Presentations for the

August 24, 2020

City Council Meeting
ELECTRIC UTILITY
CARBON NEUTRAL PLAN UPDATE
OVERVIEW

Three key elements to the staff and UAC motion:

1. **Renewable Energy (REC) Exchanges:** Allow the exchange of in-state renewable energy (Bucket 1 RECs) for out-of-state renewable energy (Bucket 3 RECs), to the maximum extent possible while remaining RPS-compliant, but only through 2024.

2. **Use of REC Exchange Revenues:** Seeking Council direction on the allocation of ~$3M/year in revenue from the REC Exchanges.

3. **Carbon Neutral Plan Accounting Update:** Change the annual carbon accounting methodology used in the Carbon Neutral Plan to a more accurate hourly emissions factors.
PART 1: REC EXCHANGES
The City’s Carbon Neutral Plan states that all resources should be in-state.

Cost: $15/REC

Cost: $2/REC
“Supply to Sell” is 60,000 MWh of in-state, Bucket 1 renewable energy that exceeds Palo Alto electric load. This will be sold regardless of tonight’s discussion. It equals 7% of load in CY 2021.

“Supply to Exchange” is 195,200 MWh of in-state, Bucket 1 renewable energy that will be exchanged for out-of-state, Bucket 3 renewable energy if Council adopts the recommended motion. It equals 23% of load in CY 2021.
## REC EXCHANGE REVENUE POTENTIAL (FY 2021-2025)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales of Bucket 1 RECs Exceeding Annual Load (“Supply to Sell”)</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
<td>$0.79</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
<td>$2.48</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Bucket 1 REC Sales (“Supply to Exchange”)</td>
<td>$3.51</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>$0.95</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket 3 REC Purchases Cost (“Supply to Exchange”)</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue Potential</td>
<td>$3.46</td>
<td>$2.84</td>
<td>$2.90</td>
<td>$3.26</td>
<td>$3.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Revenue Potential:** $15.5 M

Staff & the UAC recommend re-evaluating this REC Exchange authorization by the end of 2022.
POWER CONTENT LABEL IMPACT (CY 2021)

Current Portfolio

RPS Level: 62%
Emissions Intensity: 6 kg CO₂/MWh

REC Exchanges

RPS Level: 36%
Emissions Intensity: 102 kg CO₂/MWh

"Unspecified Power" may confuse customers, make it look like we’re not meeting our Carbon Neutral supply goals.
PART 2: USE OF REC EXCHANGE REVENUES
POTENTIAL USES OF REVENUE

UAC & Staff Recommendation

- Reducing electric rates ($3.1M is a 2.1% reduction) 2/3 for first 2 years
- Building electrification & decarbonization programs 1/3 for first 2 years, then 100%
- Smart Grid (AMI) investment
- EV infrastructure investment/incentives
- Second transmission line
PART 3: CARBON NEUTRAL PLAN ACCOUNTING UPDATE
PROPOSED CARBON NEUTRAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Proposed Changes:
• Switch from an annual carbon accounting methodology to one based on hourly average emissions factors.
• Permit the use of RPS-eligible, unbundled RECs (“Bucket 3 RECs”) only for neutralizing any residual emissions that result from this change in carbon accounting methodology.
  • Projected cost impact: +$140k under average hydro conditions
• Only permit the use of Bucket 3 RECs for neutralizing residual emissions through 2024. Staff to return in 2024 to review/modify this policy.
• Additional minor clean-up to 2013 Carbon Neutral Plan.
PROPOSED CARBON NEUTRAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Motivation for Proposed Changes:

- The grid has changed dramatically since 2013 (Duck Curve)
- The emissions intensity of grid electricity now varies dramatically by hour and season
- CPAU’s periods of surplus energy generally align with periods when the electricity on the grid is relatively clean

### Average 2018 CAISO Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour Ending</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LbCO2/MWh

**Net Citygate Load** and **Net CO2 Emissions**
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NEXT STEPS

• Staff is currently in the process of selling the City’s surplus renewable supplies (Bucket 1 RECs exceeding the City’s annual load) for 2020.

• If approved, staff will sell additional Bucket 1 RECs, and purchase Bucket 3 RECs, in 2nd half of 2020.

• Staff will report on portfolio emissions under annual and hourly carbon accounting frameworks in annual RPS/Carbon Neutral Plan report (Q4).

• Staff will perform a comprehensive portfolio rebalancing analysis in the 2023 timeframe – prior to the 2025 Western contract renewal date.
The Council approves the resolution to:

1. Adopt an amendment to the Carbon Neutral Plan to:
   a. Modify the definition of carbon neutrality to use an hourly emissions accounting standard;
   b. Authorize the exchange of bundled RECs from the City’s long-term renewable resources (Bucket 1 RECs) for RPS-eligible, unbundled RECs (Bucket 3 RECs), to the maximum extent possible, while maintaining compliance with the state’s RPS regulations;
   c. For CYs 2020 through 2024, authorize the purchase of Bucket 3 RECs to neutralize any residual emissions resulting from the switch to an hourly emissions accounting methodology; and

2. Create a Cap and Trade Program Reserve in the Electric Fund which will hold revenues from the sale of carbon allowances freely allocated to the electric utility under the State’s Cap and Trade Program;

3. Direct staff to return to Council in 2022 to review the authorization to minimize electric supply portfolio costs via REC Exchanges; and

4. Direct staff to return to Council by the end of 2024 with a review of the Carbon Neutral Plan to evaluate the effectiveness of these policy changes and to modify them if necessary.
Jim Stack, Ph.D.
Senior Resource Planner
james.stack@cityofpaloalto.org
(650) 329-2314
The City currently has approximately a 10% surplus of renewable energy, and will pursue different sales strategies based on the decisions below:

1. **Business as Usual: Retain annual accounting approach** (*Baseline cost*)
   A. Sell surplus Bucket 1 supplies down to 100% of load

Staff & UAC Recommendation

2. **Hourly accounting with Bucket 3 RECs** (*+$140k/yr cost impact*)

3. **Hourly accounting without Bucket 3 RECs** (*+$600k/yr cost impact*)
   A. Sell surplus Bucket 1 supplies down to 104.5% of load

**Note:** Under each of these approaches, staff will report on net CO₂ emissions under hourly accounting approach as part of annual RPS/Carbon Neutral Plan report (no cost impact) & will use an hourly accounting framework for evaluating supply and demand resources on equal footing.
## EFFECTS OF RPS COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES (2020-2030)

### Annual Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Portfolio</th>
<th>1) Annual Accounting, Sell All Surplus</th>
<th>2) Hourly Accounting w/ Bucket 3s</th>
<th>3) Hourly Accounting w/ Bucket 1s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus Sales Revenue ($M)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$2.24</td>
<td>$2.24</td>
<td>$2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual CO₂ Cost ($M)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenue ($M)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$2.24</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewable Level</strong></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emissions Intensity (Hourly Accounting) (lb CO₂/MWh)</strong></td>
<td>-125</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42 (0 w/ RECs)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emissions Intensity (Power Content Label) (lb CO₂/MWh)</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff & UAC Recommendation
# RPS COMPLIANCE STRATEGY OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio Options</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Annual Carbon-Free Supplies (as % of Annual Load)*</th>
<th>In-State Carbon-Free Resources (as % of Annual Load)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Sell renewables &gt; Load (remain Carbon Neutral w/ hourly accounting)</td>
<td>Staff began implementing this in 2019</td>
<td>104.5%</td>
<td>104.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sell renewables &gt; Load</td>
<td>Would require purchasing small volume of unbundled RECs to remain Carbon Neutral</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Trade in-state renewable energy &gt; RPS requirement for out-of-state renewable energy</td>
<td>Staff would like to explore this, seeking UAC feedback</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75% (25% out-of-state renewables)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF RPS COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES (FY 2021-2025)
POWER CONTENT LABEL IMPACT COMPARISON

- California Grid Average
- Current Portfolio
- Sell RPS Supplies > Load (Stay CN)
- Sell RPS Supplies > Load
- Renewable Exchange Strategy
BACKGROUND – THE “DUCK CURVE”

In 2013, Palo Alto approved its Carbon Neutral Electric Supply Plan – and the Duck Curve first appears.
Palo Alto’s electric supply resources vary both hourly and seasonally.
BACKGROUND – CPAU 2018 ELECTRIC SUPPLIES

CPAU RPS Level: 64%
State requirement: 29%

Total Load: 906 GWh

- Solar: 38%
- Hydro: 40%
- Landfill Gas: 12%
- Wind: 11%
The mechanisms that could be used to abate the City’s residual emissions, and their current approximate costs per metric tonne of CO2 abated, include:

- Unbundled RECs ($3.50/mT CO2)
- Carbon Offsets ($14/mT CO2)
- Carbon Allowances ($18/mT CO2)
- Bundled (Bucket 1) RECs ($44/mT CO2)
- Rebalancing the Portfolio (Difficult to quantify)

Purchasing unbundled RECs or carbon offsets would be the easiest mechanisms to implement, and the easiest to explain. The argument against unbundled RECs is that they don’t provide any “additionality.”

However, aside from the CEC’s PCL protocols, all industry protocols recognize the emissions value of unbundled RECs.
## Cost of Abating 2018 Total Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Annual Accounting</th>
<th>Hourly Accounting (Average Emissions Factors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Emissions</strong></td>
<td>1,557 mT CO₂</td>
<td>17,675 mT CO₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbundled RECs</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Offsets</td>
<td>$21,800</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Allowances</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundled (Bucket 1) RECs</td>
<td>$68,500</td>
<td>$778,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Bucket 1 (PCC1)** – Energy and RECs (typically from CA) delivered to a California Balancing Authority (CBA) without substituting electricity from another source. Premium product, \( \sim \$15/\text{MWh}, \text{Min 75\% RPS} \)

• **Bucket 2 (PCC2)** – Energy and RECs (typically from an out-of-state renewable energy project) that cannot be delivered to a CBA without substituting energy from another source (i.e. intermittent wind energy needs to substitute in another energy source to meet demand during times when the wind facility is not generating electricity). \$8 \text{ to } \$12/\text{MWh} \)

• **Bucket 3 (PCC3)** – Unbundled RECs, or RECs that do not meet Category 1 and 2 conditions. \$2/\text{MWh}, \text{Maximum 10\%} \)
8 Can’t Wait Policies
Human Relations Commission & Palo Alto Police Department
Timeline of Review Process

Council directed the HRC to lead the “8 Can’t Wait” campaign (June 15, 2020)
• “Direct the Human Relations Commission (HRC) to lead the ‘8 Can’t Wait’ campaign and to produce a report on the Black and Brown history and current community in Palo Alto, within 60 days.”

HRC discussion on 8 Can’t Wait including panel of experts (July 9, 2020)

Asst. Chief Binder presented current PAPD policies to HRC (July 22, 2020)

HRC discussion and recommendations for revising current PAPD policies and additional considerations (July 22, 2020)
8 Can’t Wait Policies

1. Ban Chokeholds and Strangleholds
2. Require De-escalation
3. Require Warning before Shooting
4. Exhaust all Alternatives before Shooting
5. Duty to Intervene
6. Ban Shooting at Moving Vehicles
7. Require Use of Force Continuum
8. Require Comprehensive Reporting
HRC Recommendations

1. Ban Chokeholds and Strangleholds

**HRC Motion:** The HRC recommends that the language “Chokeholds, strangleholds, lateral vascular neck restraints, chest compressions, or any other tactics that restrict blood flow to head or neck” be explicitly prohibited and added to PAPD policy.

2. Require De-escalation

**HRC Motion:** The HRC recommends the model use of force language with respect to de-escalation, “prior to using physical, verbal and/or mental, non-deadly and/or deadly force, all law enforcement officers must use proper de-escalation techniques.” The HRC also recommends elaboration with a clear explanation of de-escalation tactics modeled after San Francisco and Mountain View.
3. Require Warning Before Shooting

**HRC Motion:** PAPD policy is consistent with 8 Can’t Wait. No change proposed.

4. Requires Exhaust all Alternatives Before Shooting

**HRC Motion:** The HRC recommends that the Council adopt the San Francisco PD policy which states that, “It is the policy of the department to use deadly force only as a last resort when reasonable alternatives have been exhausted or not feasible to protect the safety of the public and/or police officers.”

5. Duty to Intervene

**HRC Motion:** PAPD policy is consistent with 8 Can’t Wait. No change proposed.
HRC Recommendations

6. Ban Shooting at Moving Vehicles
**HRC Motion:** The HRC recommends that shooting at moving vehicles be banned unless the person poses a deadly threat.

7. Require Use of Force Continuum
**HRC Motion:** The HRC recommends that this matter be referred to the Council’s Police Policy Manual, Data, and Hiring Ad Hoc Committee and request the Ad Hoc work with the HRC and PAPD to explore optimizing use of force options.

8. Require Comprehensive Reporting
**HRC Motion:** PAPD policy is consistent with 8 Can’t Wait. No change proposed.
RECOMMENDED MOTION

1. Accept the Human Relations Commission report on their review of “8 Can’t Wait” policies in relation to current PAPD practices, and

2. Review and accept the department response, and direct the City Manager to revise Use of Force policies to:
   a. explicitly prohibit the use of chokeholds and strangleholds;
   b. add more comprehensive use of force language with respect to de-escalation; and
   c. revise deadly force application to require officers to evaluate each situation in consideration of the circumstances in each case and to use other available resources and techniques when reasonably safe and feasible to do so, including that an officer must reasonably believe the use of deadly force is necessary to justify its use.

Note: Implementation of policy changes are dependent on process and review by the PAPD, Palo Alto Police Officers Association, and City Attorney
Citywide Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc

Members: Mayor Adrian Fine, Councilmember Alison Cormack, Councilmember Liz Kniss
Purpose: This ad hoc is exploring opportunities to increase equity and inclusion throughout the City, both as an organization and as a community. Potential areas of focus include training, hiring and internal measures to increase equity and diversity.

What has happened so far:

- Exploring options for collaborating with neighboring jurisdictions
- Analyzing resources for diversity and inclusion best practices/lessons learned through professional groups
- Discussed Diversity and Inclusion elements for potential Citywide
- Focus of efforts will be both on City initiatives as well as Community engagement
- Developed draft mission statement for Council consideration, see below:

The City of Palo Alto is committed to creating a respectful, fair, and professional workplace and city. We will identify inequities and prejudices, welcome diverse perspectives, and use a collaborative approach to create an environment that works for everyone.
For Council Discussion:
• Review Draft Mission Statement
• Discuss timeline and elements of Citywide Diversity and Inclusion focus areas
• Explore and pursue partnerships with other professional organizations/jurisdictions
• Discuss approaches to include City Boards, Commissions, and Committees in overall effort

Next Steps:
• Further City Council discussion and possible adoption of Mission Statement
• Establish ongoing City Council updates, including work with professional organizations and jurisdictions
• Continue engagement with the community and workforce on race and equity efforts
Police Policy Manual, Data, and Hiring Ad Hoc

Members: Vice-Mayor Tom DuBois, Councilmember Alison Cormack, Councilmember Lydia Kou
Purpose: This ad hoc is exploring current Police Department approaches including how the department regularly interacts with the community, and the data collected about these interactions. It is also looking at current Police Department hiring and promotional processes and improvements.

Goals

- Suggest updates to specific policies to eliminate/minimize racial bias and deadly force and to increase de-escalation
- Suggest changes to hiring and transfer policies
- Suggest points to address in upcoming Labor negotiations
- Suggest additional data to track to inform decision making
Workplan:
- Review Memo of Agreement, Police Policy Manual, and other information from Police Department (internal sources)
- Review best practices and gather thought leader input (external sources)
- Convene, analyze, and recommend changes

What has happened so far:
- Review Memo of Agreement, Police Policy Manual, and other information from Police Department
  - Extensively reviewed the Police Policy Manual, learned about current approaches
  - Reviewed labor agreements and State law and other requirements related to discipline process, etc.
  - Received information regarding Police contact data requirements and new state legislation including the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA)
  - Discussed status of proposed assembly bills, lobbyist update at Council
Next Steps

- Review best practices and gather thought leader input
  - Explore opportunities for external partnerships for peer review and data analysis, such as affiliations with Stanford University SPARQ
  - Consider data analysis with an outside entity
  - Incorporate suggestions from the Human Relations Commission

- Convene, analyze and recommend changes
Police Accountability and Transparency Ad Hoc

Members: Vice-Mayor Tom DuBois, Councilmember Eric Filseth

www.cityofpaloalto.org/raceandequity
CURRENT AD HOC STATUS

Purpose: This ad hoc is focusing on how information is shared with the community and the timeliness of information sharing. It is looking at current approaches to review police incidents and other accountability measures.

Goals

• Suggest updates to specific policies around data transparency and accountability
• Suggest changes to Union contract to increase accountability
• Suggest additional data to track to inform decision making
**CURRENT AD HOC STATUS**

**Workplan:**
- Review existing city policies with appropriate staff:
  - Review of data flow from initial dispatch through the life of a request for support/case
  - Review of IPA process, public records request process, open data
- Review Best Practices / Thought Leaders
- Ad-hoc to write up suggested changes

**What has happened so far:**
- Flow chart of process and data in Use of Force (UOF) and Internal Affairs (IA)/Citizen Complaints
- Palo Alto Police Department created a *Community Briefing on Accountability and Transparency* (presented by Acting Captain Reifschneider; link: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aLu3Lbx2sVE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aLu3Lbx2sVE))
- Reviewed State legislation that would impact accountability and transparency
ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION & NEXT STEPS

Next Steps:

• Public Records request process
• Policy on default approach to information; removing redactions from policy manual
• IPA policies and turnaround time
• Disciplinary record policy - retention, use for hiring, transfers
• Statistical summary public reporting
• Individual case policy
Public Safety Alternative Models Ad Hoc

**Members:** Councilmember Greg Tanaka, Councilmember Liz Kniss
Purpose: This ad hoc will examine alternative service delivery options for public safety, including a Council budget related referral regarding fire services and medical response.

What has happened so far:

• Ad hoc discussed issues, conducted research and review options.
• Councilmembers independently met with Sunnyvale Mayor Larry Klein.
• Engaged with Sunnyvale’s Deputy Chief in a 2-hour learning session to understand model.
• Staff has researched alternative service options detailed in Data Transmittal #1 and available at www.cityofpaloalto.org/raceandequity
• Councilmembers were provided the opportunity to participate in ride-alongs with both Police and Fire.
Discussion:
• Unique nature of Palo Alto → Palo Alto has its own medical transport service; one of only a few cities in the state. (Counties are typically responsible for medical transport.)
• Advantages and disadvantages of the Sunnyvale model, including cost considerations.
• Alternative models or services for public safety
  • Opportunities to partner with County or others for models such as Psychiatric Emergency Response Teams (PERT) or Mobile Crisis Response Team (MCRT)

Next Steps:
• Conclude evaluation of Public Safety Alternative Models
• Pursue opportunities for “apples to apples” comparisons to other jurisdictions including collaboration with Stanford University
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