



CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Special Meeting
March 17, 2014

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:09 P.M.

Mayor Shepherd announced the Study Session would be heard at 6:00 P.M. If the Study Session was not completed by 7:00 P.M., it would be tabled in order to convene the Public Improvement Corporation Board Meeting. Following adjournment of the Public Improvement Corporation Board Meeting, the Council would hear Item Numbers 3 and 4 and then the Study Session if it was not completed earlier.

Present: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss, Scharff arrived at 6:14 P.M., Schmid, Shepherd

Absent: Price

STUDY SESSION

1. The National Citizen Survey 2013.

Houman Boussina, Acting City Auditor, reported the 11th annual National Citizen Survey was conducted by the National Research Center (NRC) in coordination with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). Surveys were mailed to 1,200 Palo Alto households in August 2013, of which 337 surveys or 29 percent were returned. NRC gathered information from approximately 500 local jurisdictions for benchmarking purposes. The National Citizen Survey was comprised of four components: a report of survey results, a benchmark report, a geographic subgroup comparisons report, and a trend report. The NRC utilized a GIS software system to track the locations where surveys were mailed. The north-south boundary for geographic comparisons of Palo Alto was Page Mill Road or Oregon Expressway. According to the NRC, the overall quality of community life could be the best indicator of success in providing natural ambience, services, and amenities that made a community attractive. The overall community quality measures were overall quality of life in Palo Alto; neighborhood as a place to live; Palo Alto as a place to live; recommend living in Palo Alto to someone who asks; and remain in Palo Alto for the next five years. For most of the measures, residents rated Palo Alto very highly.

Measures which improved in survey ratings between 2012 and 2013 were percent of crime victims who reported the crime to police; job growth seen as too slow; and personal economic future. Measures which declined in ratings between 2012 and 2013 were land use, planning, and zoning; services provided by the Federal government and by Santa Clara County government; overall quality of new development in Palo Alto; amount of public parking; Palo Alto as a place to retire; safety in your neighborhood after dark; bus or transit services; safety in Palo Alto's Downtown area after dark; participated in a club or civic group in Palo Alto; opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities; and safety from violent crime. The NRC reviewed 19 services and identified 4 that correlated most highly with residents' perceptions of overall city service quality. The services were public information services, public schools, sidewalk maintenance, and street lighting. In theory by targeting improvements in key services, the City could focus on services that had the greatest likelihood of influencing residents' opinions about overall service quality. There were no key drivers ranked below the benchmark or trending lower than the benchmark in the 2012 survey. The NRC noted that the City may wish to seek improvement in sidewalk maintenance since it received ratings similar to other benchmarked jurisdictions. Areas with statistically significant differences in the geographic subgroups included services to seniors; opportunities to attend cultural activities; opportunities to participate in social events; sense of community; openness; services to youth; quality of business; ease of bus travel; ease of rail travel; overall direction Palo Alto was taking; recreational opportunities; availability of preventive health services; Palo Alto as a place to work; overall quality of life; shopping; overall appearance; environmental hazards; educational opportunities; neighborhood as a place to live; and Palo Alto as a place to raise children. There were significant improvements from 2003 to 2013 in trends for employment opportunities, economic development, services to youth, availability of affordable quality housing, and sidewalk maintenance. Selected trends with declines in ratings included garbage collection, overall quality of new development, public parking, and bus or transit services. Some of the safety perception ratings which experienced declines were Palo Alto's Downtown area after dark and property crimes. Staff compiled data from 2003 to 2013 and made it available on the City's Open Data platform. Raw data was comprised of approximately 5,000 records representing approximately 5,000 National Citizen Surveys from 2003 to 2013.

Council Member Schmid remarked that the report was referenced throughout the year in a variety of ways. He noted the dramatic decline in ratings for land use assessments and quality of new developments. He was particularly upset by the comparisons of north Palo Alto and south Palo Alto. The differences began at 24 percent and 14 measures had differences

greater than 10 percent. He requested Staff comment on those startling discrepancies and ways to address them.

James Keene, City Manager, suggested Staff could obtain more specific or granular location data if the Council was interested in the issue. Clusters of responses could correlate with proximity to bus service, access for seniors, or other such issues. Staff could more easily deal with specific service issues as opposed to people's perception of the community. He did not know what the historical information would demonstrate or if issues were related to the underlying urban design of one area versus the other. There were a host of issues that could play into these things.

Council Member Schmid understood the north-south division had not been a regular part of the presentation. The same types of discrepancies were last seen in the Library Bond election of 2008. If the discrepancies were averaged, they probably totaled around 12 percentage points between north and south Palo Alto. That was the same discrepancy in the Maybell election.

Council Member Klein noted that the questionnaire was mailed at approximately the same time as the Measure D campaign. He inquired whether there was a method to determine the impact, if any, of the Measure D campaign on responses.

Mr. Boussina was not able to answer that.

Council Member Klein believed many of the differences between 2012 and 2013 begged for more information. The report indicated a greater concern about crime in the Downtown area between 2012 and 2013; however, crime did not increase between 2012 and 2013. He wished to learn the objective facts behind the difference in answers. He asked if Staff had the ability to probe more deeply.

Mr. Boussina reported Staff could not make additional inquiries in the scope of the current survey. The City could ask customized questions in future surveys.

Council Member Klein suggested survey questions include whether the answer was the same as given the previous year and, if not, why not. This could provide the reasoning behind perceived changes when the objective facts indicated there were no changes.

Mr. Boussina indicated in the Performance Report Staff attempted to incorporate and place side-by-side some information from the National Citizen Survey with facts.

Council Member Klein was interested in raw data rather than opinions.

Council Member Burt was also interested in north-south disparities and actual differences in services. Some striking categories with statistically significant differences were openness to diverse backgrounds; preventative healthcare access; safety of Downtown; sense of community; place to work; availability of religious and spiritual opportunities; and employment opportunities within the City. Interestingly, there was no difference in perception about the rate of the population of growth being too fast. At a minimum, the report showed a difference in perceptions. There could be differences also in realities. Downtown was not safer for north Palo Alto residents than for south Palo Alto residents. Employment opportunities in the City were not different.

Council Member Holman suggested the information could be used to poll in a larger way, using the same or similar questions. She inquired whether the questions had a priority.

Mr. Keene answered no.

Council Member Holman felt some of the questions would inform the Council's discussion of the Comprehensive Plan and Planned Communities (PC). The questions seemed to have identified some dissatisfaction in the areas of land use and quality of design. The percentages related to civic engagement questions changed only slightly. With all of Staff's outreach and community engagement efforts, civic engagement percentages remained very low.

Council Member Scharff noted almost 90 percent of respondents recommended living in Palo Alto. A large percentage of people would remain in Palo Alto for the next five years. 84 percent of respondents indicated the government of Palo Alto was doing a good job. That was striking in comparison to the ratings for Federal, State and Santa Clara County governments. 92 percent of respondents rated Palo Alto as an excellent place to live, while 7 percent rated Palo Alto as a poor place to live. That difference was striking when considering the north-south divide. The rating of Palo Alto as a place to retire was interesting and could be reviewed at some future time. The overall quality of life in Palo Alto was rated excellent or good by 91 percent of respondents across both the north and south. Traffic signal timing was an issue for many respondents. There seemed to be an issue with quality of design; respondents did not perceive new development as having a good quality of design. He inquired whether the Council could obtain granular information for some issues.

Mr. Keene indicated any poll was designed to test perceptions. Surveys and reports could point towards issues; however, the Council should be careful about drawing conclusions. Ratings for the amount of public parking

declined from 2003 to 2013; however, ratings for Palo Alto were higher in comparison to other benchmarked cities. Parking was an issue for residents, and the Council would take action even though the City rated higher than other cities. Staff was planning to determine ways to maintain good scores and improve poor scores. Fire and libraries would always score higher than the Development Center or Code enforcement, even across cities. Inherently, it was difficult to obtain a high score for some negative issues. Staff would be happy to obtain detailed explanations if the Council was interested in that.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether respondents' age and gender matched the City's demographic data.

Mr. Boussina stated the factual results were weighted so that they would match.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether the demographics of respondents were similar to the demographics of Palo Alto.

Mr. Boussina did not have at hand a breakdown of the actual demographics. Results were weighted to consider any variances between the population and the actual makeup of Palo Alto.

Council Member Berman indicated page 9 provided an age breakdown for Palo Alto residents. A desire for multifamily housing in transit corridors could correlate with the low number of respondents interested in retiring in Palo Alto. Even though fewer people had been victims of crime, there was a perception that crime was worse.

Vice Mayor Kniss felt people who were anxious to live in Palo Alto were not as concerned with issues as long-time residents. The Council should review how the survey was performed. An overall quality of life above 90 percent was not all bad.

Mayor Shepherd believed mobility was very important to quality of life. She was interested in the impact of the new Mitchell Park Library and Community Center and improvements at Cubberley on ratings from residents in south Palo Alto. However, those results would not be available for a few years. It would be appropriate for the Policy and Services Committee to consider issues for more exploration. The upper limits for monthly housing costs and household income were low for Palo Alto. She wanted a better understanding of the actual cost of living. She asked if the Policy and Services Committee reviewed survey questions.

Mr. Boussina reported Staff reviewed questions internally and discussed customized questions with Departments. Staff could discuss with NRC any particular concerns or level of granularity that might be desirable.

2. City of Palo Alto FY 2013 Performance Report (formerly the Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report) and Citizen Centric Report.

Houman Boussina, Acting City Auditor, indicated the Performance Report provided background on spending, staffing and workload, multiyear historical comparisons, and comparisons to other cities. It was designed for use by elected officials, management, and the public, and covered Fiscal Year 2013. Methodology was set by the Government Accounting Standards Board and the Association of Government Accountants. The Performance Report did not comprise a complete set of performance measures. Population figures were the most recent estimates from the California Department of Finance and other sources including the U.S. Census Bureau. Financial data was not adjusted for inflation; however, background information included Consumer Price Index (CPI) information. Some tables and graphs might not add up to 100 percent; however, the percent change was based on underlying numbers, not the rounded numbers. Comparisons to nearby California cities were provided where available. With respect to comparisons, he cautioned the Council to remember that cities provided different levels of services and categorized expenditures in different ways. The purpose of the Performance Report was to supplement other key City reports including the Annual Budget and the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. The Performance Report could help focus efforts on the most significant areas of interest or concern. A brief explanation of internal/external factors that might affect performance results was included when possible. The Performance Report did not thoroughly analyze the causes of negative or positive performance. Departments utilized the Performance Report for a variety of purposes. Copies of the Performance Report were available from the City Auditor's Office and from the City's website.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to table this item to after Special Orders of the Day on the Agenda.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Price absent

The Council adjourned to the Public Improvement Corporation Board meeting at 7:03 P.M. and reconvened as the City Council at 7:10 P.M.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

3. Proclamation for Tsuchiura Students Visit to Palo Alto and Introduction of Marathon Runner for the 24th Kasumigaura Marathon.

Keiko Nakajima, Neighbors Abroad, introduced 16 guest students and 16 host students. Zachi Baharav, the marathon runner would represent Palo Alto in the 24th Kasumigaura International Marathon in Tsuchiura on April 20, 2014.

Zachi Baharav, Marathon runner, thanked the Council and Neighbors Abroad for the opportunity to participate in the Marathon. He would return with photographs to show the community.

Ms. Nakajima indicated 16 junior high students from Tsuchiura arrived in Palo Alto on March 14, 2014. Host families and the community gave students a warm welcome at a barbeque. Students would depart Palo Alto on March 23, 2014. In June 2014, 22 Palo Alto students and parents would visit Tsuchiura.

Ms. Wada appreciated the invitation to visit Palo Alto. This was the 20th anniversary of the student exchange program and the fifth anniversary of the Sister City relationship between Tsuchiura and Palo Alto. Tsuchiura welcomed more opportunities to interact with Palo Alto.

Mayor Shepherd thanked host families for opening their homes to exchange students.

Vice Mayor Kniss read the Proclamation into the record.

4. In Recognition of Valuable Contribution to Four Aspiring Journalists at Jordan Middle School for Producing a Video to Solicit and Encourage Input From the Community on Palo Alto's Core Values.

Claudia Keith, Chief Information Officer, thanked the students for their creativity and assistance in developing the Core Values video.

Council reconvened to the Study Session on the 2013 Performance Report.

2. City of Palo Alto FY 2013 Performance Report (formerly the Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report) and Citizen Centric Report.

Mayor Shepherd did not believe demographic data on page 9 was useful and inquired whether Staff could provide better information.

Houman Boussina, Acting City Auditor, reported the information was taken from the Census Bureau.

Mayor Shepherd requested more granular information.

Mr. Boussina would provide that.

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Mayor Shepherd announced that the renaming of the Main Library (Agenda Item Number 15) would be continued to April 7, 2014.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

Jim Keene, City Manager, reported the City Clerk was recruiting members for the Human Relations Commission, the Library Advisory Commission, the Public Art Commission, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. Community meetings regarding the pilot program for solid waste collection were scheduled for March 26, 2014 and March 29, 2014. Results from the pilot program would be presented to the Finance Committee on June 3, 2014. Development Services recently launched Accela Citizen Access to provide online services for the public. On March 24, 2014, the Utilities Department would receive the 2014 award from Silicon Valley Water Conservations Awards Coalition for outstanding commitment to water conservation.

Eric Nickel, Fire Chief, indicated Pulse Point was a cost-effective method to connect the community with technology to save lives. Pulse Point would provide notice of all emergency medical, fire, and rescue dispatches. It would send a text alert if CPR/AED was needed in a public location and would provide CPR self-help.

Mr. Keene acknowledged an email letter from Cheryl Lilienstein and Palo Altans to Preserve Neighborhood Zoning regarding several issues. Staff would respond to items within Staff's purview.

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Klein attended the National League of Cities meeting in Washington, DC the prior week, where he spoke regarding the City's carbon neutral electrical generation program.

Vice Mayor Kniss indicated Council Member Klein gave an excellent presentation. While at the conference, Council Members spoke with consultants, the Army Corps of Engineers, Senator Feinstein's staff,

Representative Anna Eshoo, Senator Boxer's staff, and the Department of Transportation.

Mayor Shepherd spoke at the Clean Tech Conference hosted by the Sierra Club in San Francisco the prior week. Chief Sustainability Officer Gil Friend attended as well. She attended the French Fair and welcomed the UN Ambassador of French-speaking countries in Africa. She also attended the Palo Alto High School gym closing event along with other Council Members. She and Richard Hackmann met with Senator Hill regarding legislation.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Wynn Grcich announced Ireland was the latest country to stop fluoridation. On March 22, 2014, Clean Water California would hold a march against fluoride in San Francisco. Fluoride was a hazardous waste and caused cancer.

Don Barr reported 129 children age 18 and under lived in Buena Vista Mobile Home Park, 101 of whom attended Palo Alto schools. Of the 31 children in high school and 4 children in local community colleges, not a single one dropped out of school. He provided additional information regarding healthcare and dental care for children living in Buena Vista Mobile Home Park. All children in the mobile home park were receiving substantial benefit from living in Palo Alto.

Don Anderson knew the residents of Buena Vista Mobile Home Park as hardworking people who cared about one another and the neighborhood. Closing Buena Vista Mobile Home Park would mean the loss of 108 units of affordable housing. The City should commit substantial funds to assist Buena Vista residents or an affordable housing developer to buy the site.

Omar Chatty noted another person was killed by Caltrain in Atherton. Caltrain had killed four people in Palo Alto since the beginning of 2013. Caltrain did not belong in an urban environment. He requested the Council work with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to bring the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) to Palo.

Herb Borock remarked that the Caltrain Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for electrification was tentatively scheduled for Council discussion on April 7, 2014. He requested the Council consider having the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC), the Architectural Review Board (ARB) and possibly the Historic Resources Board (HRB) make recommendations. The Council meeting on April 7 was an opportunity for the Council to obtain public comments and to review comments from Staff and Boards and Commissions.

Margaret Heath did not believe the lease between the developer and his son for a grocery store at the proposed 2180 El Camino Real Planned Community (PC) development met the requirements of the PC Ordinance.

Adina Levin, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition Volunteer, announced May 17, 2014 would be Bike to Shop Day. This was an opportunity for residents to experience bicycling for trips other than to work. Volunteers were organizing merchant discounts and promotions for bicyclists.

Shani Kleinhaus, Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, noted the Lucy Evans Baylands Nature Interpretive Center boardwalk was closed. She asked the Council to invest funds in repairing and reopening it as quickly as possible. The Audubon Society would support the City's efforts to obtain permits for repairs.

Stephanie Munoz commented that the homeless shelter for mothers and children at the Lutheran church close to the Stanford University campus would close April 16, 2014. The Sunnyvale Armory shelter would close to allow construction of affordable housing. The Buena Vista Mobile Home Park was in danger of closing. The Council needed to take some action to help the homeless.

MINUTES APPROVAL

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to approve the minutes of January 27, 2014, February 1 and 3, 2014.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Price absent

CONSENT CALENDAR

Ralph Thomas supported Agenda Item Number 9, the improved bicycle infrastructure. Improvements should be made to improve safety for bicyclists.

Penny Ellson supported the Staff recommendation for Agenda Item Number 9, regarding bicycle and pedestrian projects. The action was an efficient method to design individual projects. She thanked Staff for their extensive outreach to neighborhoods and every Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) school site community.

Andrew Boone felt Agenda Item Number 9, the Bicycle Boulevard network was a big step forward. Creating a network of boulevards was a brilliant solution for commuting by bicycle.

Keri Wagner commented that Agenda Item Number 9, the Charleston/Arastradero Complete Street Project was vigorously vetted and received approval. Charleston/Arastradero Road would be an important part of the proposed integrated network and should be included in the complete network.

Michael Midolo opposed Agenda Item Number 8, the addition of a bocce ball court to Scott Park because of noise. Heritage Park would be a better site for a bocce ball court.

Omar Chatty spoke regarding Agenda Item Number 9 and believed bringing the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) up the Peninsula would allow a 60-mile bike path between San Francisco and San Jose. Bike networks in all cities could tie into the bike path. Bike networks aligned with the larger picture of regional transportation.

MOTION: Council Member Berman moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Kniss to approve Agenda Item Numbers 5-13.

5. Cancellation of April 14, 2014 Council meeting.
6. Approval of the Acceptance and Expenditure of Citizens Options for Public Safety (COPS) Funds on Various Law Enforcement Equipment and Approval of a Budget Amendment Ordinance 5237 entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto for the Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Fund."
7. Revenue Agreement with the County of Santa Clara in the Amount of \$250,000 Over Two Years for Support of Intensive Case Management in Connection with Housing Subsidies to be Provided by the County of Santa Clara for Palo Alto's Homeless.
8. Recommendation to Adopt a Park Improvement Ordinance for the Design of the Scott Park Capital Improvement Project.
9. Approval of Five Consultant Contracts Totaling \$2,231,211 for Design and Environmental Review of Bicycle Plan Implementation Projects and Adoption of a Budget Amendment Ordinance 5238 for \$335,000.
10. Approval of Seven On-Call Planning and Environmental Consulting Services Contracts and Amendment of One On-Call Planning Contract for the Department of Planning and Community Environment to Support Routine Current Planning Activities, Special Projects, and Environmental Review for a Total Not to Exceed Amount of \$931,998.

11. Approval to Extend CALNET2 State Contract with AT&T for Telecommunications in an Amount Not to Exceed \$400,000 Annually, Contract: C10133753.
12. Approval of Amendment No. Two to Professional Services Agreement with Genuent USA, LLC for IT Staff Augmentation in an Amount to Not Exceed \$350,000.
13. Approval of a Contract with Canopy for a Three-Year Period Not to Exceed \$354,630 for Assistance with Urban Forestry Programs and Community Outreach.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Price absent

ACTION ITEMS

14. Comprehensive Plan Update – Review of Revised Approach, Schedule, Scope of Work, Approval of Amendment Number 2 to Contract C08125506 with The Planning Center | DCE in the amount of \$597,206 and Adoption of a Budget Amendment Ordinance 5239 entitled “Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto in the Amount of \$200,000 for Consultant Support Related to the Ongoing Update of Palo Alto’s Comprehensive Plan for the Future of Our City” (Continued from March 3, 2014).

Steven Turner, Advanced Planner, reported Staff had reached the point in updating the Comprehensive Plan to begin discussions with the Council and to initiate the environmental review process. Late in 2013, the Council and Staff began discussions regarding the relationship of the Comprehensive Plan to other studies such as the Housing Element update, Planned Community (PC) reform, the Downtown Development CAP Study, and the Downtown Parking and Traffic Studies. The thought at that time was to develop a program to capture and foster the relationships between studies while allowing extensive public engagement efforts. The Our Palo Alto process was a framework of ideas, actions, and designs with the Comprehensive Plan update representing the design portion. The Comprehensive Plan was built around goals, policies, and programs that addressed all parts of the City, not only land use. Elements of the Comprehensive Plan focused on specific topics. The Business and Economics and Governance Elements were optional. Only the Council was required to approve the Comprehensive Plan. The original Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1998 and included a Citywide development cap of 1.3 million commercial square feet and a Downtown cap of 350,000 commercial square feet. The City had not reached those caps. Per City Council direction, an updated Comprehensive Plan was not likely to introduce any significant new

land use or policy changes. In 2006, the Council wanted to focus on a number of issues, including preservation of commercial land uses, retail and services; incorporation of sustainability concepts; updating the Housing Element; and preparing Concept Area Plans for California Avenue and East Meadow. In 2010, the Council provided direction to Staff: 1) to update growth projections; 2) to update the document structure, vision, goals, policies and programs and to remove repetition and redundancy; and 3) to consider policies for the south El Camino Real area. Staff worked with the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) to address those items. Where appropriate, Staff included community involvement from partners and stakeholder groups. Staff reviewed draft edits with other Boards and Commissions and then reviewed each Element with the P&TC as a public hearing item. The P&TC accepted those Elements. Staff reviewed six of the seven draft Element goals, policies, and programs. Staff felt the Governance Element could be completed near the end of the process and could serve as an executive summary. The two Concept Area Plans and a future year traffic demand forecasting model were prepared. Now was the time to forge a collective vision for the City, to consolidate all concurrent planning efforts, and to question growth management strategies. Our Palo Alto was a framework for planning efforts and provided an opportunity for broad community engagement. Staff proposed a ceremonial kick-off of the Comprehensive Plan update process by reuniting participants in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan effort. Staff proposed to convene a Community Leadership Group comprised of a broad spectrum of the community. Within the kick-off phase, Staff would issue the formal Notice of Preparation and project description to begin the environmental review and scoping period. Community engagement would begin in April 2014 and extend through August 2014. Staff would release and distribute baseline data including studies focused on build-out calculations, jobs, housing, and employment trends. Development of alternative scenarios would be studied in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Staff wanted to listen to community ideas and concerns for the future, hold public hearings, and provide information through the City's website. Staff would utilize online tools and social media and hold a symposium throughout the City on current issues such as housing affordability, demographics, urban design, and automobile use. After completing public outreach, Staff would develop the draft EIR and Comprehensive Plan document. Another series of public engagements would be utilized to select preferred alternatives. In 2015, Staff would release the final Comprehensive Plan document and the final EIR with expanded analysis of the preferred alternative scenario and would respond to public comment. The final EIR and Comprehensive Plan could be adopted and certified by December 2015. In early 2016, Staff proposed creating an online and interactive user's guide to provide greater accessibility to the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan consultant, Place Works, began working with

Staff in 2008 by reviewing all existing Elements, suggesting revisions, adding sustainability concepts, preparing Concept Area Plans and a future year traffic demand scenario model, and administering the website. Staff requested an amendment of the Place Works contract to include new tasks for community engagement tools, an extended scoping period and additional meetings, development of alternative scenarios, and development of a user's guide. Staff recommended the Council reframe the process for the Comprehensive Plan to provide robust alternatives analysis and to initiate an expanded community engagement exercise.

Robert Moss felt the overall approach was good. Adoption of policies and programs should include timelines for completion. Staff should consider all impacts through an integrated view.

Stephanie Munoz suggested Mr. Turner review residents' comments regarding previous development projects. Development rights added to the value of land; however, they reduced the amount of land available for affordable housing.

Shani Kleinhaus believed the contract for the consultant was slightly high. Online tools were not effective and were easy to manipulate.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to: 1) adopt the recommended schedule to complete the Comprehensive Plan amendment and associated program-level Environmental Impact Report by the end of 2015; 2) approve Amendment Number 2 to Contract No. C08125506 in the amount of \$597,206 with The Planning Center|DCE to provide additional services associated with the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Project; and 3) approve a Budget Amendment Ordinance in the amount of \$200,000 to ensure the Planning and Community Environment Department has sufficient resources within the General Fund for the contract amendment.

Vice Mayor Kniss commented that the plan was good. The original Comprehensive Plan involved a large number of people who worked through a very long and complicated process. The two-year plan involved a limited number of people working closely with Staff. Going into the community to listen to comments was a terrific idea.

Council Member Scharff stated the fatal flaw in Staff's proposal was the one-year process for the Housing Element and the two-year process for the Comprehensive Plan. There would not be sufficient time to have a robust alternatives analysis before the Housing Element was due. The Housing Element process should be disconnected from the Comprehensive Plan process. The Council could approve the current Housing Element update,

and then use the two-year period to discuss rezoning. He inquired whether Staff considered decoupling the two processes.

Hillary Gitelman, Director Planning and Community Environment, indicated the State placed local jurisdictions in a difficult spot by giving a short time to update the Housing Element. Those people working on the Housing Element update could be forced to make quick choices without examining dramatic alternatives. If the Comprehensive Plan process occurred concurrently with the Housing Element process, Staff would have the opportunity and forum to discuss alternatives. If the Comprehensive Plan took a direction different from the Housing Element, then Staff would need to amend the Housing Element. At that point, hopefully the City would have some consensus regarding changes.

Council Member Scharff remarked that if the Council adopted Staff's proposal, the housing discussion would be decoupled from the Housing Element. When the Council reviewed the Comprehensive Plan, then it could ask the bigger questions. He asked if Staff would decouple the two processes.

Ms. Gitelman was sensitive to use of the term "decoupling," because the Housing Element was part of the Comprehensive Plan. The Council was required to adopt a Housing Element and Comprehensive Plan that were internally consistent. She understood the concern regarding the potential for confusion. Staff would have to find a good way to communicate those two different tasks and how they related to each other.

Council Member Scharff was not concerned with specific terminology. A first track would be to approve the Housing Element. A second track would be the conversation regarding the Comprehensive Plan that anticipated revisions to the Housing Element. If there were revisions, then the community could make suggestions.

Ms. Gitelman agreed. That was the process Staff was attempting to create.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether the Motion included that process as the concept.

Ms. Gitelman reported that was Staff's concept; although, Staff did not articulate it clearly.

James Keene, City Manager, felt it was important to recognize that the Housing Element would proceed quickly while the Comprehensive Plan conversation continued.

Council Member Scharff noted half the units needed to meet the City's Housing Element requirement were located at the Fry's site. The community needed a precise plan for the Fry's site; otherwise, it would be 30 residential units per acre with no retail or anything else.

Ms. Gitelman indicated the Fry's site would be part of the projects described in the first phrase.

Council Member Holman was happy to have a plan and a schedule and with various components; however, she was frustrated that it had taken so long to reach this point. She encouraged and supported Council Member Scharff's concerns regarding a California Avenue Concept Area Plan. If the Council did not move swiftly with the California Avenue Concept Area Plan, then the developer could submit a plan for the Fry's site over which the Council had little control. She was not overly concerned about the current Housing Element update, because rezoning would not be needed to meet the requirement. The existing Comprehensive Plan should be the basis for community discussions. The Staff Report seemed to propose use of the P&TC recommendations as the basis for the project description. The Council had not vetted the P&TC recommendations, and the recommendations were not broadly disseminated. The section on packet page 1302, what was worth preserving and where change would happen, seemed to be a negative approach to the existing Comprehensive Plan. She preferred an approach of stating the changes and the outcomes resulting from those changes. With respect to the Community Leadership Group, it appeared that Staff would meet with the group to review the community engagement plan, receive reports, and recommend adjustments to promote greater participation. She wanted to see processes that would educate, inform, and invest participants. She recommended adding EIR tutorials for Council, Boards, and Commissions. A deadline of December 2014 for the draft EIR seemed early as the final EIR would not be completed for another year.

Ms. Gitelman explained that Staff wanted to draft a project description that reflected where the City was in the Comprehensive Plan process. The best policy would be to explain where the City was, not which plan the City would begin with. She wanted to draft a project description that projected where the City would be if it maintained the existing course, and then discuss alternatives with the community.

Council Member Holman asked if the current Comprehensive Plan would be stated as "here is where the City is, here are recommendations from the P&TC," and then request community comments.

Ms. Gitelman stated Staff's concept was to develop a project description that described the fundamental tenets of the Comprehensive Plan as it existed,

which were not proposed to change; that described the land use pattern in the City based on the land use map in the Comprehensive Plan; that described the development caps stated in the Comprehensive Plan; and that described the work that occurred to begin revising the Comprehensive Plan. All of that would be combined into descriptive material that allowed and elicited meaningful comments regarding ideas and alternatives. For the Community Leadership Group, Staff could not utilize a 60-person committee in a schedule of 18-24 months. Staff proposed the Community Leadership Group be composed of 12-15 people. Staff would request applications from people who were interested in being leaders, who had connections in the community, and who had the ability to assist with community engagement. Staff was specifically searching for people with talent in community engagement and community networks.

Council Member Holman did not believe the Community Leadership Group would perform the actual work of revising the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Gitelman reported the group would make recommendations regarding the Comprehensive Plan. Community engagement would be added to the group's charge.

Council Member Holman inquired whether Staff was searching for representatives from broad interest groups.

Ms. Gitelman would solicit applications from people in various categories and evaluate those applications to empanel a group that would be partners throughout the Comprehensive Plan effort.

Council Member Holman asked if the Community Leadership Group would hold public meetings.

Ms. Gitelman responded yes. EIR tutorials were beyond the scope of the Comprehensive Plan effort. Staff anticipated a much longer review period for the draft EIR than was typical. Between December 2014 and December 2015, Staff would provide redline versions of the Elements on which the P&TC worked and request community input on policies and program language. Staff needed an extended period to achieve those two objectives.

Council Member Holman inquired about a method to expedite the California Avenue Concept Area Plan.

Ms. Gitelman indicated the P&TC's work regarding the California Avenue Concept Area Plan was a public document and available for review. At the Regional Housing Mandate Committee meeting, Staff promised to provide an analysis of the amount of housing that could be incorporated into the Fry's

site under the proposal in the California Avenue Concept Area Plan. The site was zoned for multifamily housing. Rezoning could not be accomplished quickly as it would require an environmental document of some complexity.

Council Member Schmid noted this was the first open Council discussion of the Comprehensive Plan in four years. One of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan was to retain City Council authority over decision making in these processes. Two tracks would not work. The Council was engaged in decision making with either the existing Comprehensive Plan or a new Comprehensive Plan. In either case, the Comprehensive Plan was not working. The existing Comprehensive Plan clearly stated that the goal was to have dense housing in mixed-use Downtown areas. Nothing in the Council's packet reflected the consultant's work over the past several years. He referenced the Housing Vision Statement, Policy H-3, and Policy L-9 of the Comprehensive Plan and Council discussions of May 12, 2010, June 23, 2010, and January 22, 2013. The existing Comprehensive Plan and Council actions clearly indicated housing density near transit was a good objective. The Housing Element for 2014 located 25 percent of housing units in dense areas and 50 percent in the South El Camino Real corridor. The ratio of 2:1 did not meet the criteria established by the Comprehensive Plan and reiterated by the Council. According to the National Citizen Survey, people in south Palo Alto were upset about traffic, design, and parking. Yet 50 percent of housing units were placed in south Palo Alto. The Council needed to make a decision to use the existing Comprehensive Plan guidelines.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Holman that during the first month of the consultant contract they should look at the relationship between the existing Comprehensive Plan and Housing Element and set an immediate priority for the use of LEED-ND design guidelines on dense housing sites and bring a summary of the South El Camino Area Concept Plan to Council.

Mr. Keene questioned whether the Amendment should be part of the current item.

Council Member Holman requested clarification of South El Camino Area Concept Plan.

Council Member Schmid indicated he was reading from the Council mandate passed on June 23, 2010, that there would be a South El Camino Area Concept Plan that restricted rezoning for residential intensification until the Concept Plan was approved.

Council Member Holman inquired whether the South El Camino Area Concept Plan would be a part of the implementation portion as opposed to the policy portion.

Council Member Schmid explained that the Motion attempted to integrate Council discussion of the Housing Element with the existing Comprehensive Plan and the amendments approved four years ago by the Council. The Amendment also asked the consultant to spend time upfront making that connection and providing a recommendation.

Council Member Holman requested Staff respond to her previous question.

Ms. Gitelman reported that the Amendment was unclear, because the Comprehensive Plan and the Housing Element were one and the same. The Housing Element was part of the Comprehensive Plan; therefore, an inconsistency between the parts of the Comprehensive Plan could not exist. The Council adopted the Housing Element and essentially affirmed that it was internally consistent. With regard to the South El Camino Area Concept Plan, the Council considered in 2010 whether the Comprehensive Plan process should be amended to include this area plan which was estimated to cost another \$140,000. At that time, the Council decided to put an action in the Comprehensive Plan that called for development of a South El Camino Area Concept Plan as an implementation task after the Comprehensive Plan was completed. It was recognized as a need, but the Council indicated it would be done after the Comprehensive Plan was adopted.

Council Member Holman withdrew her second to the Motion.

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Council Member Klein agreed with comments regarding the Fry's site. Many citizens were not impressed with the process used in developing the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. He urged the City Manager to discuss reform of the Housing Element process with the City's state lobbyist. Staff needed an expert to guide them on reaching portions of the community that typically did not participate in outreach, such as renters, people under the age of 40, and the Chinese-American community.

Mr. Keene indicated the entire burden of outreach would not be shouldered by the Planning Department.

Council Member Klein asked who would be responsible for outreach.

Mr. Keene remarked that the City did not have in-house expertise.

Council Member Klein felt that should be included in the proposal as the timeframe was short.

Ms. Gitelman included a considerable amount of resources in the consultant's contract towards outreach. The consultant could shape the outreach program to address the groups Council Member Klein mentioned.

Council Member Klein did not believe Ms. Gitelman's prior comments regarding outreach were consistent with the City Manager's comments.

Mr. Keene explained that Staff's role was to issue an invitation to residents. To be effective, Staff had to involve more people. The basic design of the proposal was not to default automatically to a small group of experts willing to work hard. Staff wanted to reach beyond that model.

Council Member Klein suggested Staff return with a more specific, wider ranging outreach plan that could entail use of additional consultants. He expressed concern about the word "leadership" in Community Leadership Group. He asked which recommendation would be presented to the Council if the Community Leadership Group and Staff supported different recommendations.

Ms. Gitelman envisioned the Community Leadership Group as advisory to Staff; however, it would ultimately make a recommendation to the P&TC and Council. The Community Leadership Group could disagree with Staff. She hoped Staff could work collaboratively with the group.

Council Member Klein noted that information presented to the public would be a Staff recommendation that was not vetted by the Council. That could be a problem for the Council, because the Council would be held responsible for Staff's recommendation. He requested Staff comment on ways to avoid that problem.

Ms. Gitelman reported that the outlined process envisioned an extended scoping effort at the beginning of the process. Between the current time and August 2014, Staff would hold a series of public meetings, engage in scoping for the EIR, and schedule hearings with the P&TC and the Council. The Council's hearing, which would be held at the end of the process, would obtain input from the community on alternatives and issues. At that point, the Council could give directions to Staff. Staff would then prepare the draft EIR and make adjustments to suggested revisions from the P&TC and disseminate those documents for public comment. At the end of the comment period, Staff would return to the Council for final direction on a preferred alternative. If Staff continued with the current Comprehensive Plan process, they would present the P&TC recommendations to the Council

one Element at a time. The Council's review of each Element could extend into August 2014. After Council review, Staff would begin the public dialog regarding alternatives and the EIR process. Continuing the current Comprehensive Plan process could extend past the December 2015 deadline. Staff preferred a community dialog regarding growth management strategies, alternatives, and issues important to the community, and to reflect that community dialog in the alternatives included in the EIR and Comprehensive Plan revisions.

Council Member Klein inquired whether the Community Leadership Group would be subject to the Brown Act.

Ms. Gitelman indicated it would not technically be subject to the Brown Act; however, meetings would be public and comply with the Brown Act.

Council Member Klein asked if Staff would solicit representatives from organizations or appoint applicants.

Ms. Gitelman would first solicit applications from people representing organizations to determine interest.

Council Member Klein suggested three additional organizations: the League of Women Voters, an environmental organization or preferably Acterra, and Stanford Research Park. He did not have a clear understanding of whether the Community Leadership Group would provide feedback or act in the same manner as the P&TC.

Council Member Burt commented that the Housing Element update was an update to the current Comprehensive Plan. The housing component of the new Comprehensive Plan would guide subsequent Housing Elements. The current Comprehensive Plan with updates was the foundation that should inform the Housing Element update. The work of the Regional Housing Mandate Committee should fold forward into the Housing Element of the new Comprehensive Plan. The Staff Report described the Community Leadership Group as not being a policy recommendation group. Ms. Gitelman's comments deviated significantly from the Staff Report. The composition of the Community Leadership Group would require compliance with the Brown Act. The proposed reunion of Comprehensive Plan participants was not purposeful. Prior Comprehensive Plan participants could be valuable in deconstructing the process to inform the current process. He would not support any proposal that did not include that. The Council should move forward with a review and a reference point of the existing Comprehensive Plan and the draft document from the P&TC. The P&TC performed valuable work, but the Council had not vetted that work. The Council needed to discuss and understand the issues now rather than in two years. The

Council could hold a Retreat with Council Members reviewing information independently prior to the Retreat. The Council also needed to review the California Avenue Concept Area Plan and consider the Fry's site prior to the developer submitting a proposal.

Vice Mayor Kniss noted Staff would return to the Council regarding outreach. The Community Leadership Group was a good idea. With respect to Staff deconstructing the prior Comprehensive Plan process, that sounded as though Council Member Burt was talking down to Staff. She asked why that needed to be detailed in the Motion.

Council Member Burt indicated it was omitted from the proposal and it was important.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to direct Staff to return to Council with additional consideration of the outreach process and composition and procedures for the Community Leadership Group, timing of the California Avenue Concept Area Plan and Council consideration of it, and review the prior Comprehensive Plan process and SOFA Plan process for lessons learned.

Ms. Gitelman understood the direction to Staff was to return with additional clarity on the outreach process including the Community Leadership Group, and separately to solve the issue of the California Avenue Concept Area Plan timing. She inquired whether Council Member Burt was suggesting Staff jettison the 18-24 month process as outlined and use a process similar to the prior Comprehensive Plan and SOFA processes.

Council Member Burt replied no. Staff should use what they learned from deconstructing past processes to inform the proposed process. Early in the process Staff should consider holding community charrettes with prominent visionary keynote speakers and then a community charrette. That would begin the education process for the community and pull in community participation. It worked effectively in the prior Comprehensive Plan process.

Ms. Gitelman stated that model would alter the proposed process and deadline. It would not fit in the 18-24 month timeframe.

Vice Mayor Kniss could accept Council Member Burt's proposed changes through the process for lessons learned. The final change would begin the process again and add at least a year.

Council Member Burt agreed to segregate the final proposed change for a separate Amendment.

Ms. Gitelman indicated the P&TC had completed its review and recommendation regarding the California Avenue Concept Area Plan.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether the California Avenue Concept Area Plan contained a plan for the Fry's site.

Ms. Gitelman reported it contained a land use plan of the Fry's site and its surroundings.

Council Member Scharff asked if the plan was for RM-30 zoning or mixed-use development.

Ms. Gitelman answered mixed use.

Mr. Keene believed the Council could consider the California Avenue Concept Area Plan separately from the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Burt asked how the proposed changes to the Motion would affect Staff's proposed process.

Ms. Gitelman did not believe proposed changes would alter the outlined process. The Council was asking Staff to schedule a discussion of the outreach process at a Council meeting. The P&TC reviewed the California Avenue Concept Area Plan and made a recommendation. Staff could bring that to the Council as they proceeded with other activities. That should not affect the process, unless the Council requested changes and additional information.

Council Member Burt asked how Staff would incorporate any lessons learned from the prior Comprehensive Plan and SOFA processes in the proposed process.

Ms. Gitelman understood Staff was to review the past processes and determine if there were any lessons they could apply to the proposed schedule and process. If the Council did not support the proposed process and wanted Staff to modify it after reviewing the lessons learned, Staff could do so. She hoped the Council would support the proposed process. Staff would present the P&TC's recommendation for the California Avenue Concept Area Plan, at which time the Council could offer comments and possibly endorse the direction of the plan. The Council could not take action on it, because Staff had not completed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, which would be performed as part of the EIR process.

Council Member Burt did not hear any comments regarding incorporating any lessons learned.

Ms. Gitelman indicated Staff would not be proposing a two-year process if they had not spent the prior six years reviewing the Comprehensive Plan. Staff would learn what they could from the past processes. She hoped the Council would support the concept of intensive community engagement work to bring a long process to a conclusion.

Council Member Burt felt the proposal was not complete. Staff committed to reviewing the prior processes, and he assumed that would not be a hollow review. If Staff learned information that would change their thinking about the process, then they would return to the Council.

Council Member Berman was looking forward to reviewing the California Avenue Concept Area Plan. The Council should review the P&TC recommendations regarding the Comprehensive Plan rather than reviewing anew the existing Comprehensive Plan. He was concerned that the Community Leadership Group would not contain people aged 20-44. He suggested Staff consider some at-large spots to include people outside the mainstream. The new Comprehensive Plan was proposed to sunset in 2030. Because of the length of time needed to revise the Comprehensive Plan, perhaps Staff should note work on a future revision should begin in 2025 or change the sunset date to 2028. He recommended Staff review thoroughly and comprehensively any and all baseline data.

Mayor Shepherd was not interested in a Council Member participating in the Community Leadership Group, because they could influence the group's report. Working with groups that had stronger contact lists would be more effective than Staff's proposal.

Ms. Stump indicated the composition of the Community Leadership Group was an illustration provided by Staff. The various Board Members listed would most likely not be a part of the group. The Community Leadership Group would focus on citizens.

Mayor Shepherd suggested Staff include a representative from Safe Routes to School. Reaching the family demographic would be difficult. She wanted to make community engagement palatable to individuals so they would provide input. Website information should be contemporary and accessible and topical.

Council Member Holman proposed a change to the Motion to direct Staff to present the P&TC Comprehensive Plan recommendation to the Council for comments and recommendations. The current Comprehensive Plan should be the basis.

Council Member Klein requested Council Member Holman provide her Amendment and hold discussion until the Amendment was seconded.

Vice Mayor Kniss understood the P&TC recommendation would be presented to the Council in the normal course of business.

Council Member Holman noted the P&TC recommendation would not be presented to the Council for several months. The Council should be knowledgeable regarding information presented to the public.

Council Member Scharff was inclined to accept the change, unless Staff could provide a reason not to accept it.

Ms. Gitelman reported the P&TC recommendation was quite a body of work. The California Avenue Concept Plan was the new element. Review of the recommendation could be an exhaustive exercise for the Council, requiring months of work that could impede the outreach process. Staff envisioned the close reading and evaluation of edits and changes to the policies and programs happening concurrent with the draft EIR.

Council Member Holman felt the Council did not know whether it could recommend the P&TC recommendation be presented to the public or whether the recommendation would require a great deal of Council work.

Council Member Scharff could accept the proposed change if it included a Study Session only, with Council Members providing high-level comments but no editing.

Vice Mayor Kniss inquired about the length the Study Session.

Council Member Scharff suggested three to four hours and preferably on a weekday.

Vice Mayor Kniss felt a four-hour Study Session would likely last six hours. She questioned whether the Council would be revising the recommendation at the Study Session.

Council Member Scharff remarked that no action could be taken at a Study Session.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to direct Staff to bring the Planning and Transportation Comprehensive Plan recommendation to Council for comments and recommendations during a 2-4 hour Study Session with high level comments, and not to be held on weekend.

Mr. Keene believed the Council could not endorse and launch a public process without fulfilling its representative role of reviewing information given to the public. The Council would need to read Study Session material on its own time. If the Council edited the Comprehensive Plan prior to public input, it would not be supporting the proposed process. The other directives in the Motion allowed the Council to revise the proposed process.

Vice Mayor Kniss added that the Council could not continuously add pieces to the Comprehensive Plan review process.

Mr. Keene concurred. The Motion identified three or four topics for which the Council requested additional details. If those details did not elicit Council support for the proposed outreach process, then Staff would have to identify a new process.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the review of the prior Comprehensive Plan process meant only the 1998 process or the 1998 process and subsequent Council amendments.

Mayor Shepherd replied the 1998 Comprehensive Plan process.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 7-1 Schmid no, Price absent

~~15. From Policy and Services Committee Staff Requests Direction From Council on the Naming of the Main Library (Continued from March 3, 2014).~~

16. Resolution 9398 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving a New Memorandum of Agreement with Service Employees' International Union Local 521 and Amending Section 1401 of the Merit System Rules and Regulations."

Kathy Shen, Chief People Officer, reported the Service Employees' International Union (SEIU) contract provided a reasonable economic increase, the first since 2008 for SEIU employees; and provided structural changes for the City in health benefits. SEIU employees would pay 8 percent of pension costs and 10 percent of healthcare premiums. The contract covered the period December 2013 to December 2015. The contract contained two general salary increases of 2 percent and 2.5 percent over two years and market adjustments to salaries based on a survey of total compensation costs. The contract included an important structural change to medical benefit costs by implementing a fixed City contribution toward medical premiums.

Council Member Schmid noted public comments regarding the contract contained mixed messages. First, the contract covered a two-year period.

Second, the Staff Report mention of a Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) was not contained in the contract. The use of COLA was misleading.

Stephanie Munoz urged the Council not to reduce health benefits for employees.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to adopt the Resolution approving a new Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City of Palo Alto and Service Employees' International Union (SEIU), Local 521 effective December 1, 2013 through December 1, 2015 and concomitantly amending Section 1401 of the Merit System Rules and Regulations.

Council Member Klein reiterated that the contract did not contain a COLA, but a salary increase. The two-year contract would affect the Budget over two years. The contract was good for the City and employees. He appreciated the opinion/editorial column by Council Members Burt and Berman.

Mayor Shepherd indicated the opinion/editorial column was excellent.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Price absent

CLOSED SESSION

17. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS, CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.8.

Property: U.S. Post Office, 380 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto 94301

Agency Negotiators: James Keene, Lalo Perez, Hamid Ghaemmaghami, Joe Saccio, Hillary Gitelman, Aaron Aknin, Meg Monroe, Molly Stump, Cara Silver

Negotiating Parties: City of Palo Alto and United States Post Office

Under Negotiation: Purchase and Lease-back, Price and Terms of Payment

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:59 P.M.