The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date via virtual teleconference at 6:38 P.M.

Participating Remotely: Cormack, DuBois, Filseth, Fine, Kniss, Kou, Tanaka

Absent:

Special Action Item


Ed Shikada, City Manager reported Staff continued to provide essential services, redeploy employees, evaluate a variety of recovery, and track the fiscal situation.

Ken Dueker, Director Office of Emergency Services advised that the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and the Citizen Corps Council remained activated. Recovery pertained to every aspect of the community. Sheltering in place and minimizing exposure were the best ways to remain well. The number of cases continued to increase, but indications were positive. Hospitals were planning for all potential impacts.

Mr. Shikada indicated Staff continued to develop a program for small business financial support and a recovery strategy. He said the criteria for business financial support could be informed by feedback from the Business Roundtable. Staff proposed convening three to four Business Roundtables composed of 20 participants each with meetings beginning in the next few weeks. The Roundtables provided direct feedback that would inform actionable plans. Peter Coughlan of Saltus Consulting was to act as facilitator. Mayor Fine appointed Council Members Kniss and Cormack to a business support Ad Hoc Committee. Business support programs in nearby cities focused on brick-and-mortar businesses that had been deemed nonessential, had 25-50 employees and had a demonstrated loss due to COVID-19. Some programs included nonprofits some did not. Many cities were working with nonprofit partners. Staff proposed one-time funding of $500,000 from the General Fund. He was thinking funding could be used as seed money or matching funds. The Roundtables could propose criteria if the Council chose not to do so. Potential choices for the Council were businesses only or...
businesses and nonprofits; grants or loans administered by a third party; number of employees; a revenue cap; tenure in Palo Alto; a grant or loan amount; permissible uses of funding; and documentation of use of funding. The City and their partners began discussion of Governor Newsom's six critical indicators to modify shelter in place.

Lori Villarreal inquired about the criteria for selection of Roundtable participants. She volunteered to serve on a Roundtable or requested assurance that a businessowner with a voice similar to hers would be a participant.

John Shenk believed accurate information was critically important for the City to provide relief. Rather than providing funding, the City was able fast track permit applications.

Giselle Galper expressed concern for the safety of workers in essential businesses and suggested the Council require the wearing of face coverings.

Mary Jane Marcus suggested the Council consider a fund for low-income workers that did not live in the City.

Steve Sincheck expressed interest in participating on the Roundtable or offering input.

Mr. Shikada requested interested businessowners contact him via email at ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org.

Mayor Fine requested the rationale for the City to conduct or not conduct testing for the coronavirus.

Mr. Shikada explained that under-reporting of cases in other cities had created a misunderstanding of the importance for social distancing. In Santa Clara County, the importance of social distancing was understood. Staff had addressed testing with the Department of Public Health and offered to participate as needed.

Mr. Dueker added that the Department of Public Health had not articulated a need for testing but could designate a testing facility at Stanford University.

Mayor Fine related that City public safety personnel had access to testing at the Stanford University site. The Department of Public Health was the appropriate agency to enact and enforce the wearing of face coverings, and it preferred voluntary compliance. He inquired about the need to establish sanitation stations.
Mr. Shikada indicated hygiene stations had been installed for unhoused persons.

Mayor Fine inquired about the City’s potential receipt of funding through the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act.

Mr. Shikada explained that funding through the CARES Act was not available for cities, except through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding. The City was awarded slightly less than $300,000 in CDBG funding. Federal funding was available for counties and cities with populations greater than 500,000. Staff contacted the County of Santa Clara (County), and the County anticipated their expenditures for the health emergency would exceed funding allocated to it.

Mayor Fine recommended criterion for a Business Relief Program of 50 employees but no criteria for use and tenure. He inquired about the rationale for using a third-party administrator.

Mr. Shikada clarified that cities were using Main Street Launch for loan programs and community foundations for grant programs.

Heather Dauler, Senior Resources Planner added that third-party administrators had experience and infrastructure to manage these programs.

Mr. Shikada advised that the Palo Alto Community Fund (PACF) expressed interest in working with the City.

Council Member Kniss reported PACF injected $500,000 into the community over the past three weeks and delivered 8,000 meals to the Boys and Girls Club in East Palo Alto. Of that amount, PACF had given $180,000 to Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) families. PACF requested Council support of its efforts in order to leverage funding. Many people in Palo Alto had no physician to contact should they develop COVID-19 symptoms. The emergency department referred patients for testing at Stanford University. Almost all other testing sites required an appointment. More testing was needed, especially for those who worked in close proximity to others.

Council Member Tanaka felt implementing business relief quickly was extremely important. Funding for the Payroll Protection Program (PPP) and Small Business Administration (SBA) loans had been exhausted. The City needed to provide more than $500,000 and utilize matching grants. He proposed a streamlined process and criteria of potential future Sales Tax paid by a business and a maximum of 50 employees.
Mayor Fine indicated early city programs offered funding on a first-come-first-serve basis, and all funding had been expended. He thought the funding may not have been well spent.

Council Member Tanaka asked what the City Manager needed to initiate a program.

Mr. Shikada reported if the Council provided guidelines, Staff could present a proposal at the next Council meeting.

Council Member Tanaka supported the public comment about wearing a face covering in public.

Mr. Shikada explained that requiring face coverings could become an enforcement issue.

Council Member Tanaka suggested the public would comply with a mandate even if there was no enforcement. He asked about potentially relaxing the restriction on gardening because gardeners typically worked alone.

Mr. Shikada clarified that gardening to address safety issues was allowed. A gardener may not interact with the homeowner, but he was traveling and interacting with others. The point of the public health order was to minimize all nonessential activity. Routine gardening performed by neighbors or unpaid individuals was not allowed.

Council Member Tanaka inquired about closing streets to allow residents to have recreation while maintaining social distances.

Mr. Shikada advised that Staff was working through the issues.

Molly Stump, City Attorney reported legal issues had to be considered.

Council Member Tanaka concurred with Council Member Kniss' comments regarding testing. He requested to know the newspapers in which the City had advertised.

Mr. Shikada replied Palo Alto Online and The Palo Alto Daily Post.

Council Member Tanaka asked if messaging had included information about the store for paper bags.

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor, Chief Communications Official indicated Public Works Staff had communicated to all grocery stores that the City would not enforce the fee for paper bags.
Council Member Kou asked if an appointment for testing was required.

Mr. Shikada indicated Stanford University and Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) required an individual to consult with a medical provider prior to testing. Drive-through testing did not require an appointment, but an individual needed to have at least one of the common symptoms of COVID-19.

Council Member Kou inquired about contact testing.

Mr. Shikada explained that contact testing was based on a positive test from an individual, which raised privacy issues because of the use of medical records to trace the individual's contacts. The County was aware of the City's interest in supporting efforts to trace cases.

Council Member Kou inquired about County services for the homeless and vehicle dwellers.

Kristen O’Kane, Community Services Director did not have an update regarding vehicle dwellers. Nonprofit agencies were contacting the County directly to address needs for the homeless. Planning Department Staff was working with the County regarding Safe Parking.

Robert Jonsen, Police Chief reported the Police Department did not receive any complaints about vehicle dwellers since the Shelter-in-Place Order went into effect. Over the weekend, 27 Recreational Vehicles (RV) were counted on El Camino, which was a dramatic decrease from a March, 2020 count.

Council Member Kou preferred a low-interest loan program for small businesses with forgiveness of the loan if the business continued to operate. She concurred with criteria for businesses to generate revenue for the City and to have a maximum of 50 employees. Use of funding should be prioritized for workers who were dependent on their wages. Landlords needed to be part of the solution for retaining and preserving tenants. Individuals with urgent medical needs needed to seek medical care.

Vice Mayor DuBois preferred to emphasize the importance of face coverings rather than to mandate them; he supported comments about testing. Reopening businesses was going to be challenging, and Staff may need to draft rules for businesses to open. Perhaps the business support Ad Hoc Committee was able to draft some policy to help businesses recover. It was possible that a loan program could increase a small business' debt. He did not support using funding for rent unless a landlord was offering some rent relief but did support using funds to adapt to COVID-19. Maybe questions on an application provided some assurance that businesses would be viable into
and beyond recovery. Leveraging City funding was worthwhile. The City was able to provide resources other than funding, such as allowing the use of additional public space for social distancing. He questioned whether funding for small businesses would be better used in support of food banks and feeding people.

Council Member Cormack asked if Staff was contemplating placing homeless people into hotels.

Mr. Shikada responded no. The County was taking the lead on the issue and did not identify any hotels for that purpose.

Council Member Cormack noted the Morgan Family Foundation donated $100,000 of PACF’s $500,000. Rapid testing was available with results provided in 15 minutes. Testing sites where anyone could be tested were funded through philanthropy rather than cities. She asked if there were businesses in Palo Alto with fewer than 50 employees.

Kiely Nose, Chief Financial Officer and Director of Administrative Services clarified that 2,921 businesses that would have been subject to a Business Tax had fewer than 50 employees. Other businesses with fewer than 50 employees were possibly exempt from a Business Tax.

Council Member Cormack noted there were more than 2,921 Palo Alto businesses with fewer than 50 employees and calculated $500,000 expended in $5,000 grants or loans supported only 100 businesses. She inquired whether restaurants qualified for funding in other jurisdictions.

Ms. Dauler answered yes.

Council Member Cormack noted some nonprofits operated as businesses, and she did not want to restrict a program to small businesses only. She preferred grants rather than loans and using a lottery to determine the businesses that could apply. Many businesses provided valuable services that did not generate Sales Tax.

Council Member Filseth concurred with the preference for leveraging City funding. Retail and restaurants were impacted the most, and funding was limited to those businesses.

**MOTION:** Mayor Fine moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to direct Staff to return with a Business Support Program with the following parameters: in the amount of $500,000 in grants, up to 50 employees, with third-party administration, while finding leverage or seeking matching funds.
Council Member Kniss supported small businesses for many years because they colored the community. Everyone had their favorite businesses. She supported Council Member Cormack's suggestion of a lottery.

Council Member Tanaka urged the use of a streamlined process.

Mayor Fine indicated the Roundtable could provide feedback as to the process.

Mr. Shikada agreed that a Roundtable would probably provide recommendations.

Council Member Tanaka suggested increasing funding to $2 million.

Mayor Fine explained that $500,000 was a start. Additional funding probably was not feasible with the City facing a $20 million deficit.

Vice Mayor DuBois felt the Motion was premature as he understood the Business Support Ad Hoc Committee was to draft the parameters with input from the Roundtable. He preferred to cap the City's match amount. He suggested an Amendment to direct Staff and the Ad Hoc Committee to explore a business relief program and return to the Council as soon as possible.

Mayor Fine related that the program could be informed by the Ad Hoc Committee and Roundtable, but there was some urgency to initiating a program.

Vice Mayor DuBois requested the purpose of the Business Support Ad Hoc Committee if it was not to structure the relief program.

Mayor Fine advised that the Ad Hoc Committee was going to support Staff, the City Manager and the Business Roundtable. The Roundtable was going to be a series of meetings with dozens of businesses, and the Ad Hoc Committee was going to obtain businesses' feedback and distill it for the City Manager and the Council. He thought allowing the Roundtable to craft a program could require months.

Vice Mayor DuBois felt the purpose of the Roundtable was undefined. He preferred to focus on nonprofits separately. He strongly advocated for the use of City funds to match funds.

Mayor Fine asked if grants would be disbursed only if there were matching funds.

Vice Mayor DuBois explained that the City would contribute up to $500,000 in matching funds.
Mr. Shikada reiterated that Staff was in communication with a potential partner and needed to ensure the partner could seek donations to match the City’s funding.

**AMENDMENT:** Vice Mayor DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to require the program to include $500,000 in matching funds.

Vice Mayor DuBois expressed interest in flexible parameters, but a message of matching funds would be supported in the community.

Council Member Filseth expressed concern about the amount of funding in relation to the number of businesses. In light of the anticipated massive shortfall in City revenues, any amount for a relief program was a bigger concern. Leveraging City funding was a big factor in his support of a relief program.

Council Member Cormack did not support the Amendment because business needs, in light of the multitude of community needs, probably was not going to garner philanthropic support.

Council Member Kou asked if funds would be distributed once matching funds had been obtained.

Vice Mayor DuBois clarified that the City would contribute funding as donations were received.

**AMENDMENT FAILED:** 3-4 Cormack, Kniss, Kou, Tanaka no

Vice Mayor DuBois wanted to allow Staff to figure out the types of retail businesses and retail-like services.

Council Member Cormack supported the Motion but noted she may not support the program when proposed. She was not interested in limiting the program to restaurants and retailers. She asked when the Council would address nonprofits if not in the relief program.

Mr. Shikada reported the City had an ongoing series of grants and relationships with nonprofits including additional CDBG funding that the Council would review in May. If the Council wished to initiate a similar relief program for nonprofits, Staff needed to return to the Council with some analysis.

Vice Mayor DuBois asked if Stanford University had contributed $200,000.
Mr. Shikada indicated Staff was evaluating options for use of additional CDBG funding to present to the Finance Committee and the Council. He did not know the details of Stanford University's donation.

Vice Mayor DuBois understood information discussed during a Citizen Corps Council meeting included a Stanford University donation.

Mr. Shikada suggested the information may have referred to PACF monies.

Council Member Kou added that she understood the discussion referred to PACF monies.

Council Member Filseth was struggling with funding a relief program. He supported the Motion but may not support a relief program. One criterion may be a minimum business size because a large number of businesses had only one employee. Professional, scientific, and technical services may not be the target of the program.

Mayor Fine suggested the target business was one with a storefront.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7-0

Council took a break at 8:30 P.M. and returned at 8:43 P.M.

**Study Session**

2. **Presentation of the City Manager’s Proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-2021 Budget.**

Ed Shikada, City Manager reported taxpayers funded all City costs; therefore, the Proposed Budget reflected taxpayers' reduced incomes. The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and salary and benefits were the largest City expenses. Many of the forecasts and estimates contained in the Proposed Budget were prepared more than a month earlier and were out of date. Staff estimated a $20 million shortfall for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-2020 General Fund Budget and a $20-$30 million shortfall for the FY 2020-2021 General Fund Operating Budget. Staff was working on three scenarios: disaster recovery; shelter in place through the spring followed by an economic recession; and phased shelter in place through the winter followed by an economic recession. Sales Tax, Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) and charges for services comprised 40 percent of General Fund revenues and were extremely sensitive to economic constraints. Staff recommended a series of principles to guide work because over the past five years, the number of personnel declined to 1,035 Full-Time Equivalents (FTE) in FY 2020. Next steps included maintaining essential services, supporting businesses,
developing a recovery strategy and modifying the Proposed Budget in May and June, 2020.

Mayor Fine advised that, given the time and the magnitude of the crisis, development of a new FY 2021 Budget was not logical; consequently, the Council chose to initiate a carryover Budget. Pages 6 and 7 of the City Manager's letter outlined the task before the Council and their effects on services, staffing and Council Priorities.

David Page suggested the Council consider reducing office space and making remote work permanent.

Vice Mayor DuBois noted the Council would make drastic changes and cope with unknown factors when reviewing the budget. The Council needed data and needed to have an opportunity to request data prior to discussions. Priorities were going to change, and one-time funding was going to be used to fill budget gaps. He supported the principles for Staff work and did not want across-the-board reductions. Perhaps Staff was able to prepare lists of projects and initiatives that could be delayed for a year and that were priorities. He inquired about anticipated impacts to Utilities.

Mr. Shikada indicated nonresidential sales had decreased.

Vice Mayor DuBois proposed a token payment to the Pension Trust Fund and in-depth discussions of funding the Transportation Management Association (TMA), suspension of Utility Rate increases and elimination of community protections.

Council Member Tanaka concurred with the Council requesting data in advance of discussions. He asked if Staff had compiled revenue and expense data for Quarters 1-3.

Kiely Nose, Chief Financial Officer and Director of Administrative Services reported data was available for Quarters 1-2 but not Quarter 3.

Council Member Tanaka requested the assumptions or data be used to estimate the $15-$20 million shortfall for Quarter 4.

Mr. Shikada explained that the estimate was based on the dramatic decrease in Sales and TOT Tax revenues and Staff's understanding of the timeframes in which revenue decreases were felt. The shortfall was an estimate based on Staff's best judgment.
Council Member Tanaka requested the rationale for basing the FY 2021 Proposed Budget on the FY 2020 Adopted Budget instead of basing it on FY 2021 data.

Mr. Shikada reported Staff would adjust the FY 2021 Proposed Budget based on FY 2021 data as data became available. The Proposed Budget reflected Staff's understanding of department needs.

Council Member Tanaka noted Citywide revenue by category contained projections for higher revenues in FY 2021, but those would not occur.

Mayor Fine advised that the Charter required the City Manager to present a budget. With the impacts of the crisis unknown, the Council approved the preparation of a placeholder budget. The projections were wildly inaccurate, but they were a beginning point.

Council Member Tanaka asked if the Council would adopt the budget as proposed or revise the budget to reflect reality.

Mayor Fine indicated the second option.

Council Member Tanaka asked when the Council would receive more realistic projections.

Mr. Shikada replied on May 11, 2020 Staff would present updated information. Characterizing projections as realistic or unrealistic was inflammatory and did not reflect the time in which changes had occurred.

Council Member Tanaka believed a list of prioritizations would be useful and asked if Staff would provide that.

Mr. Shikada reported Staff would provide estimates and preliminary suggestions for priorities. The Council was to determine the priorities.

Council Member Tanaka asked why Staff proposed the use of temporary solutions to bridge revenue losses rather than more sustainable fixes.

Mr. Shikada clarified that temporary solutions would be applied to cashflow issues. Staff was able to discuss sustainable financial practices.

Council Member Tanaka did not support an across-the-board reduction. The City seemed to have too many expensive managers and reducing the number of managers was preferable to reducing services. He did not want to increase taxes and fees.
Council Member Filseth thanked Staff for taking a logical and systematic approach to preparing the Budget. The financial impacts of the pandemic were already twice as severe as the impacts of the 2008 Great Recession.

Council Member Cormack believed the third scenario was the most realistic and preferred to build an extremely conservative budget. Increasing funding during the year was easier than making additional reductions. She deeply regretted the proposal not to reopen all Library branches. She believed the Council should not omit long-term problems but continue to plan for them. While the amount was insignificant, she asked the City Manager and the Chief Financial Officer to cease paying their salary through the end of the year.

Council Member Kniss asked if Council comments had altered the way financial information might be presented in the future.

Mr. Shikada advised that future reports would reflect as much information and data as possible. Staff needed to continue to provide as much information as possible as transparently as possible to the public.

Council Member Kniss urged the Council not to decimate or dissect the Proposed Budget. Rational decision-making was challenging as Council Members had their favorite projects. She inquired about a more expedient way to take public comments.

Mr. Shikada indicated revisions or removal of the Shelter in Place Order in May or June, 2020 could affect meetings, but Staff would explore options.

Beth Minor, City Clerk explained that coordinating public comments in Zoom was a bit lengthy. The public was able to provide comments through other communication channels.

Council Member Kou agreed that communications and transparency would be the priorities regarding the budget. She inquired whether Staff could prepare data for Quarter 3 and forecast data for Quarter 4.

Mr. Shikada related that Staff was preparing third quarter information and would present updated data on May 11, 2020.

Council Member Kou asked if Staff would review each department for reductions in funding and programming.

Mr. Shikada explained that Staff viewed departments in clusters that provided related services and efficiencies. He anticipated presenting reductions for groupings of departments.
Council Member Kou remarked that reductions in the Community Services Department would be difficult because it offered many programs that the community valued. She inquired whether adopting a bare-bones budget and adjusting it afterwards, as the State would do, would be a good process.

Mr. Shikada was not clear how that process would be different from the proposed process. For the City, a bare-bones budget meant the largest reductions. Staff planned on presenting scenarios that could assist the Council with reductions.

Council Member Kou asked if Staff had prepared scenarios.

Mr. Shikada reported Staff had prepared scenarios for revenues. Under a two-year planning horizon, some programs were able to survive while others could cease in the first year and rebuild in the second year.

Mayor Fine requested Staff provide a forum for Council Members to request data prior to the May 11, 2020 meeting. He was interested in lists of projects and initiatives that could be delayed for a year or two and that should be accelerated. He inquired about leading indicators that could inform Council decisions.

Ms. Nose reported Staff was seeking current information from reliable sources as well as following National and State information.

Mr. Shikada believed the most important variable was a rate of recovery because it would drive planning and resources.

Mayor Fine encouraged Staff to explore alternate means for public input that could occur outside of Council meetings.

**NO ACTION TAKEN**

**Special Orders of the Day**


Beth Minor, City Clerk reported recruitments for the Human Relations Commission (HRC), Public Art Commission (PAC) and Utilities Advisory Commission (UAC) were underway for five weeks and were scheduled to continue another two weeks when the Shelter-in-Place-Order occurred. Staff had received one application for three HRC positions, four applications for four PAC positions and four applications for two UAC positions. The Municipal Code required recruitments of 15 days.
Mayor Fine noted an Ad Hoc Committee composed of Council Member Cormack and Vice Mayor DuBois was working on issues and opportunities for Boards and Commissions.

Vice Mayor DuBois proposed additional 15-day recruitments for the HRC and PAC, scheduling virtual interviews for UAC applicants, and including recruitments in City messaging.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether 15 days was sufficient time for recruitment.

Vice Mayor DuBois responded yes. With additional funding for nonprofits, positions on the HRC needed to be filled rapidly.

Council Member Kniss related that the HRC had discussed reducing the number of Commissioners from seven to five. She proposed 30-day recruitments as the Council had to work on the Budget.

Vice Mayor DuBois was fine with either 15 or 30 days.

Council Member Cormack believed the Council should consider the size of all Boards and Commissions and suggested a direction to Staff to present advantages and disadvantages, next steps, and a recommendation regarding the size of the HRC and the PAC.

Vice Mayor DuBois asked if reductions in size would affect the next recruitments.

Mayor Fine suggested reducing the HRC and PAC to five members and initiating recruitments for one position on the HRC and two positions on the PAC.

Molly Stump, City Attorney advised that reducing the size of the HRC and PAC was not agendized, but the Council was able to direct Staff to return with information. Reducing the number of participants required an Ordinance amending the appropriate provisions of the Municipal Code. A reduction in size needed to be made prior to recruitment so that potential applicants were able to know the number of open positions and the size of the Board or Commission.

Council Member Cormack asked if Staff could return to the Council with a presentation on May 4, 2020.

Ms. Minor replied no, because the Agenda Packet for May 4, 2020 would be released during the week.
Ms. Stump indicated Staff could present options to reduce the size now or prior to the next recruitment. If the Council chose to reduce the size at the next recruitment, they could hold positions vacant and not interview for them.

Council Member Kniss wanted to reduce the size of the HRC and PAC prior to appointing Commissioners.

Mayor Fine clarified the options as, one, recruit now and reduce the size for the next recruitment and, two, reduce the size and then recruit and appoint applicants. He preferred the second option.

Council Member Kniss concurred with the second option.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to direct Staff to return, as soon as possible, with options for reducing the number of members on the Public Art Commission and Human Relations Commission, and then reopen recruiting for the Public Art Commission and Human Resources Commission; and direct Staff to continue with interviews for the Utilities Advisory Commission.

Council Member Filseth did not want to appoint people to Boards or Commissions and a few months later eliminate their positions. That likely was not going to happen with the HRC and PAC.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7-0

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Mayor Fine announced Agenda Item Number 10, “Adoption of a Resolution Waiving the Business Registration Fee for Calendar Year 2020...” was continued to May 10, 2020; and Agenda Item Number 8, “Approval of Amendment Number 1 to Contract Number C16162436 With TJKM Transportation Consultant...” was cancelled.

**Oral Communications**

Judy Kleinberg, Palo Alto Anniversary Celebration Committee Chair recalled that anniversary events had been scheduled to conclude that day. The theme for Palo Alto Day 2020 was Palo Alto Proud with a focus on appreciating and acknowledging the community coming together and supporting each other.

Annie Reynolds, Palo Alto Museum Teen Advisory Council explained the Corona Challenge for Palo Alto Day 2020 and provided a link to additional information.

Charlie Weidanz highlighted Takeout Tuesday in support of local restaurants.
Minutes Approval

4. Approval of Action Minutes for the April 6, 2020 Council Meeting.

**MOTION:** Mayor Fine moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack approve the Action Minutes for the April 6, 2020 Council Meeting.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7-0

Consent Calendar

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 5.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to approve Agenda Item Numbers 5-7 and 9.

5. Approval of Contract Number C20177684 With Contract Sweeping Services, Inc. for Street Sweeping Services With a Five-Year Term and Total Not-to-Exceed Amount of $5,608,232; and Authorization of the City Manager or Designee to Execute Contract Amendments to Memorialize any Annual Consumer Price Index Adjustments to the Compensation Rates as Provided in the Contract.

6. 840 Kipling Street [18PLN-00185]: Variance Associated With an Individual Review Application for Modifications to an Existing Historic 1,192 Square Foot, One-story Single-family Home Allowing: (1) a Second-story Home Addition on a Substandard, Irregular R-2 Zoned Lot, and (2) Extension of a Non-complying Wall That Encroaches 2.5 Feet Into an Interior Side Setback; On February 26, 2020, the Planning and Transportation Commission Unanimously Recommended Approval of the Variance. This Project is Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e).

7. Approval of the Amended and Restated Agreement for the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Between the Cities of Palo Alto, Menlo Park, and East Palo Alto, the Santa Clara Valley Water District, and the San Mateo County Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District, to Reflect the Recent Name Change of the Latter Agency and the Current Administrative Practices of the JPA.

8. Approval of Amendment Number 1 to Contract Number C16162436 With TJKM Transportation Consultants and Amendment Number 1 to Contract Number C16163381 With Fehr and Peers for Provision of Oncall Transportation Engineering Project Support Services; Each Amendment
9. Adoption of an Ordinance Temporarily Suspending the Expiration of and Automatically Extending all Planning Entitlements, Building Permits, and Building Permit Applications Valid as of March 16, 2020; the Ordinance Also Suspends and Extends Municipal Code Application Processing Timelines. This Action is Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).

**MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 5:** 6-1 Tanaka no

**MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEMS NUMBER 6, 7, 9:** 7-0

Council Member Tanaka believed street sweeping was a critical service, but the contract was negotiated prior to the pandemic. The City received only one bid. The contract needed to be re-released for bids.

**City Manager Comments**

Ed Shikada, City Manager remarked that the contract in Agenda Item Number 5 was an example of ingenuity during the Great Recession. Compensation was based on miles served so that the Council could change the frequency of service in response to fiscal constraints.

**Action Items**

10. Adoption of a Resolution Waiving the Business Registration Fee for Calendar Year 2020 in Calendar Year 2020; Adoption of a Resolution Rescinding the Levy of Assessments for the Downtown Business Improvement District (BID) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020; and Approval of the Reimbursement of Business Registration Fees and BID Assessments Due in 2020. (Continued to May 4, 2020)

**Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements**

Mayor Fine indicated the Caltrain Local Policy Maker Group had canceled a number of meetings.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 P.M.