. Carol G. advocated permanent closure of California Avenue because it made event and business sense. She did not believe the one-way compromise solution would work.
6. Deborah G. believed connectivity was lost when introducing cars into a public space which adversely affected mental health and wellness.
7. Greg H. stated this was an issue of cars versus pedestrians. He encouraged a townhall meeting to specifically address this issue. He felt there was no baseline. It was his opinion the only vehicles that should go down that street was first responders. He encouraged the City to look at other examples in the world.
8. Chris T. was strongly in favor of keeping the pedestrian zone on California Avenue and against the compromise. He felt the activity was better for retail.
9. Nancy C. talked on behalf of the majority of business owners on Ramona Street who believed the pedestrian friendly street was in the best interest of Palo Alto residents, visitors, restaurants and business community. She had collected over 6000 survey responses in favor of closed to car streets. She opined retail had been affected by a change in consumers habits and by layoffs.
10. Jeannet K. stated that Heidelberg was prided to have probably the longest pedestrian zone in Europe. She could report that all the retail businesses, restaurants and service stores were doing phenomenally. She agreed that it was related to connectivity in the community. She urged keeping California and Ramona Avenues closed.
11. Maico E. felt there was some animosity between restaurant owners, retailers and people on the street. He stated California Avenue is a family and need to work together to make the district more successful. He believed a promenade would be successful for Palo Alto.
12. Charlie W. advocated for a decision to accomplish the goal of success and offered recommendations if the decision to remain car-free in 2024 was opted for.
13. Bridget A.H. believed car-free spaces brings community and businesses together. She encouraged Council to step back and see the landscape of promise the car-free model offers and vote to keep Cal Ave car free.

SUMMARY MINUTES

14. Kelly H. observed Cal Ave to be more vibrant when the street was closed. She believed the new Public Safety Building opening was going to change the dynamic of Cal Ave further. She supported keeping Cal Ave car free.
15. Ryan K. was for the closure and not the compromise. He stated any business failing would happen with or without street closure. He invited Council to reach out to him for his perspective.
16. Carla B. stated she never considered going to Cal Ave for shopping or dining until it became a closed street. She detailed reasons that she opposed reopening the street and urged continuation of a closed street.
17. Bruce M. encouraged keeping Cal Ave and Ramona closed and suggested the City should look at options to close other streets.
18. Ahmed F. supported permanent closure of California Avenue. There had been unanimous positive feedback for permanent road closure.
19. Todd B. did not believe the compromise would work. He wanted to see the street continue to be walkable and believed most residents wanted that. He believed the businesses that were struggling would benefit from help with their digital presence.
20. Jeff G. encouraged City Council to continue to keep the street closed to vehicles. He suggested improving signage and finding ways to guide people to the different retailers and restaurants.
21. Natalie G. advocated for keeping Cal Ave closed to cars.
22. Bill R. thought there had been an inadequate outreach with respect to the owners and lessees of property. He felt the Business Registry could be used as a baseline to facilitate adequate notice. He observed a need for a present, basic, effective implemented safety plan for law enforcement, fire prevention, suppression and EMS and a need for this to be calendared every month.
23. Scott O. (Zoom) opined the compromise proposal was the worst option.
24. Ann B. (Zoom) spoke on behalf of the College Terrace Residents Association. Their board recommended that City Council approve the extension keeping California Avenue closed to vehicular traffic through December 2024.
25. Liz G. (Zoom) advocated for street closure but pointed out the closure abuts ECR. She encouraged the City to work with Caltrans and in making the ECR side amenable.
26. Lara E. (Zoom) asked for the reopening of the street to cars in both directions effective January 2024. As a business owner, she felt her voice did not have any power.

SUMMARY MINUTES

27. Kate M. (Zoom) expressed support for the permanent closure. She thought the one-lane option was a lose-lose for everyone. She thought it was impossible to verify that certain businesses were seeing a decline due to the street closure.
28. Alfred P. (Zoom) thought this was an opportunity to create an exceptional pedestrian-friendly transportation centered commercial retail, office, housing and arts environment.
29. Mark S. (Zoom) spoke on behalf of people that go to California Avenue by bicycle. He asked what the route around it would be and how it would be made safe and convenient for bike commuters. He also thought electric alternative for the methane heaters was needed.
30. Lisa R. (Zoom) stated what business owners are asking for is access. She has elderly clients who cannot get to her front door from the nearest parking. She would like a passenger loading zone in front of her business. She supported a complete opening.
32. John S. (Zoom) thought it was unacceptable that the City received only one response to the RFP and downtown Palo Alto should not have to suffer another year of studies and instability. He asked for the one-half block of Ramona Street to be reopened. He added the only businesses that the City has interviewed regarding the Ramona Street closure are the restaurants that benefit economically. He did not feel decisions should be made based on polls and surveys but on Street Sense and professionals that have already been engaged who have experience in retail vibrancy and urban design.
33. Joseph (Zoom) observed that the restaurants have drawn him to increase his engagement with local businesses as a pedestrian. He felt the money for consultants could be diverted to improving the street if it continues to stay closed. He requested permanent street closure for 2024 and beyond.
34. Michael E. (Zoom) clarified that the City spent \$7M 10 years ago to make California Avenue more pedestrian friendly. Since May 2022, the retail and service sector have been asking to be given back visibility and access they were willing to sacrifice for the restaurants to provide during the pandemic. Most of the businesses understood they would be reopening at the end of this year and found out on October 30 that Staff was recommending keeping the street closed for an additional year at least. He said that the ad in the previous week's weekly showed that the majority of businesses are asking to reopen the street either fully or with a compromise.
35. Mike S. (Zoom) stated their customer count is down by 7300 this year alone. He said the sales tax chart that Staff used is misleading. He opined that businesses do not have time for another experiment.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. Guagliardo presented and discussed a graph of the publicly available data for the greater downtown area sales tax. He stated it was difficult to point to the causality of the reopening and say retail had recovered with cars back on the street.

Council Member Burt commented on the need to do more investing in helping all of the businesses and particularly good retailers to measures that should have been two years ago to include improved signage, parking signs on El Camino, Sherman and Cambridge, partnering with Stanford Research Park to help get the remaining workers there sooner and street design bringing back Cal Ave as part of the bicycle route. Pedestrians are still being encouraged to walk down the center instead of on the sidewalks in front of the retailers. He stated they want a slow, well-marked bike lane down the center and pedestrians on the sidewalks to see the retailers. He felt everybody agrees they need to allow parklets to be built by the businesses who would choose to do that investment now with an understanding that they have a two to four-year period in which they will be doing the permanent redesign with a possibility of having to tweak the parklets in two to four years. Loading areas are also needed for disabled people, common carriers and delivery trucks. He hoped Council would support moving forward on them aggressively. He was confident that opening the street to cars would not bring any more workers into their offices and would not stop people from shopping on Amazon, which are the prime drivers as to why goods retailers are down. Business is up in the evening because it has been made a social gathering place and it is down during the daytime because workers are not in the office. He did not agree with the compromise.

Vice Mayor Stone agreed with Council Member Burt's statements. He did not support the compromise because either way cars would be on the street eliminating the primary reason the Community was coming out to enjoy the open streets. The one-way closure would take significant time requiring another study. He was uncomfortable with the decision Staff would have to make to determine which side of the street would be opened. He supported the Staff motion for maintaining street closure through the end of 2024.

Council Member Lauing observed that the streets were just a tool in helping redevelop the vibrancy of retail and community. The plan going forward is for the retailers, restaurants, developers and City to work on visibility. He stated the merchants needed a decision on the permanent plan so they could plan their business. He thought they should start now on refurbishing the look of the street. He agreed pedestrian traffic should be shifted to the sidewalks. He presented his motion.

Mayor Kou wanted to make sure there is a way in for loading zones and for people who find it difficult to walk. She asked how they could communicate with rideshare companies in how they can get closer. She wondered if people walk on the street because it is too narrow and crowded on the sidewalk and felt that needed to be explored. She thought the enforcement of bicycles needed to be studied so bicycles would not be speeding though the street and people could feel secure walking on the streets. She referenced a situation wherein an emergency occurred

SUMMARY MINUTES

on California Avenue and the firetruck had difficulty reaching it. She asked if there was an emergency plan in place for such situations.

Mr. Kamhi stated the parking manager is working with the City ADA Coordinator for those. He stated they have direct communication with Palo Alto Link to provide that information to them and the other rideshare companies can make their own decisions but could follow their directions. He stated some cities have implemented a two-way bike lane in the middle that is meant for bicycles only and not pedestrians and some have implemented a shared-street concept where there is a designated area for bicycles but also meant to be shared with pedestrians. He was curious what the Council was looking for in that.

Tami Jasso, Fire Marshall, detailed the plan that is in place for emergency access on California Avenue. She would have to do research to find out what happened on that night with the firetruck being unable to reach the emergency.

Council Member Lauing said that his intent was to have it bicycles only in order to encourage the pedestrians to walk in front of the retail shops.

City Manager Shikada noted that they did experiment with that early on but he suspected it would be a struggle because of the short length on California Avenue. He felt it was appropriate to hand it to Staff and the experts with the expectation that it would be a struggle.

Council Member Veenker expressed concern about jumping to this as a permanent decision that night. She did not think any of them really knew how much working from home and online shopping would actually have a lasting negative impact. Substituting her judgment over the business owners gave her pause. She felt they needed to remember that the decision to close Cal Avenue was not just about the impact to the businesses on the closed portion of the street and it was their job to look at the best interest of the whole City. The business owners on the closed part of the street, the open part of the street and adjacent streets needed to be considered. The shopping needs and preferences of current and potential customers needed to be considered to current and future businesses. The impact on nearby residents, commuter traffic from El Camino Real and the train station and the impact on bicyclists and pedestrians all needed to be a consideration. She echoed Mayor Kou about getting all business owners involved. She would not support the motion on making a permanent decision at that time because of a lack of process and expertise.

Council Member Tanaka thought it was important to make a quick and certain decision so the businesses can move forward. He asked if Staff could give the stakeholders a timeline. He wondered if Staff would be open to exploring the idea of reorienting the stalls of the Farmer's Market in order to face the businesses. He wondered if there was opportunity to take the activate the alleys of the businesses.

Council Member Lauing answered that was the intention so people can take action. He did not know that Staff was ready to commit to that at that time but he hoped narrowing it down to

SUMMARY MINUTES

one alternative would speed the progress. He thought it was worthwhile to investigate the idea of reoriented the Farmer's Market stalls.

Mr. Kamhi was not prepared to respond to a timeline. The consultant needed to be engaged to rescope first. He said some things would happen quickly such as Item 6. He noted Farmer's Market is highly sensitive to any types of changes. He felt the activation of alleys could fit into their initial motion on Item 3.

Mr. Guagliardo responded Farmer's Market has accommodated all of their changes but some of the changes have resulted in changes in their tenancy. He said Staff could look into the idea of reorienting the stalls but he wanted to manage expectations on that.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims added they could sign the alleyways as entrances.

Council Member Burt concurred with Mayor Kou on establishing sidewalk boundaries and need to make the access for emergency vehicles clearly understood.

Mayor Kou asked why Item B would be stopping December 31, 2024.

Council Member Lauing answered they did not want to send the signal that they are closing the streets for another year but they need daylight to get the work done.

Mr. Kamhi noted that in order to have the street remain closed as of January 1, they had to pass an ordinance that would need a second reading at least 21 days before it happens so there would need to be a meeting on December 4.

MOTION: Council Member Lauing moved, seconded by Council Member Lythcott-Haims to direct staff to return with the necessary actions to implement the following:

1. California Avenue Portions:

- a. Maintain California Avenue as a car-free street with current areas of street closure to be made permanent.
- b. Pedestrian traffic be directed to the sidewalks to increase visibility of retailers.
- c. Implement a Permanent Parklet Program based on the adopted program City-wide except on Car-Free streets, but adjusted for contextual differences on California Avenue if necessary.
- d. Create two-way slow bike lane down the center of California Avenue in the car-free area.

SUMMARY MINUTES

- e. Install gateway way signs at Cambridge and Sherman on El Camino, and on Page Mill. Install wayfinding signage on California Ave primarily to promote retail businesses and events.
- f. Conduct regularly scheduled street clean up and maintenance.
- g. Initiate a branding program based on the historic and contemporary strengths of the California Ave/Mayfield district.
- h. Explore reorienting the stalls of our farmers market to face the other businesses to be more synergistic and or other options that could benefit the farmers market and the existing businesses consistent with pedestrian traffic.

2. Ramona Street Portions:

- a. Maintain Ramona Street as a car-free street as-is with closure to be made permanent.
- b. Initiate branding of the historic Ramona Street district, add wayfinding signage, and conduct regular street clean up and maintenance.

In addition, Council approves the following:

- A. Adopt the attached Interim Ordinance Continuing On-Street Outdoor Dining until December 31, 2024 and Some Parking Lot and Sidewalk Uses through March 2024; and
- B. Adopt the attached Resolutions extending the City Manager's authority to temporarily close portions of California Avenue and Ramona Street through December 31, 2024.
- C. The Council Liaison to the business districts be involved and included in the meetings with staff and outreach with the stakeholders.

MOTION PASSED: 5-2, Veenker, Kou no

- 10. LEGISLATIVE: Adopt Ordinances Amending Planned Community Ordinance 2343 for 2901-2905 Middlefield Road and Establishing a Separate Planned Community Zoning Designation for 702 Ellsworth Place to Enable the Development of a new Single-Story, Single-Family Residence. CEQA Status -- Categorically Exempt Under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15061(b)(3), 15301, and 15303 (Continued from September 18, 2023)

Agenda item number 10 was deferred to a date to be determined.

Public Comment:

SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Talya S. (Zoom) spoke as a representative of the Palo Alto Student Climate Coalition (PASCC). She spoke about the importance of the push for electrification in order to reduce emissions. She encouraged setting a specific gas sunset date and work toward encouraging and incentivizing the transition away from natural gas.
2. Tim P. stated he had provided 20 pages of information regarding activity in the past 10 years and prior to that. He spoke about some police department video tapes that had been destroyed under the protection of Dennis Burns. He claimed an FBI agent told him if the missing eight minutes of the video tapes, they would have shut down the Santa Clara County DA.
3. Aram J. (Zoom) requested Council to condemn the state of Israel and the US Government for complicity in the war crimes.
4. Donna W. (Zoom) strongly urged Palo Alto City Council to pass a resolution calling for an immediate cease fire on Gaza, stop sending all weapons and U.S. aid to Israel and condemn Israel for committing genocide.
5. Julia Z. (Zoom), shared some history about the Palo Alto Student Climate Coalition (PASCC) of which she is a cofounder. On behalf of PASCC, she humbly requested an opportunity to meet with the collective Council to have a community dialog surrounding a gas shutoff date.
6. Avroh S. (Zoom) spoke as a representative of the Palo Alto Student Climate Coalition (PASCC). He discussed some climate change issues and suggested Palo Alto could help curb the contribution to the issue through decreasing overall emissions by setting a specific sunset date on natural gas.
7. Peter B. felt stated that everyone was collectively responsible for what the government does and that the Council represents the voice of Palo Alto and needed to speak out for a cease fire in Palestine and Israel.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:13 P.M.