



CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Special Meeting
January 31, 2015

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the El Palo Alto Room at the Mitchell Park Community Center, 3700 Middlefield Road, at 9:04 A.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach

Absent:

Oral Communications

Lynn Huidekoper thanked the Council for rescinding the Living in Vehicles Ordinance. The City needed a plan for vehicle dwellers to park in the community and not be cited. One vehicle dweller was parking in a church parking lot with permission.

Roberta Alquist hoped the City would promote low-income housing and play a role in building housing. The City should provide opportunities for more low-income housing and a rent stabilization program in order to promote a diverse community.

Herb Borock read comments made by Richard Hackmann, City of Palo Alto, and David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF, to the Caltrain Board at its January 2015 meeting to certify the Electrification Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Mr. Schonbrunn's comments to challenge certification of the EIR were consistent with Palo Alto's adopted guidelines.

Mark Weiss appreciated the Council's ability to address a wide variety of issues. Local press was not covering Gunn High School football.

Cybele LoVuolo-Bhushan was not sure what type of program was needed for vehicle dwellers; however, the City should retain ethnic and economic diversity in the community.

MINUTES

Nielson Buchanan suggested the Council review its Priorities, which it would identify later in the meeting, at midyear and determine if they were practical in relation to Staff's capacity. He would be working with others to stimulate solutions to known problems.

Chuck Jagoda recalled that the County of Santa Clara did not plan to replace the homeless shelter at the armory in Sunnyvale; however, funds had been allocated to replace the shelter. The Council carried the moral arc for the City.

Richard Brand suggested the Council think regionally in terms of transit, communication, and education. The City's transportation programs should be integrated with programs of the Metropolitan Transportation Council (MTC) and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

Jennifer Landesmann appreciated the Council addressing airplane noise. She looked forward to Council Members' leadership and engagement on this topic.

Shani Kleinhaus read the definition of sustainability from the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Measurements of sustainability with respect to nature relied on mitigations. Nature should be an integral part of every project and not a mitigation. She requested the Council consider the issue of bird-safe buildings and structures.

Mila Zelkha, InnVision Shelter Network, related InnVision's efforts to reduce costs without reducing services. She was interested in sharing her ideas for homeless programs with the Council.

Aram James hoped the Council would engage in discussions regarding Buena Vista Mobile Home Park. Members of Stop the Ban would need City assistance to organize and implement a program similar to Santa Barbara's overnight parking program. The City Council should discuss policies for police officers' use of body cameras.

Mayor's Welcome and Overview of Day

Mayor Holman reviewed the Agenda for the meeting.

Action Items

1. 2015 Work Plan.

James Keene, City Manager, advised that the Council Retreat historically focused on setting Council Priorities for the year. Over the past few years, the focus had evolved to developing a work plan around Priorities.

MINUTES

The Council defined a Priority as a topic that would receive particular, unusual, and significant attention during the year. The purpose of establishing Priorities was to assist the Council and Staff in better allotting and utilizing time for discussion and decision making. There was a goal of no more than three Priorities per year, and Priorities had a three-year time limit. The Policy and Services Committee discussed Priorities and public submissions in December 2014. The report of the Policy and Services Committee was provided to Council Members on January 20, 2015. One goal of the Retreat was to populate a work plan for the year. In setting Priorities, the Council would consider distinctive issues that needed attention and that delivered a strategic public value. Capacity to respond to Priorities was a critical factor in setting realistic Priorities. Only 66 City employees were available to work on strategic issues around Priorities and existing initiatives. Priorities suggested by Council Members could be grouped into themes of land use, transportation, the Comprehensive Plan, Technology and the Connected City, and infrastructure. Priorities of Healthy City/Health Community, social services, and transparency/responsiveness/customer service were suggested once each. Staff began creating a work plan related to land use, transportation, the Comprehensive Plan, Technology and the Connected City, and zoning. He listed the elements of each theme. Staff focused the list of elements on potential deliverables in 2015. Each person who worked on those issues also had another fulltime job or had other priorities that were important to the City. The Council's discussion would allow Staff to develop processes to accomplish this work even though issues changed during the course of the year. Staff's ability to recognize new issues and adapt to them would be key. It was important for the Council to have a sense of the scale of work before discussing Priorities.

Mayor Holman added that the Council wanted a means to grasp all of the topics Staff was working on and to prioritize those under Priorities.

Council Member Kniss noted the community's concern about traffic. Traffic was becoming far more complicated than simply congestion. She questioned whether the City had considered using red light cameras. They helped with traffic and were a funding source. Methodologies were available and effective. She wanted to consider some type of traffic control.

Council Member DuBois believed some elements on the list had to be accomplished; therefore, there was no need to prioritize them. Segregating required items would be useful in discussing other elements as Priorities. Many of the projects had moved into the implementation phase and hopefully would require less Council attention.

MINUTES

Mayor Holman requested the City Manager comment regarding ways the Council could utilize the list in the discussion of Priorities.

Council Member Scharff wanted to know the amount of man hours required for each City department. Obviously Utilities Staff were not working on land use issues. He asked if the Council would prioritize projects within each City department. He suggested ranking a specified number of elements in each category as high, medium and low. However, high, medium, and low would need to be defined. There had to be some correlation between the list and the number of Staff for each item.

Mr. Keene questioned the relationship between elements and Priorities. Because Council Members suggested all the elements as Priorities, Staff wanted to identify the initiatives or tasks or work that the Council requested. Staff could sharpen or segment some of the components in the next few weeks. If the Council identified other Priorities, then Staff would revise the list. Staff was in the process of developing a more detailed, full work plan with gap analyses of daily operations in order to understand allocation of work and time within each department. Within the next week or two, Staff could be more specific about the Staff and time budget for projects and initiatives and be able to inform the Council about the impacts of shifting priorities.

Council Member Burt felt the Council had to utilize the same meanings of rankings when giving importance ranking to items. The Council should consider removing any elements that did not need policy-based input. Utilities projects should be separated with respect to policy issues on non-infrastructure and infrastructure. The Council instituted the Business Registry as a means to obtain data that would inform policy decisions for other initiatives; therefore, the ranking of the Business Registry could affect work on other priority initiatives. After attending the recent Transportation Management Association (TMA) meeting, he was concerned that statements made in the meeting did not meet the Council's intentions. Those things needed to be framed and brought before the Council for at least Council understanding of the issues and Council guidance. Several years ago the Council did discuss red light cameras. He was willing to explore them as public safety innovations and to increase efficiency of providing services, but not as a revenue source.

Robert Moss stated if a task was identified as having a high priority, the Council should identify the issues about which it was concerned. The Council should consider changing the assumed population density of office workers. He questioned whether the area around Downtown and California Avenue should be expanded for preserving ground-floor retail.

MINUTES

A discussion of population density and traffic impacts should include requirements for parking. The Council should discuss ways to improve the Public Safety Building and when it should be constructed.

Frank Ingle indicated the weakness in the project list was whether the project was small, medium or large as well as its urgency. He suggested Staff create a graph that plotted urgency on the y-axis and cost on the x-axis.

Lois Salo wanted the City Council to endorse the peace and planet mobilization scheduled for April 24-25, 2015 in New York City and to sign the petition for elimination of nuclear weapons. The Council should build low-income housing and help fund the purchase of the Buena Vista Mobile Home Park.

Council Member Wolbach was interested in whether elements might flow into others, might be prerequisites for others, and might significantly change the Council's view of others. He questioned whether the number of Staff was sufficient to tackle the challenges given them. The Council should seriously discuss whether Staff had the resources to do the work that the Council and the community would ask them to perform.

Mayor Holman suggested the project list return to the Council in a few weeks as an Agenda Item. The list should include the departments involved in each item, the scale of each project, existing resources that could be applied to projects, the status of each project, and the initiation date and anticipated completion date of each project.

Mr. Keene inquired whether those topics should be included for each element of the list.

Mayor Holman replied yes. She suggested the City Auditor, City Attorney, and Administrative Services be added to the list.

Mr. Keene reported the Staff work plan would contain that level of detail, such as deadlines and Staff interfaces. Staff attempted to list initiatives falling under the themes generated by the Council's suggested Priorities. Staff was working on a comprehensive work plan. No work plan process could accommodate all aspirations. The Council would have to make choices.

Mayor Holman recalled Council comments regarding not knowing pending projects or their status; therefore, she requested those details be added to projects on the list.

MINUTES

Council Member Filseth believed the Council's policies had to guide the prioritization of projects. The list was valuable as a way for the Council to formulate and articulate macro priorities. He felt street resurfacing and cut-through traffic was more important than attracting new business to Palo Alto. Street resurfacing had ramifications for infrastructure and cut-through traffic for parking. The Council could state their priorities and see how those priorities mapped to projects on the list.

Vice Mayor Schmid recommended the Council move to Agenda Item Number 2.

Mr. Keene would take the Council's input and revise the list. Perhaps the list could include the concept of forced trade-offs.

Council took a break at 10:46 A.M. and returned at 10:58 A.M.

2. Council Annual Priorities Setting.

Mayor Holman noted the Council had received written submissions for Council Priorities from the public.

Penny Ellson stated the Bike and Pedestrian Plan fit into a larger multimodal puzzle. Most Bike Boulevard projects addressed multimodal needs. The City needed to communicate the benefits being delivered to all road users through projects. She hoped the Council would prioritize a commitment to implementing a vision for multimodal mobility management.

Jeff Hoel supported Citywide Fiber to the Premises (FTTP). Perhaps the City could experiment with Fiber to the Premises in the coming year. The Council and the public should be made aware of discussions held by the Citizens Advisory Committee on Fiber to the Premises.

Lynn Huidekoper was disappointed by the exclusion of social services from the list of Priorities. The Council should encourage the Human Relations Commission to address any issue within its purview.

Richard Brand concurred with Mr. Hoel's comments to emphasize Fiber to the Premises over wireless. FTTP should be the Priority, with wireless being built upon FTTP.

MOTION: Mayor Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to have Land Use and Multimodal Transportation as a Priority.

Mayor Holman remarked that the Council had to address many land use items, all of which affected transportation initiatives.

MINUTES

Council Member Kniss presumed the Motion would include the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) system as well. TDM was one of the more exciting ventures proposed for the City. She requested the correct name for the initiative.

James Keene, City Manager, responded Transportation Management Association (TMA) was the concept nested within TDM.

Council Member DuBois wanted to be clear about the concepts of land use and transportation. Several Council Members cited the need to address land use and transportation issues before completing the Comprehensive Plan. Other Council Members proposed immediate initiatives versus longer-term Comprehensive Plan initiatives. Land use and multimodal transportation seemed to encompass both.

Mayor Holman clarified that land use would include all projects under land use, such as the Comprehensive Plan and zoning.

Council Member DuBois suggested the Council clarify whether it was focusing on items to be implemented before completion of the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Scharff supported the Motion. Land Use encompassed both areas Council Member DuBois discussed. The Priority should be stated broadly. It did not preclude near-term land-use objectives.

Vice Mayor Schmid noted the low approval scores for the areas of land use, parking, and traffic on the National Citizens Survey. These were areas of key concern and had been a concern for two consecutive years. A key element of the proposed Priority was development limits, which the Council had on its Agenda. Development limits tied into the Comprehensive Plan, parking, multimodal transportation, and economics of who paid and who benefited.

Council Member Wolbach suggested in his December 2014 submission separating transportation and land use into separate Priorities. Both were important, encompassed many topics, and required a great deal of Staff time. He was agreeable to having both as one Priority. These issues had a nexus and deserved particular, unusual and significant attention. He inquired whether Staff felt the Priority was too broad.

Mr. Keene advised that one of the purposes of setting a Priority was to signal to the community the Council's important focus. It was appropriate to include two categories in one Priority. Once Staff identified work plan tasks under the Priority, then a prioritizing of tasks would occur.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt viewed land use and transportation as intrinsically intertwined and would not want to separate them. The proposed Priority contained an intent very similar to the 2014 Priority of The Built Environment: Mobility, Parking and Livability. He requested the Council comment on reasons for changing the wording and the impact of those changes. Multimodal transportation emphasized the Council's vision.

Mayor Holman felt multimodal transportation was descriptive of Council actions and intentions and clarified that in very simple terms.

Council Member Burt suggested the Priority state the built environment and then list the three aspects of the built environment. Multimodal transportation was a substitute for mobility with a little more clarity. Parking had been removed, but it was implicit. He struggled with whether the proposed Priority captured some of the values of the 2014 Priority.

Council Member Wolbach suggested replacing the word livability with land use. He questioned whether the spirit of "livability" was contained within wording such as balanced land use.

Mr. Keene indicated the Priority could contain a heading and subtext or several words of description. Expressing a value statement within the Priority was very helpful. Multimodal transportation signaled different things than transportation. Land use did not provide the direction the Council intended.

Mayor Holman asked if Council Member Burt could accept "The Built Environment: Multimodal Transportation, Parking and Livability."

Council Member Burt responded yes.

Council Member Kniss believed everyone understood the Council's meaning of multimodal.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to change the words to The Built Environment: Multimodal Transportation, Parking and Livability.

Council Member Filseth asked why land use was removed from the Motion.

Mayor Holman explained land use was included in built environment and livability.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member XXX to change the Priority to: "The Built Environment: Multimodal Transportation, Parking, and Balanced Land Use."

MINUTES

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

AMENDMENT: Council Member Dubois moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to change the Priority to: The Built Environment: Multimodal Transportation, Parking, and Land Use Focused on Quality of Life for Residents.

Council Member Kniss requested clarification of "Land Use Focused on Quality of Life for Residents."

Mayor Holman would accept the language without "for Residents." Businesses were important too. The Council had to balance the interests of businesses and residents.

Council Member DuBois was suggesting a prioritization of residents over businesses.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if Council Member DuBois wanted to give residents more weight than businesses.

Council Member DuBois was not specifying the degree of weight. As the Comprehensive Plan stated, he would prioritize the needs of residents over businesses; however, business needs would not be ignored. In the recent election, he clearly stated his position on land use and he wanted that to be stated explicitly in Council Priorities.

Mayor Holman restated the Amendment "The Built Environment: Multimodal Transportation, and Parking and Land Use Focused on Quality of Life for Residents.

Council Member Filseth stated prioritization was about making choices. He would favor a slight preference for residents over businesses.

Vice Mayor Schmid believed the amended language explicitly stated the focus on residents rather than commuters. He would support the Amendment.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member XXX to change the last part of the Motion to: Land Use Focused on Parks, Housing and Retail.

Council Member Wolbach explained that parks, housing and retail identified key areas of land use which were important to residents. His proposed language avoided use of the imprecise term quality of life.

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

MINUTES

Council Member Burt remarked that Priorities by nature had to be succinct. The emphasis on living in the community was captured in "livability." Livability in the context of the built environment captured "land use focused on quality of life for residents" as well as any single word could. He discouraged the Council from proposing long narratives that were not succinct messages about the Priority.

Council Member Scharff concurred with Council Member Burt's comments. The word livability contained the emphasis on residents.

Council Member Filseth requested Council Member Burt propose language.

Council Member Burt would not substitute "livability" with "land use focused on quality of life for residents."

Council Member Filseth requested someone read the 2014 Priority.

Council Member Burt responded "The Built Environment: Mobility, Parking and Livability." To change the wording without making a substantive change in the purpose was confusing to the community and did not add value.

Mayor Holman requested the Council reach a conclusion quickly in the interest of time.

Council Member DuBois inquired whether the Council would vote on Priorities individually.

Mayor Holman answered yes.

Council Member DuBois did not believe nine words versus one word was a major issue. The term livability could have many meanings and different interpretations. He preferred to use "land use" and "residents" in a Priority.

Mayor Holman explained that the proposed Priority would include land use items from the list.

Council Member DuBois would agree to "livability" if he was the only Council Member opposed to its use.

Council Member Wolbach would not support the Motion because "livability" was as vague as "quality of life."

AMENDMENT FAILED: 3-6 DuBois, Filseth, Schmid yes

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0

MINUTES

Vice Mayor Schmid recalled the process utilized by the Council in 2014 to select Priorities.

Mayor Holman would entertain Motions for Priorities and then call a vote on the Motions individually.

MOTION: Council Member Berman moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to include Infrastructure Implementation and Execution as a Council Priority.

Mayor Holman asked if Council Member Berman proposed continuing the 2014 Priority of Infrastructure Strategy and Funding.

Council Member Berman explained that his Priority was the next step of the previous year's Priority.

Mr. Keene inquired whether Council Members were proposing Priorities first.

Mayor Holman requested Council Members offer Motions for Priorities.

Council Member Filseth requested clarification of "implementation and execution." Implementation and execution of projects seemed to be the City Manager's responsibility.

Council Member Berman explained that the Council needed to provide policy direction so the City Manager could do his job. Once the Council made the major decisions, then Staff could execute them.

Council Member Filseth proposed removing "execution" and replacing it with Strategy.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to change the verbiage to: Infrastructure Strategy and Implementation.

Council Member Scharff added that many policy decisions regarding infrastructure remained and needed focus.

Mayor Holman requested additional proposals of Priorities.

Council Member Kniss commented that the Healthy City/Healthy Community initiative had been discussed often. It was important and included in the Comprehensive Plan.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Mayor Holman to include Healthy City/Healthy Community as a Priority.

MINUTES

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to include Technology and the Connected City with a focus on fiber as a Priority.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member XXX to include Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Master Plan as a Priority.

Mayor Holman believed the Master Plan would fall under some of the other topics.

MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF SECOND

Vice Mayor Schmid requested a clarification of Healthy City/Healthy Community.

Mayor Holman indicated the Council would discuss Priorities once all were proposed.

Council Member Filseth asked if finalization of the Comprehensive Plan was encompassed by one of the topics or was a separate issue.

Mayor Holman reported the Comprehensive Plan would be contained within the Built Environment: Multimodal Transportation, Parking and Livability.

Council Member Burt suggested Colleagues refer a Priority to the Policy and Services Committee to provide additional context for the Priority, if colleagues felt additional information was necessary. Each Priority could have a whole sentence or a paragraph to further explain the intent of the Priority.

Mayor Holman did not support referring Priorities to the Policy and Services Committee for clarification.

Council Member DuBois noted the Comprehensive Plan contained more elements than just land use and transportation. In the work plan, the Comprehensive Plan was its own category.

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to include Revise the Process and Complete the Comprehensive Plan as a Priority.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reminded the Council that completion of the Comprehensive Plan required an environmental review, which probably was not feasible in 2015.

MINUTES

Council Member DuBois viewed the Priorities as having a term of three years.

Mayor Holman announced that Council Members could comment on the proposed Priorities after the lunch break.

Council took a break at 11:55 A.M. and returned at 12:11 P.M.

Mayor Holman requested comment regarding the proposed infrastructure Priority.

Council Member Berman felt Staff needed Council analysis and policy direction regarding several major infrastructure projects. He wanted the Council to make the necessary decisions so that projects could proceed.

Council Member Scharff believed the City had been talking about a Public Safety Building for the past 20 years. The Council promised the community a new Public Safety Building; therefore, the Council should show a commitment to accomplishing that.

Council Member Burt remarked that the slight change in wording from the 2014 Priority was an important message that the Council was moving forward. Accomplishing the list of infrastructure projects would be a momentous achievement.

Mayor Holman advised that Council Members should make their arguments for and against Priorities. Council Members would vote following arguments.

Council Member DuBois indicated infrastructure projects had shifted to oversight. Because the Council was limited to three Priorities, he would rank infrastructure as a fourth Priority. If the Council could have five Priorities, he would support infrastructure as a Priority.

Mayor Holman reported the Council was not limited to only three Priorities. Council Members could offer arguments for selecting more than three Priorities prior to voting.

Council Member DuBois suggested Council Members adopt five Priorities, because the proposed Priorities impacted the work of different departments.

Council Member Kniss commented that the Council would have more involvement with infrastructure projects now that funding was in place. Discussion of locations and prioritization of projects would require a great deal of Council discussion.

MINUTES

Mayor Holman requested comments on the proposed Healthy City/Healthy Community Priority.

Council Member Kniss felt this Priority was the City's attempt to reconstruct the City as a healthy city.

Mayor Holman read a definition and goals of a Healthy City.

Council Member Wolbach believed the City should focus on social services for seniors, youths, and the disabled. Those services were encompassed within the Priority.

Vice Mayor Schmid could support the Priority if it focused on a diverse community, affordable housing, and social services. He did not understand how the City could propose projects for sustainable community, quality of life, and access to healthcare.

Council Member Burt reiterated the concepts that constituted a Priority. Healthy City/Healthy Community merited strong consideration as a Core Value. He related prior Council discussion of Core Values. The Council should ensure Priorities were Priorities rather than Core Values.

Council Member Scharff agreed with Council Member Burt. If the Healthy City/Healthy Community Priority followed the stated rubric, then it should be contained in the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Filseth concurred with Council Members Burt and Scharff. They provided a useful delineation between Priority and Core Value.

Council Member Berman felt the initiatives of Healthy City/Healthy Community were incredibly important; however, it was a Core Value. He would support the Priority if the Council held a discussion of Core Values soon.

Council Member Kniss stated that as a Core Value, Healthy City/Healthy Community would be lost from the conversation. The Council did not give priority to Core Values. Healthy City/Healthy Community could be woven into every Council action if it was a Priority. Cities created around access to transportation and so forth tended to be healthier cities.

Council Member Wolbach agreed Healthy City/Healthy Community was a Core Value. A discussion of Core Values was needed. Healthy City/Healthy Community should be a Priority in 2015. Significant policy attention was required for initiatives included in Healthy City/Healthy Community.

MINUTES

Mayor Holman agreed Healthy City/Healthy Community was a Core Value if the Council held that discussion. There were many pressing needs and issues in the community that the Council could address in 2015. She requested comments on Technology and the Connected City with a Focus on Fiber.

Council Member DuBois believed the third year of the Priority was a time for action. Broadband was a utility of the 21st century. This proposed Priority would ensure innovation and competitive pricing and access and would assist with the Smart Grid. The challenge would be communicating the benefits to the community.

Council Member Scharff agreed with Council Member DuBois' comments; however, he had some concerns about prioritizing fiber over Wi-Fi. Both had been moving on parallel tracks. He requested Staff comment on prioritizing one over the other.

Jonathan Reichental, Chief Information Officer, had not seen any evidence that wireless work was impacting the pace of fiber. Both were moving as quickly as they could. Fiber was a necessary backhaul for wireless and Wi-Fi. There were some near-term opportunities for Wi-Fi in the community. A strategy for laying fiber would require multiple years.

Council Member Scharff wanted to focus on both fiber and Wi-Fi.

Mayor Holman noted the proposed Priority would focus on fiber and Wi-Fi.

Council Member Kniss did not believe the proposed Priority would alter actions concerning fiber and/or Wi-Fi. She was unsure whether it needed to remain a Priority in 2015.

Council Member Berman was unsure of the Council's role regarding fiber in 2015. He requested Staff comment.

Mr. Reichental noted fiber was scheduled for Council discussion on February 2, 2015. During 2015, the Council would discuss Google Fiber and the results of an engineering study. At least three major milestones would occur in 2015. Beyond that, the Council would have to discuss implementation across the City.

Council Member Wolbach asked if fiber would be delayed by the Council by omitting it as a Priority.

MINUTES

Mr. Keene reported the City would continue its work on fiber whether or not it was a Priority. The question was whether something was missing that needed a boost from the Council.

Council Member Burt wanted assurance that Priorities would be completed. Staff had reassured the Council that major milestones were well defined, had initial policy guidance, and would return timely to the Council with a concrete set of decision points for implementation. Previous Priorities that were discussed as Core Values were environmental sustainability, long-term financial planning or sustainability, and youth well being. He requested Council feedback regarding a discussion of Core Values occurring at the Council or being referred to the Policy and Services Committee.

Mr. Keene advised that if Fiber to the Premises was not made a Council Priority for 2015, nothing precluded the Council from taking a public action expressly stating Council policy and expectations for the year. The Council could lead on this outside of a Priority being set specifically.

Mayor Holman requested comment regarding revising and completing the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member DuBois offered substitute language to complete the Comprehensive Plan Update with increased focus from Council. The Council's role was to set policy that was embodied in the Comprehensive Plan. The Council should receive updates more often than currently planned.

Council Member Filseth concurred. The first Priority was in danger of becoming a super Priority because of the many issues it covered. The need for Council to take an active role in the Comprehensive Plan process warranted a separate Priority for the Comprehensive Plan.

Vice Mayor Schmid stated that the Comprehensive Plan could not be completed without inputs from the first Priority. Having a separate Priority for the Comprehensive Plan would duplicate efforts. The built environment and the Comprehensive Plan were so intertwined that it was difficult to separate the two.

Council Member DuBois noted the Comprehensive Plan contained more elements than just land use and transportation.

Vice Mayor Schmid recalled parks were mentioned as part of livability.

Council Member Burt was convinced that the first and fifth Priorities were distinct enough to warrant being separate.

MINUTES

Many elements of the Comprehensive Plan were outside the built environment, and many components of the built environment were outside the Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Holman remarked that the Council attempted to narrow Priorities to three, but there was no dictate to limit the number to three. She inquired whether more than three Priorities would impact workload.

Mr. Keene advised that the Council adopted language stating a goal of no more than three Priorities.

Mayor Holman suggested taking a straw poll regarding the number of Priorities.

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to adopt all five priorities.

Council Member Kniss felt all were Priorities, but each had a different weight.

Council Member Burt recalled in past years the Council decided to vote on each Priority individually.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to go through Priority Numbers 2 through 5 individually and vote on each.

Council Member Burt asked whether there should be a straw poll or a binding poll.

Mayor Holman suggested a straw poll.

Council Member Scharff felt choosing all five had a built-in bias. The Council should make choices.

Council Member Filseth asked how he should vote if he supported all five Priorities but felt only three should be prioritized.

Mayor Holman advised that his vote should demonstrate that.

Council Member Burt indicated his Substitute Motion did not direct a straw poll or a binding poll.

MOTION FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PASSED: 7-2 Schmid, DuBois no

MOTION FOR HEALTHY CITY PASSED: 6-3 Scharff, Filseth, Burt no

MINUTES

MOTION FOR TECHNOLOGY FAILED: 1-8 DuBois yes

MOTION FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PASSED: 9-0

Council Member Kniss hoped the City would receive support from the California League of Cities and the National League of Cities regarding Healthy City/Healthy Community.

3. Getting the Work Done.

Mark Weiss did not like machines dictating operations. He wondered whether Council Members could refrain from commenting when they agreed with previous comments. He requested the Council not limit time for public speakers.

Frank Ingle suggested the Council resolve that fiber was a public utility.

Mayor Holman noted five Council Members submitted comments regarding meeting management, Staff and Council roles and relations, communications and reports, Committees and Commissions, and liaison roles. She would refine the time allotments for Agenda Items. She wanted to allow public comment within the time stated on the Agenda for an item, even if that item had not been called for discussion. She requested everyone be aware of the words they chose to disagree with or criticize someone. In the interest of time, she recommended deferring Committees and Commissions, referring liaison roles to the Policy and Services Committee, and deferring communications and reports. Topics for discussion were meeting management and Staff/Council roles and relations.

Council Member Burt inquired about the topic of policy.

Mayor Holman advised policy was Staff/Council roles and relations.

Council Member Burt disagreed.

Mayor Holman indicated they were the same for purposes of the discussion.

Council Member Burt asked if items under policy would be discussed as Staff/Council roles and relations.

Mayor Holman replied yes. She requested the Council discuss Staff/Council roles and relations first.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt submitted the issue of completion of adoption of Core Values. The question for the Council was whether to refer the topic to the Policy and Services Committee for a recommendation or set it as a Council Agenda Item.

Mayor Holman requested clarification of the type of action the Council could take.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported the Council could specify a method to work on Core Values. A procedural question did not need to be agendized again in the future.

Council Member Kniss seemed to recall the Policy and Services Committee discussed Core Values. She would prefer the Policy and Services Committee take up the discussion.

Council Member Burt wanted to defer the process to colleagues.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Berman that Staff schedule a Study Session, not to exceed one hour in length, for Council Members to offer suggestions of Core Values prior to referring completion of Core Values to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Berman suggested Council Members offer suggestions for the Policy and Services Committee to discuss. Perhaps the Council should have an Agenda Item to offer suggestions of Core Values.

Council Member Scharff recalled that the Policy and Services Committee made a recommendation to the Council; however, the Council disagreed with the recommended Core Values and sent it back to the Policy and Services Committee. At that point, the discussion was dropped because of a lack of consensus at the Policy and Services Committee. The full Council should hold a discussion to set the groundwork.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth that a Committee of the Whole discuss Core Values.

Council Member Filseth felt Core Values was sufficiently important for a Council discussion.

Vice Mayor Schmid inquired whether a Committee of the Whole could vote on actions.

Mayor Holman answered yes.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt explained that a Committee of the Whole would allow communications among Council Members and a dialog with the community.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 8-1 Kniss no

Council Member Kniss believed that without greater structure the discussion of Core Values would not be productive.

Council Member Burt suggested adding the State Housing Density Bonus Law to the Council's legislative agenda. The fuel switching component of the Climate Action Plan could require legislative action. He requested comments on whether to add those topics to the legislative agenda and a process for the Council to proceed.

Vice Mayor Schmid indicated the legislative agenda was scheduled to return to the Council soon.

James Keene, City Manager, believed the legislative program was continued to February 2015. He could include the two topics mentioned by Council Member Burt in the item scheduled in February.

Council Member Kniss requested Staff schedule a time for the legislative consultant to meet with the Council.

Council Member Burt wanted to request senior Staff identify certain trends that might be apparent to them before the trends were apparent to the Council or the community. Staff could identify trends as a potential policy discussion for the Council. The Council could make a general direction and request to Staff. Staff's role would supplement the Council's and community's role of identifying trends.

Mr. Keene reported that Staff did identify trends. He wondered if there was some way to focus the direction into particular areas to which Staff would pay close attention.

Council Member Burt was not sure he could or would want to focus direction to particular areas. The Living in Vehicles Ordinance was a good example of the Council needing to identify trends better.

Mayor Holman concurred with Council Member Burt's comments. Staff was in a better position to see trends than Council Members. However, she did not want Staff to be criticized for something that required a policy discussion. She inquired about a method to address the issue.

Council Member Burt suggested the Council refer it to the Policy and Services Committee.

MINUTES

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, believed the Council often was in a better position than Staff to recognize trends. The community was in an even better position to recognize trends. Staff and the Council should commit to working in partnership to identify trends and to raise them in a forum where they could be discussed and vetted thoroughly. Referring to the Policy and Services Committee or discussing it further would not give Staff more tools to better identify trends.

Mayor Holman was attempting to request Staff come forward with trends as soon as they recognized them.

Council Member Scharff indicated Ms. Gitelman understood that the Council wanted to hear about emerging trends. He was not sure whether the Council would gain anything by referring it to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Kniss recalled learning of the vehicle dwelling issue during her campaign for the City Council. Council Members often learned of issues through public comments made during election campaigns.

Mayor Holman asked if the direction for Staff to identify trends and present them to the Council was sufficiently clear.

Mr. Keene replied yes. Staff and the Council needed to be understanding and tolerant of each other. Staff could present a trend that the Council dismissed until the community raised it.

Mayor Holman remarked that the Council wanted Staff to identify the things they saw as trends, issues, or concerns. The Council would decide whether it wanted to take up the issue.

Mr. Keene felt balance was necessary.

Mayor Holman discussed the work plan document provided by the Council Appointed Officers (CAO) which was for Council to set policy by prioritizing projects and ensure directives for Staff were well written.

Council Member Wolbach asked if the Council would discuss procedures and protocols.

Mayor Holman wanted to defer procedures and protocols.

MINUTES

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer Number 1: consideration of different telephone participation guidelines for Closed Session and Open Session items and Number 2: review of rules regarding Council procedures on Consent Calendar items to the Policy and Services Committee and to review calling into meetings.

Council Member Scharff would support the first topic but not the second; therefore, he would not support the Motion.

Mayor Holman bifurcated the Motion.

Council Member Burt indicated his submission contained two aspects. The first aspect related to Council Member DuBois' request for review of rules for Council Members calling into Council meetings. The second aspect, whether contracts should be placed on the Consent Calendar and whether two votes were needed to remove an item from the Consent Calendar, would involve a review of Consent procedures. The two Motions were to refer review of rules for telephone participation to the Policy and Services Committee, and to refer review of rules regarding the Consent Calendar to the Policy and Services Committee.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER: for the Policy and Services Committee to review and clarify the respective roles of the City Manager, Staff, Mayor, and Vice Mayor in setting the Agendas.

Mayor Holman indicated the Council would participate in a straw poll.

MOTION PASSED FOR: Policy and Services Committee consideration of different telephone participation guidelines for Closed Session and Open Session items: 9-0

MOTION PASSED FOR: Policy and Services Committee review of rules regarding Council procedures on Consent Calendar items: 7-2 Kniss, Scharff no

Council Member Kniss asked if Council Member Burt suggested review of the roles of the City Manager, Staff, Mayor, and Vice Mayor.

Council Member Burt answered yes. This policy was not clearly stated.

Council Member Kniss did not realize Council policy provided any guidance on the roles of the City Manager, Staff, Mayor, and Vice Mayor.

MINUTES

Ms. Stump reported the policies and procedures did not provide specific, concrete rules. This was a complex topic that flowed from the City Charter. The City Manager was generating most of the Agenda work. Staff could review different ways that could be described or revised within the policies and procedures consistent with the Charter.

Council Member Kniss believed that would be a good discussion; however, the current policy appeared to be vague.

Vice Mayor Schmid wanted the full Council to discuss the issue rather than referring it to the Policy and Services Committee.

Mayor Holman preferred to refer the topic to the Policy and Services Committee as that body had the responsibility of annually reviewing procedures and protocols.

Mr. Keene indicated some of those topics were meeting management issues. He would argue for placing more items on the Consent Calendar. Staff needed better guidance to ensure the appropriate equity of their responses to the full Council as opposed to individual Council Members. Individual Council Members could ask questions that had policy implications and that requested information should be shared with the Council. He suggested that be included in the list for review by the Policy and Services Committee. He requested review of the one-hour rule and ways for Staff to respond. The current rule was that if an individual Council Member asked a question and a response required more than one hour of Staff time, then Staff did not respond to the question. The Council should discuss the ways Staff supported the Council and how Staff made those decisions.

Mayor Holman appreciated Staff's current practice of sending responses to individual Council Member questions to the full Council. That was one way issues were raised and vetted.

Mr. Keene wanted to ensure Staff satisfied the Council's understanding of how Staff supported the Council. The Council should develop procedures for Staff to respond individually and collectively.

Vice Mayor Schmid inquired whether the issue was referred to the Policy and Services Committee.

Mayor Holman would make a list of topics to be referred to the Policy and Services Committee.

MINUTES

Council Member Scharff suggested the Council defer meeting management issues, because he was not sure how the Council could discuss topics and refer them to the Policy and Services Committee in the remaining time allotted.

Mayor Holman asked if the Council was willing to remain past the ending time to decide topics to refer to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Burt suggested the Council discuss a Committee of the Whole meeting as a follow-up to the Retreat, and then determine which topics should be referred to which Committee.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to refer all meeting management items to a Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Keene added that the Council could decide to refer topics to the Policy and Services Committee at the Committee of the Whole meeting.

Council Member Burt reported the City Manager raised the concept of a Committee of the Whole. A Committee of the Whole meeting was similar to a Study Session and would be a useful forum for the Council.

Mayor Holman requested the City Manager and Council Members provide topics for a Committee of the Whole discussion.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss for the Retreat to continue for 30 minutes.

Mayor Holman noted Council Member Scharff had to leave the Retreat. Given the amount of discussion, she did not believe the Council could accomplish much in 30 minutes.

Council Member DuBois felt a few items could be accomplished in 30 minutes.

Council Member Burt suggested the Council discuss topics, but not take a vote if the Retreat continued.

Mayor Holman inquired whether Staff could remain.

Mr. Keene could respond to Council questions if Staff had to leave the meeting.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 6-3 Berman, Filseth, Scharff no

Council Member Scharff left the meeting at 1:57 P.M.

MINUTES

Council Member Kniss recalled that in the past the Council had a hard stop of 11:00 P.M. for Council meetings. Extending the meeting to 11:15 P.M. and then to 11:30 P.M. required a Council vote. She requested referral of the issue to the Policy and Services Committee. Because Council meetings began at 6:00 P.M., Council Members were tired by 11:00 P.M.

Council Member Wolbach suggested utilizing the written record and technology to avoid reading aloud at meetings. Anything that was read aloud or prepared reports should be placed in the record unless there was a real need to read it aloud. Digital clocks could be used to track time spent on Agenda Items and to track Council Member comments. He proposed scheduling Council meetings for the first and third Mondays only, and reserving the second and fourth Mondays for items continued from meetings held on the first and third Mondays.

Council Member DuBois proposed allocating times for presentations, utilizing clocks, and limiting meetings to three hours. The Council needed to look at the causes of exceptions and appeals, other ways that would shorten Council meetings.

Vice Mayor Schmid submitted focusing on meetings and setting a hard stop time of 11:00 P.M. for Council meetings. With the earlier release of packets, Council Member questions were being answered and distributed earlier. That should affect the number of questions Council Members asked during Council meetings. Perhaps question and answer periods should also be limited. The Chair should request time limits for each part of the Council meeting.

Mr. Keene agreed with the need for a change in culture. The Council had to rethink content delivery and participation or it would be impossible to make any changes. Staff could provide their presentations technologically in advance of Council meetings. One afternoon per month could be reserved for Study Sessions. Council Members could attend those meetings remotely or submit comments in writing for sharing during Study Sessions. He encouraged the Council to consider new ways to deliver information so that meetings could end earlier and allow better public participation.

Mayor Holman asked if the Council agreed to forward Council Member Wolbach's suggestions to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member Burt agreed with streamlining written presentations. The Council discussed the use of timers a year ago and supported it. He stated the workload would be cut in half was wishful thinking. Council meetings at the beginning of the year did not reflect the workload over the course of the year.

MINUTES

Placing more items on the Consent Calendar would make the most impact, but it would not have much support. He would not support referring a reduction of the number of Council meetings to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Filseth agreed that two meetings per month was not realistic. He wanted to retain Staff presentations for substantive action business as opposed to Study Sessions. Staff had been reasonably quick and concise with their presentations.

Mayor Holman agreed with Council Member Burt's comments regarding two meetings per month and with Council Member Filseth regarding Staff presentations. Other ideas could advance the agenda more rapidly, but they were not on the Agenda. For the Council to make progress on managing meetings and time, Council Members had to manage their comments.

Council Member Wolbach was not proposing to reduce the number of meetings by half. He was proposing changing how they were scheduled and agendaized. The Council likely would have three or four meetings per month; however, there would be more clarity regarding items on the Agenda for the second and fourth weeks.

Mayor Holman reiterated that the Council was not taking final action on any of the topics under discussion. She requested Council Members indicate their support for Council Member Wolbach's Recommendation 13-1 being referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Council Member DuBois did not believe the Council was discussing specifically Recommendation 13. He interpreted the comments as pulling out elements. He was not sure what the Council was attempting to accomplish by discussing only Recommendation 13.

Mayor Holman was attempting to get through as many topics as possible.

Council Member Kniss suggested a hold on some topics for three months.

Mayor Holman advised that the Council could bring up some topics later.

Council Member Burt explained that referring items to the Committee of the Whole was an action. He recommended the Council not take any action but discuss topics in the remaining time.

Council Member Kniss noted Council Members frequently continued speaking unless someone turned off their microphones. Council Members had to discipline themselves to limit their comments.

MINUTES

Council Member DuBois indicated the idea behind his suggestion of a chess clock was to provide flexibility in the length of time that people spoke per item.

Mayor Holman requested Council Members submit suggestions for other topics to consider.

Vice Mayor Schmid recommended the package of items be scheduled for a Council meeting with a substantial amount of time available for discussion and as soon as possible.

Mayor Holman stated Staff could possibly schedule it for February 9, 2015, but not for February 2, 2015.

4. Wrap-up and Next Steps.

James Keene, City Manager, requested the Mayor close the Retreat with a summation.

Mayor Holman felt the Retreat was productive. Reviewing the work plan moved the Council in a good direction. The Council adopted four Priorities and began a discussion of accomplishing work and managing meetings.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 P.M.