



# CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Special Meeting  
January 28, 2013

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 7:10 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss, Price, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd

Absent:

## CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

James Keene, City Manager announced a free creative program at the Art Center would be held on February 8, 2013, from 6:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M. The Council Retreat was scheduled for February 2, 2013, beginning at 9:00 A.M. at the Art Center.

## MINUTES APPROVAL

**MOTION:** Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd to approve the minutes of December 10, 2012.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

## ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Tony Kramer spoke regarding the interpretation of the Palo Alto Noise Code. He demonstrated the sound level with white noise, a tone, and oscillating noise. The Noise Code allowed a ridiculously high noise level. With more equipment, the ambient noise level would increase.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to approve Agenda Item Numbers 1-7.

# MINUTES

Elaine Keller spoke on Agenda Item Numbers 3 and 4 and petitioned the Council to reject the proposed AT&T DAS node at 3945 Nelson Drive. Typically, nodes were placed in front yards; however, this one was located in the backyard. No one should be subjected to the noise. She was dismayed that the City thought this was an appropriate site. The system exceeded residential noise requirements and had no screening.

Skip Shapiro commented on Agenda Item Numbers 3 and 4. He was concerned that the plan to relocate a pole adjacent to his property to the street would not be accomplished. He requested the Council review the interpretation of the Noise Code and provide assurances that the pole would be moved.

Dori Moss spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and accepted the fact that the location at 747 Loma Verde Avenue could not be moved; however, she requested the Council review the aesthetics of that location. The plan was to place the installation 9 feet above the tree line.

Roy Moss spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and agreed with Ms. Moss' comments and added that AT&T needed to plant a screening tree such that the pole was less visible.

Soroor Ebnesajjad spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and stated the noise level was not clearly presented in information from AT&T. A pole would be located in her backyard, and she was worried about the noise level. She questioned whether a quieter fan could be used in the installation, and whether the installation could be moved from the backyard.

Tony Kramer wanted Agenda Item Numbers 3 and 4 removed from the Consent Calendar. AT&T had not met all conditions of the notice and had not provided information regarding the DAS equipment noise levels at property lines. The Planning Department's approval was based on incomplete knowledge of whether or not the DAS equipment would meet the residential noise requirements. The installations could be modified to produce less noise.

Bala Ovadio spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and expressed concerns about the impact of the antenna on the property value of his home and the lack of foliage to screen the installation. He requested the Council reject the proposed location of the pole.

Al Ovadio spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and stated AT&T had identified alternate nodes in the area which were accessible and screened. He proposed an alternate location, and AT&T had not responded.

# MINUTES

Earl Caustin spoke on Agenda Item Numbers 3 and 4 and explained the DAS project was the result of inadequate cell phone coverage. Palo Alto needed a working cell phone system. He urged the Council to approve Phases 3 and 4 of the project.

Mary Fitch spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and agreed with Mr. Caustin's remarks. Cell phone coverage was important.

Lilian Marcus spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and did not want the installation placed at her property. She suggested moving the installation to the parking lot at the rear of her property.

Stephanie Munoz spoke on Agenda Item Number 3 and 4 and felt the City Council had an ambition to underground telephone lines; however, it worked against that aim by giving AT&T an entitlement. Cell phones often did not work even with adequate coverage.

Paul Albritton, AT&T Counsel respected the concerns of the citizens, while hoping the Council would leave Agenda Item Numbers 3 and 4 on the Consent Calendar. AT&T worked with the Architectural Review Board (ARB) to meet design requirements. Moving one pole would require the movement of other poles. The equipment was barely audible at 25 feet. AT&T agreed to Condition 13 to reduce noise to the residential standard. Only a small number of appeals of Phases 3 and 4 had been submitted.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the Council could require retrofitting of existing installed antennas should the Council establish higher standards for noise and aesthetics at a future time.

Curtis Williams, Director of Planning and Community Environment stated requirements for retrofitting antennas depended on the nature of the changes needed and whether the changes could easily be made. Once a project was approved, it was difficult to go back and impose changes.

Council Member Burt asked if residential noise requirements were within the scope of the discussion at an upcoming meeting on the use of consolidated antennas.

Mr. Williams answered yes. Staff would present a range of measures including facilities and any changes to regulations for facilities City-wide. Within a few weeks Staff would engage a consultant to do that work, so the meeting would be held in a few months.

# MINUTES

1. Utilities Advisory Commission Recommendation that the City Council Adopt a Resolution 9318 Approving the City of Palo Alto Utilities Legislative Policy Guidelines for 2013.
2. Resolution 9319 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving Amendment No. 1 to the Amended and Restated Project Agreement No. 5 Between and Among the Transmission Agency of Northern California and its Participating Members".
3. Appeal of Director's Architectural Review Approval of the Co-location by AT&T Mobility LLC of Pole-Mounted Wireless Communications Equipment and Associated Equipment Boxes on 20 Existing Utility Poles Within City Rights-of-Ways Near the Following Locations: 747 Loma Verde Ave; 3284 Cowper; 3412 Ross/ 3374 Ross Rd; 3132 David Ave; 3415 Greer Rd; 3539 Louis Rd; 2385 Waverley; 3094 Greer Road on Maddux; 390 El Dorado Ave; 452 Loma Verde; 3524 Waverly on E. Meadow; 3706 Carlson Circle; 3757 Corina Wy; 3915 Louis Rd; 631 E. Meadow; 3901 Middlefield Rd; 412 Ferne; 3945 Nelson Ave.; 1772 Hamilton Ave.; 109 Lois Lane - AT&T DAS Phase 3 Project.
4. Appeal of Director's Architectural Review Approval of the Co-location by AT&T Mobility LLC of Pole-Mounted Wireless Communications Equipment and Associated Equipment Boxes on 20 Existing Utility Poles Within City Rights-of-Ways Near the Following Locations: 4131 El Camino Way, 550 Georgia Ave, 4101 Park Blvd (on W. Meadow), 4255 Ruthelma Ave, 669 Maybell Ave, 110 E. Charleston Dr (on Alma), 493 W. Charleston Dr, 4298 Ponce Dr, 429 Monroe, 231 Parkside Dr., opposite 106 Loma Verde, 516 Barron Ave, 4257 McKellar, 320 Lambert Ave, 3989 La Donna, 397 Ventura Ave, 3364 Emerson St, 820 Chimalus Dr, 715 Barron Ave, 915 Matadero Ave. AT&T DAS Phase 4 Project.
5. Approval of \$114,165 for the Consolidated Maintenance Contract between the City of Palo Alto and Public Safety Systems, Inc. For Computer Aided Dispatch, Police Records Management, Fire Records Management, Mobile Data, and Geovalidation.
6. Authorization for the City Manager to Enter Into a One-Year Contract with the Professional Evaluation Group/The Ochoa & Moore Law Firm, P.C. (PEG/OM) in a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$125,000 for Rail Legislative Advocacy Services.

# MINUTES

7. Finance Committee Recommendation that Council Adopt Two Resolutions: 1) Resolution 9320 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving the Policy Pertaining to the Purchase of Energy from Potential Green Waste-to-Energy Facilities", and 2) Resolution 9321 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Utility Rule and Regulation 2 (Definitions and Abbreviations) and the Six Rate Schedules Covering Medium and Large Commercial Customers (E-4 and E-7) to Include Standby Service Charges".

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

## AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

9. Review and Input Regarding Scope of Services for Downtown Cap Study Request for Proposals and Direction Regarding Public Outreach and Input (Staff requests this item be continued to February 11, 2013).

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Price to continue Agenda Item Number 9, "Review and Input Regarding Scope of Services for Downtown Cap Study Request for Proposals and Direction Regarding Public Outreach and Input" to a date uncertain.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

## ACTION ITEMS

8. Colleagues Memo from Mayor Scharff and Council Member Klein to Add a Fourth Member to the Council's Committee on Infrastructure.

Mayor Scharff felt the Committee should have four members rather than three. The City's Brown Act Committees tended to have four members. Having four members led to better discussions and outcomes.

Council Member Klein explained the Committee's existence would exceed the six-month guideline issued by the City Attorney; therefore, it was a Standing Committee and all Standing Committees had four members.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd that the Infrastructure Committee be a Brown Act Committee composed of four Council Members appointed by the Mayor.

# MINUTES

Vice Mayor Shepherd agreed with the Committee having four members. The Committee needed as many members as possible, because of the technical nature of the Committee's work.

Council Member Schmid noted the lack of a description for the Committee's activities, and vaguely recalled that the Committee's mandate was to focus on the procedures of an election. It could be read that the Committee would deal with the subject of an infrastructure election. He asked for clarification of the role of the Committee.

Sheila Tucker, Assistant to the City Manager indicated the role was loosely defined. Staff envisioned engaging the Committee on key policy issues where there would be an advantage to having that dialog in advance of Council consideration.

Council Member Schmid asked if there were no limits to what the Committee could explore other than infrastructure.

James Keene, City Manager explained the Committee's activities were circumscribed by the subject area. The Council could generally assume that the intention was pointing toward a potential measure in 2014. In that sense, the Committee's role was contained. For example, the Committee would not make preliminary recommendations on the 2014 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The Committee's role would be to deal with the strategic questions related to financing the City's infrastructure needs, and particularly relating to a possible ballot measure. The Committee would periodically report to the Council, which could weigh in on the work of the Committee.

Council Member Schmid inquired about a time limit for the Committee.

Mr. Keene understood the Committee was designed with a time limit pointing to the 2014 election. In the course of the Committee's work and the Council's work on infrastructure, the Council could make other conclusions about the timeframe.

Council Member Holman supported having four members. Having a defined role for the Committee was also important. She questioned how often the Committee would report to the Council.

Mayor Scharff stated the Council had not agendized a discussion of the actual Committee and its function.

# MINUTES

Council Member Holman asked for clarification of the role of the Committee as a Brown Act Committee.

Mr. Keene indicated the impetus was to have a Subcommittee to work on the issues of infrastructure needs and funding those needs in relation to a 2014 ballot. When a committee organized, its first work was to organize the scope of its work and operating rules. The goal was to present voters with some questions, and those questions would be decided by the Council rather than a Committee. The point of the Committee was to allow more access to Staff and data, such that the Council's Agenda was not filled with those discussions.

Council Member Price suggested a preliminary mission or statement of purpose and a reference to the last Council meeting addressing the concept be included in the Staff Report.

**AMENDMENT TO MOTION:** Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by XXXX to add after Mayor, at the end of the Motion, "Will provide a final report or recommendation to the Council in July 2014."

## **AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO LACK OF SECOND**

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

10. Discussion and Adoption of the Agenda for the City Council's Annual Retreat on February 2, 2013 for the Possible Purposes of: (a) Setting the Council's Priorities with Action Steps for 2013; (b) Discussion and Possible Action on Core Principles and Guiding Values; (c) Discussion and Possible Action on Meeting Management and the Length of Council Meetings; and (d) Other Potential Topics as Determined by the Council.

James Keene, City Manager, explained the title for Agenda Item 10 was fairly expansive because the Staff intended to use the report as a way to present to the Council and the public as a whole, the packet of materials to be used during the Council Retreat. The objective was to identify the Retreat Agenda and the scope of work the Council would be achieving during the Retreat. Staff was not recommending the Council act on each aspect of the report but to review the proposed agenda for the Retreat on Saturday, February 2, 2013. The Council had made significant progress in the pre-planning process on priority setting for the year creating a smoother progression for selecting the action steps envisioned to take in order to accomplish those priorities. One of the attachments to the report was for Council Member's Schmid and Klein to work with the City Manager to sort

# MINUTES

through the 27 priorities presented by the Council Members and place them in category groups. The proposed agenda was set-up based on the previous direction by Council. Staff had received comments for other potential items that could be included as discussions during the Retreat which were included in the discussion portion of the Staff Report beginning on page 2. Staff requested Council action regarding additional items to be discussed at the retreat; the Procedures and Protocols, the Finance Committee recommendation for review of dedicating revenue streams to infrastructure projects, discussion of a mid-year retreat, and the Council schedule. According to the Municipal Code the Council's vacation schedule must be set by February of each year.

Jeff Hoel spoke regarding a Council retreat Agenda that allowed Council the ability to select fiber to the premises as a priority. The dark fiber network began in 1999 and had turned out to be a success. The thought process at the time was fiber to the premises would follow shortly thereafter.

Tony Kramer spoke regarding the Palo Alto noise code and requested the Council review the Ordinance and make the interpretation a priority.

Council Member Kniss noted the construct of a City Council Retreat was different in Palo Alto than many cities. She asked how past events had altered the structure of the Retreat and whether the end result was to select priorities or were there other goals woven into the agenda.

Mr. Keene stated the main output was identifying priorities by the Council at the Retreat with the ability to report the progress on action taken in the accomplishment of said priorities throughout the year has been taking place for the past five retreats. The pre-process of building the agenda structure was a new function in an effort to provide the Council with more time during the Retreat to dedicate to the priorities. He reviewed the criteria of what a priority was and how they differed from the core values of the City.

Council Member Kniss asked if there were other agenda's within the Retreat Agenda that may not be as clearly visible as what was listed. She recommended the use of a facilitator to run the future Retreat which would allow the Mayor the ability to participate without the distraction of running the meeting as well.

Mr. Keene state the bulk of the Retreat had been directed in such a way as to focus on the priorities and the actions steps necessary to accomplish them. There was the assignment of Guiding Principles and Core Values which the Sub-Committee thought and he agreed the timeframe did not allow for a full range of discussion.

# MINUTES

Council Member Klein mentioned the format of the Retreat Agenda was driven by the frustrations at the recent past Retreats. There was not prior preparation or extensive thought on the part of the Council Member; therefore, the end result of the Retreat was unclear as to what the priorities were. He mentioned an e-mail received defining the difference between a mandatory and discretionary priority. He acknowledged other cities performed their retreats differently than Palo Alto but the goal of Palo Alto was to set the priorities for the upcoming year rather than selecting pet projects.

Council Member Holman noted there was a goal of three priorities but it was simply a goal and not a requirement to limit it to three. She said the set timeframe of 30 minutes per potential priority but there were a number of action points under each potential priority and she believed that was not ample time for a clear discussion. She asked if the action items would return to Council for vetting at a later time.

Mr. Keene said the timelines on the agenda were estimates so it was possible the Council could schedule more than 30 minutes per item. The discussion of the action items within the category had two purposes; to assist in informing what the meaning was and to receive as much definition from the Council as early as possible for the accomplished action steps. He acknowledged there were more action steps per category than had been identified because there are micro steps that occur as the progress moved forward.

Council Member Holman believed it would be beneficial to build in the opportunity for further discussion on the priorities as they were agreed upon and whether or not they remain priorities during the year.

Vice Mayor Shepherd recalled the angst previously felt on how the retreat was run and was pleased at how the Retreat was now meaningful and purposeful with thoughtful and strategic motions for setting priorities. She appreciated the Core Value and Guiding Principles concept and the goal of mixing them as Core Principles or Guiding Values. She suggested adding Civic Engagement as one of the Core Values for the City.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer to the Finance Committee consideration of dedicating certain revenue streams to certain infrastructure projects to be heard during Finance Committee budget hearings.

# MINUTES

Vice Mayor Shepherd believed the process of the Retreat was a specific timeline dedicated for specific reasons and she did not feel adding certain items such as the revenue stream discussion was Retreat material.

Council Member Burt agreed an in-depth discussion of the revenue stream was not the best use of Retreat time and offered an Amendment to refer the item to the Finance Committee and then to the Infrastructure Committee prior to returning to the full Council for discussion.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to direct the Finance Committee to refer to the Infrastructure Committee their recommendations prior to returning to full Council for consideration.

Council Member Holman asked if the item went to the Finance Committee and then to the Infrastructure Committee and she believed the two bodies were not going to agree completely, was there an issue once the full Council received the item.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, stated as long as the item was heard in an open and noticed fashion for both Committees it would be acceptable.

Mr. Keene believed having both Committees review the matter would be beneficial for the Council because they would both be looking at it from different perspectives.

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0**

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Price to send Protocols and Procedures to the Policy and Services Committee with a recommendation that they define the Council Liaison role and address item 2.4 in Procedures and Protocols "Conduct with Palo Alto Boards and Commissions."

Council Member Price supported the Motion because there was not ample time during the retreat to address certain matters that were better vetted by the Policy & Services Committee. The role of liaison needed to be clear to the liaison and to the Board or Commission they were supporting.

Vice Mayor Shepherd noted the information provided regarding the role and responsibility to the liaisons was inarticulate for the Boards and Commission as well as for the liaison to a community organization and what the role of the organization to the liaison was.

# MINUTES

Council Member Burt said if the item was being directed to the Policy & Services Committee he felt there should be at least a brief time allotted during the Retreat for the entire Council to supply input. He recommended the terms be changed to roles, responsibilities, duties, and authorities should be reviewed as they were considered in the Friend's organizations, community organizations, and the Boards and Commissions. He offered an Amendment to the Motion to add "and community groups that Council Members are designated liaisons to" after the "Boards and Commissions." He wished to determine whether there was a necessity and whether it was appropriate for Council Members as liaisons to attend all of the additional meetings considering the utilization of the Council Members' time and the independence of the Board or Commission. It should be structured in a manner where the Council Member in the liaison position was available for the purposes of providing guidance of Council processes or actions. There needed to be boundaries established because the current verbiage states the role of liaison was limited to the process and action taken by Council.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** after "Boards and Commissions" add "and community groups that Council Members are designated liaisons to."

Council Member Klein stated section 3.1 of the protocols and procedures indicated at the beginning of each legislative year there would be a review; he was unfamiliar with the phrase each legislative year. He asked for a definition or meaning.

Ms. Stump stated the Council had the ability to interpret and apply a meaning because they were the Council procedural rules. Her understanding from the City Clerk was traditionally the beginning of the calendar year in some form or another.

Council Member Klein supported the Motion but noted if the item was returning to the full Council, he suggested an Amendment to include the Policy & Services Committee act on the matter in a timely fashion to return a recommendation to the full Council in March of 2013.

Vice Mayor Shepherd supported the Amendment and noted the Motion was not intended to open each line but believed the guidance in the specific area of the policies and procedures was short and non-descriptive. She wished to see the determination on whether the Friend's groups needed Council liaisons.

# MINUTES

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** the Policy and Services Committee is to act on this so Council could hear this item in March 2013.

Council Member Kniss asked for clarification as to whether the Policy & Services Committee was tasked with returning to Council with a complete report on what the conduct of the liaison to the Boards and Commissions should be; their attendance, involvement, the number of meetings. She felt a March deadline was not sufficient.

Vice Mayor Shepherd recommended the Chair of the Policy & Committee keep the Council updated if there was more time required to complete a directive. The process which primarily brought the matter to the Council's attention was the Policy and Procedures handbook needed to be recognized annually.

Council Member Burt clarified the Motion was not in an attempt to address all of the section in the procedures; although he agreed section 3.1 was confusing as it was written. He believed section 3.1 was in reference to the annual training.

**MOTION RECAPPED:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Price to send Protocols and Procedures to the Policy and Services Committee with a recommendation that they define the Council Liaison role and address item 2.4 in Procedures and Protocols "Conduct with Palo Alto Boards and Commissions" and community groups that Council Members are designated liaisons to. The Policy and Services Committee is to act on this so Council could hear this item in March 2013.

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0**

Mayor Scharff noted the next topic was whether there should be mid-year retreats.

Council Member Burt felt a follow-up retreat would be appropriate but he did not feel mid-year would be the best time if specific actions were being reviewed. Mid-year was a short time prior to the summer break and during budget season.

**MOTION:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Klein for Council to have in the first month of spring a retreat to discuss the adopted priorities and consider in more depth the potential action items.

Council Member Klein requested a clearer timeframe than early spring.

# MINUTES

Mr. Keene recommended from March 20, 2013 to early April to be considered for the follow-up retreat.

Council Member Kniss believed it was commendable to consider a follow-up retreat; although, her understanding was the venue was to discuss whether the priorities had been accomplished.

Council Member Burt clarified the follow-up retreat was intended to discuss in greater detail the action items in the context of the priorities having been adopted during the retreat on February 2, 2013.

Council Member Klein agreed the initial retreat did not have ample time to cover in-depth detail of each action step necessary for each priority.

Council Member Kniss asked if the follow-up retreat was an extension of the retreat.

Council Member Klein stated it was.

Council Member Kniss supported the concept and was hopeful to accomplish the follow-up tasks in three hours' time.

Council Member Klein noted the timeframe had not been discussed as of yet.

Council Member Kniss suggested the possibility of the follow-up retreat being an evening meeting rather than a Saturday.

Mayor Scharff recommended the City Clerk would poll the Council for available dates and times.

Council Member Kniss supported the follow-up retreat if the possibility was for it to not be held on a weekend.

Council Member Klein noted in 2012 there were four retreats and he recalled three of them were evening meetings. He supported an evening meeting for the follow-up retreat.

Council Member Burt was not opposed to the possibility; although, he did not wish to preclude a Saturday retreat. He suggested waiting until the end of the current retreat to determine the need for the follow-up.

Council Member Schmid asked for clarification on Item Number 4 for the proposed agenda. He believed the follow-up session would be on Item

# MINUTES

Number for Core Values/Guiding Principles but it appears as though it will be on the priorities. He asked where the time was set-aside for the Core Value discussion.

Council Member Burt stated the sequence shifted to the second retreat being framed around the Staff proposal but the statement was correct there were a limited number of minutes to discuss the Core Values. He suggested a modification to the Motion; discuss the adopted priorities, consider more depth to the potential action items and discuss perspective core values.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to discuss adopted priorities, consider more in depth the potential action items and the potential core values.

Council Member Price felt the Core Values and Guiding Principles should be discussed prior to the priorities. She believed the agenda was too ambitious and she was not convinced there would be a quality discussion to each item in the allotted time.

Council Member Klein clarified the Motion on the floor was explicit to the April meeting thus did not add time to the discussion of Saturday's retreat agenda. He noted the 2013 retreat agenda was far more focused and organized because of the advanced planning and consideration of the proposed priorities.

**AMENDMENT TO MOTION** Council Member Price moved, seconded by XXXX to say instead of "in the first month of spring" say "in the second quarter of 2013."

## **AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO LACK OF SECOND**

Council Member Schmid stated the notion that priorities were special activities throughout the year that could make a difference and the Council should spend the retreat time on such activities. There were additional notions that there were a series of Core Values or Guiding Principles that were enduring over time that were important and significant which should be acknowledged by the Council. He believed Agenda Item Number 4 was a sequencing of the reiterated Core Values. According to the Agenda the Core Values would be setting up future sessions and the priorities and action steps would be the work of the Council over the year.

Council Member Kniss reiterated if the Core Values were not in place how were the priorities being selected. The Core Values should be the driving force behind the action items.

# MINUTES

Council Member Klein stated the Core Values were clear although had not been documented; balanced finances, environmental sustainability, social equity, and care for the youth. Without being exclusive he did not feel there were any controversial items. He believed the Motion provided adequate ability to continue any discussion to the April meeting that may not be completed on February 2, 2013.

Council Member Kniss mentioned the Agenda documented Item Number four as potential Core Values. She asked if there were possible additions to them.

Council Member Klein stated the term potential referred to potentially adopted.

Council Member Kniss asked if there were more Core Values being added.

Council Member Klein noted currently there were no Core Values documented.

Council Member Kniss urged the Council to document the Core Values prior to discussing the action plans.

Council Member Burt noted there would not be an action plan at the end of Saturday's retreat but there would be perspective actions. The actions were tied to the priorities not the Core Values. He agreed that he would have preferred the Core Values to precede the priorities. The focus of the Saturday Retreat was surrounding priority setting with brief discussions around actions and Core Values. The second session was to refine the implementation of the priorities and provide the opportunity to have a meaningful and thoughtful discussion on Core Values.

## **MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0**

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to request the City Clerk bring a report to the February 2, 2013 City Council Meeting so Council can set the 2013 Council breaks at that meeting.

Vice Mayor Shepherd stated her understanding was the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) had changed their schedule and she believed an interconnected break would benefit the Council. She recommended the City Clerk to gather Council recommendations and submit proposed dates.

Donna Grider, City Clerk, informed the Council the Municipal Code documented the setting of Council break be completed in February of each

# MINUTES

year. She had polled for dates and heard from seven of the nine Council Members. She would prepare an Action Item report for the Council meeting of February 04, 2013.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

Mayor Scharff asked if Staff required a Motion to adopt the Retreat Agenda.

Ms. Stump clarified the Council would not be adopting the current agenda but the content of the agenda and Staff would adjust the language to ensure the recommended adjustments were met.

**MOTION:** Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Price to adopt the content of the Council Retreat Agenda as modified by previous Motions.

Council Member Holman stated typically and traditionally at the retreat the public would speak after the Council Member's spoke. She appreciated the improvements to the agenda but recommended transposing Agenda Items Numbers 3B and 3C.

**INCORPORATED INTO MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to transpose the City Council Retreat Agenda Item Numbers 3b and 3c.

Ms. Keene explained Agenda Item 3D was where the Council formally began to work on how they chose to regroup the nominated priorities into categories. Agenda Item 3B was to allow the opportunity for Council Members to explain their thoughts when they were discussing the items. Staff felt 3B informed the public more before they spoke in an effort to assist their comments in an informed manner.

Council Member Holman felt hearing the public comment first may form how Council explained their thoughts.

**AMENDMENT TO MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd to retain original Retreat Agenda order.

Council Member Schmid stated the original Agenda was set-up to gather input from Council and the community in written format. Agenda Item 3b was meant for the Council to acknowledge their ideas were understood and correctly placed. He saw 3B as a Council clarification of their points of view.

# MINUTES

Council Member Burt supported the original Motion of the transposition of Agenda Item Number 3B and 3C. He preferred to hear the community's comments and see how they may alter his views on a matter.

Council Member Price supported the original Motion because hearing the public prior was beneficial to both parties.

**AMENDMENT FAILED:** 5-4 Klein, Kniss, Schmid, Shepherd, yes

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED:** 9-0

## COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Mayor Shepherd reported the Pacific Art League invited the public to their February 9, 2013 Gala fund raiser at the Garden Court Hotel from 6-11pm.

Council Member Price mentioned the Palo Alto Developmental Assets Initiative gave inspirational post cards to her and she would like Council Members to send a post card to youth who could use the encouragement. The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) would hold a fair reduction demonstration program. The environmental scoping for the buss rapid transit would begin in February 2013. She also encouraged members of the public to attend events at the Bing Concert Hall at Stanford.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 P.M.