



CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL FINAL MINUTES

Special Meeting
February 2, 2019

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Community Meeting Room at 9:05 A.M.

Present: Cormack, Filseth, Fine, Kniss, Kou, Tanaka

Absent: DuBois

Mayor's Welcome, Overview of the Day, and Retreat Orientation

Mayor Filseth remarked that the Council was attempting to set broad Priorities for where the Council spent its energy. The Council was responsible for vision, policy, and oversight of the City. Each year, the Council developed a list of three or four Priorities on which the Council wished to focus for the year. During the year, the Council would try new procedures.

1. Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 National Citizen Survey™.

Harriet Richardson, City Auditor, reported the Performance Report and the Citizen Centric Survey would likely be published the following week. The response rate for the National Citizen Survey had declined gradually over time. In an attempt to increase the response rate, Staff increased the number of surveys sent to residents and reduced the length of the survey by eliminating some demographic information and some questions. 4,500 surveys were mailed, and approximately 4 percent were returned as undeliverable. From the balance of the surveys, 889 responses were received, which was 275 more than the previous year. The response rate for 2018 and 2019 was 21 percent. One hundred and ninety responses were provided online. Based on the number of responses, the margin of error was +/- 3 percent overall, +/- 5 percent based on responses from North and South Palo Alto, and +/- 15 percent based on responses from the six geographic subareas. Responses were weighted to reflect Palo Alto's adult population. Factors used to weight responses were ownership or rental of dwelling units, attached or detached dwelling units, race, ethnicity, age, gender, and location. Ratings for five of the seven quality of life questions were similar to the 2007 ratings and were 80 percent or higher. The long-term trend for all quality of life questions except neighborhood as a place to live was downward. Respondents in the 25-34 age bracket tended to give the lowest ratings to quality of life questions, and respondents who owned

FINAL MINUTES

their homes tended to give the highest ratings. One of the biggest areas of decline was Palo Alto as a place to retire with a decrease of 28 percent since 2003. Respondents were more likely to rate the question higher if they were fully retired, owned their home, had lived in Palo Alto for more than ten years, or had no children under the age of 18 living at home. Ratings for whether residents favorably viewed the overall direction of Palo Alto showed a decline of 12 percent. Respondents under age 35 were less likely to stay in Palo Alto for the next five years. Respondents who owned their home or had lived in Palo Alto for more than ten years were much more likely than renters to stay in Palo Alto for the next five years. The National Research Center categorized survey questions into eight facets: built environment, community engagement, economy, education and enrichment, mobility, natural environment, recreation and wellness, and safety. The ratings for each facet varied from 15 percent to 89 percent. Fourteen questions comprised of six safety questions, two recreation and wellness questions, two built environment questions, two education and enrichment questions, one community engagement question, and one quality of life question received ratings of 90 percent or higher. Most of the safety questions were related to fire services and feelings of safety in Palo Alto. The recreation and wellness questions were related to frequency of visits to parks and the quality of City parks. The built environment questions were related to the reliability of utility services and library facilities. The education and enrichment questions were related to the likelihood of recommending libraries to friends and the quality of K-12 education. The community engagement question was related to interaction between neighbors. The quality of life question was related to the neighborhood as a place to live. Respondents rated 29 questions 80-89 percent, 32 questions 70-79 percent, 16 questions 60-69 percent, 15 questions 50-59 percent, 14 questions 40-49 percent, 7 questions 30-39 percent, 5 questions 20-29 percent, 2 questions 10-19 percent, and 2 questions less than 10 percent. Overall, 75 questions were rated 75 percent or higher. The survey contained two open-ended questions. Comments to the question of what one change could the City make that would make the respondent happier concerned traffic (23 percent of comments), housing (21 percent), development other than housing (10 percent), and general government operations (8 percent). Comments to the question of what one thing does the City do well and should be maintained concerned parks, open space, and natural environment (23 percent), safety services (12 percent), library (11 percent), sense of community, community activities, and recreation (10 percent), utilities (10 percent), and schools and education (8 percent).

Council Member Kniss referred to the 2018 Bay Area polling results, which mirrored the National Citizen Survey results. She requested Staff comment on results from 2018 and 2019.

FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Richardson advised that she had not compared the National Citizen Survey results with any other polling results. Based on articles she had read, affordable housing and traffic were problems across the country.

Council Member Kniss recalled a Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz, and Associates (FM3) representative's comments about Bay Area residents' general unhappiness.

Mayor Filseth commented on residents' decreasing confidence that the City was headed in the right direction and decreasing confidence in local government. He inquired whether data regarding long-term trends was available for other cities.

Ms. Richardson did not know. She could attempt to obtain data from other cities that utilized the National Citizen Survey.

Council Member Kou felt the report demonstrated the need to regain the public's trust in government. She questioned whether regional efforts could impact local jurisdictions when regional efforts may not be appropriate for each jurisdiction. She expressed sadness that the rating for raising children in Palo Alto was declining. The Council should discuss whether the Legislature and regional agencies were the appropriate parties to decide what was good for Palo Alto.

Ms. Richardson indicated 86 percent of respondents with children under age 18 living at home rated Palo Alto as an excellent or good place to raise children, and 69 percent of respondents with no children living at home rated it as excellent or good.

Council Member Kou requested a comparison of the current results to the results of two and ten years previously.

Ms. Richardson did not have the raw data for ten years earlier in order to perform an analysis. She could review data for two years previously and provide information to the Council.

Vice Mayor Fine found the decline in confidence regarding Palo Alto as a place to retire interesting. The rating for neighborhood as a place to live had been relatively consistent. Some of the written comments related to neighborhood as a place to live. Because the Council's ability to alleviate traffic congestion and to reduce the cost of housing was limited, raising residents' confidence in government would be challenging. The survey did not address climate change or global warming issues or local retail. He inquired about indicators for those issues.

FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Richardson referred the Council to Question 6 for which 79 percent of respondents felt shopping opportunities were excellent or good. Seventy-one percent of respondents felt vibrant commercial areas were excellent or good.

Vice Mayor Fine noted the ratings for availability of affordable, quality childcare or preschool and for availability of affordable, quality mental health care declined 10 percent and 12 percent respectively.

Ms. Richardson related that ratings for none of the questions increased by 5 percent or more over the prior year.

Council Member Cormack felt the benchmarking data provided the Council with some insight. Responses to questions about parks, libraries, trees, and utilities were positive. Responses to traffic in all of its various dimensions reflected the comments she received during her campaign. The City could probably do a lot more to alleviate traffic congestion. The discrepancy between results for North and South Palo Alto was notable. She requested Staff comment on possible causes for the discrepancy.

Ms. Richardson suggested the location of shopping and development and the convenience of traveling to those locations could be causes.

Council Member Cormack had noticed a significant decline in the number of residents watching meetings over the past ten years. Perhaps the Council was not discussing interesting things or meetings were lasting too long or residents had better options. The Council should think about other methods to communicate with the public and to encourage people to participate.

Council Member Kniss remarked that most people liked living in Palo Alto. Being engaged in the community may increase the desirability of living in Palo Alto. The upgrade of equipment in the Council Chambers should improve the viewing experience. Palo Alto was a wonderful place to live. She inquired whether Palo Alto was one of the five or six most expensive places to live in the Bay Area.

Council Member Kou replied yes.

Council Member Kniss believed the Council could do some things better and be more aware. People who attended meetings cared about the direction of the City.

Council Member Kou wanted residents to engage with the Council and share their opinions.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka expressed concern regarding the length of the survey and questioned whether a shorter but more frequent survey would be more advantageous.

Ms. Richardson recognized the difficulties of more frequent surveys. Reducing the number of questions was an option.

Council Member Tanaka suggested instituting surveys at the end of phone calls, on the website, and in City offices to provide more frequent and immediate data. He asked why the Tableau data could not be downloaded.

Ms. Richardson did not realize the data was locked and would unlock it.

Mayor Filseth requested the survey data be provided in an Excel file.

Ms. Richardson agreed to provide the data.

Council Member Tanaka felt the public should have access to the data.

Ms. Richardson clarified that the National Research Center would not allow the release of all raw data from the survey.

Council Member Tanaka requested Staff comment regarding the cost of services.

Ms. Richardson explained that comments to an open-ended question addressed reducing the budget and reducing the cost of services.

Mayor Filseth asked if it was trending up or down.

Ms. Richardson could not compile trends for comments.

Mayor Filseth inquired whether comments were included in the raw data.

Ms. Richardson answered no.

Mayor Filseth wanted to sort comments by demographic data.

Ms. Richardson did not have demographic data for comments.

Council Member Tanaka was surprised by the downward trend in the rating of the overall economic health of Palo Alto given the economic health of the area.

Ms. Richardson suggested other questions in the survey could affect responses regarding the economic health of Palo Alto.

FINAL MINUTES

Mayor Filseth liked the National Citizen Survey because it obtained opinions from a statistical sample of Palo Alto residents. The results often provoked more questions than they answered. The Council often did not follow up with the survey.

Ms. Richardson advised that the survey was standardized and did not obtain residents' reasons for responding as they did. Focus groups would be needed to analyze the survey questions more deeply.

Vice Mayor Fine questioned whether the Council should review its Priorities and the survey results after six months.

Ms. Richardson noted some geographic areas responded more positively and some less positively. Community opinions differed based on the area in which residents lived.

Council Member Kou believed Town Hall meetings were a good method for obtaining opinions and feedback from various neighborhoods.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Council took a break from 10:10 A.M. to 10:26 A.M.

2. Discussion of 2018 Council Priorities (Transportation, Housing, Budget and Finance, and Grade Separation) and Selection of 2019 Council Priorities and Discussion and Definition of the 2019 Priorities With Greater Specificity, e.g., Sub-bullets, Outcomes, Milestones, Key Performance Indicators.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, reported the Priority-setting guidelines were provided at places. The 2018 Council Priorities were transportation, housing, grade separation, and budget and finance. Staff applied lessons learned from the Ross Road project to the Charleston/Arastradero project. The Council approved changes to the North Middlefield Road Project in response to a safety concern. A construction contract for the California Avenue Parking Garage had been awarded. Establishing Residential Preferential Parking Permit (RPP) Programs and retaining transportation staffing had been challenging. The Transportation Division was undergoing reorganization and recruiting a new Chief Transportation Official. The Transportation Management Association (TMA) was making progress in managing commute demand. The Council had adopted a Housing Work Plan, an Affordable Housing Combining District, an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) policy, and an Ordinance requiring relocation assistance for renters. 80 applications for ADUs had been submitted.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kniss requested the number of approved ADU projects.

Mr. Shikada replied 48 ADU projects had been approved since 2017.

Mayor Filseth requested the rate at which applications were submitted.

Mr. Shikada responded 48-50.

Jonathan Lait, Planning and Community Environment Interim Director, advised that Staff issued 36 permits for ADUs in 2018 and had received 48 applications since 2017. Approximately 34 applications for ADUs were pending. It was too soon to identify any trends.

Council Member Kniss requested the number of ADUs built since adoption of the ADU Ordinance.

Mr. Lait did not know the exact number of ADUs built since 2017.

Mr. Shikada remarked that the grade separation discussion had made great progress over 2018 with a new consultant joining the City in April 2018. Thirty-four grade separation alternatives had been reduced to six. In 2018, the Council implemented a \$4 million reduction in the budget in order to fund the City's pension liability. The City continued transferring funds to the pension trust. Identification of structural budget changes beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 was underway. The Council proposed, and the voters approved an increase in the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT). The Council certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and approved a design for the Public Safety Building (PSB). A construction contract for the California Avenue Parking Garage had been awarded. Agreements for the Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge were signed, and plans were undergoing final review. Construction began on Fire Station Number 3 and was expected to be complete in the spring of 2019. The Downtown Garage received Architectural Review Board (ARB) approval, and an EIR would be presented to the Council for certification. Over the course of the year, Staff had worked on airplane noise, the aquatics program, Recreational Vehicle (RV) parking, the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP), and partnerships for the Roth Building, the Animal Shelter, the Junior Museum and Zoo, and the Media Center. The City had supported community-building events and sustainability as a culture.

David Coale wanted the Council to make climate change a top Priority for 2019. Council actions should be bolder than in the past and address climate change directly. Palo Alto had cleaned up its electricity supply but needed to switch to electricity for transportation, homes, and businesses.

FINAL MINUTES

Jeff Hoel urged the Council to consider Fiber To The Premises (FTTP) as a Priority. FTTP would improve communications and encourage telecommuting.

Neva Yarkin remarked that grade separations needed to be done right. Construction of grade separations would cause major upheaval for residents. Grade separations should be a Council Priority in 2019.

Greg Schmid shared data regarding housing and income inequality in Palo Alto. The solution was to stop construction of offices and to require businesses to pay for infrastructure and housing costs.

Terry Holzemer hoped the Council would take simple and direct actions to alleviate traffic congestion and reinforce the Downtown office cap.

Suzanne Keehn stated the Council should stop job growth, which would reduce traffic congestion, increase mobility, and reduce land costs for affordable housing projects. Businesses should be taxed to pay for infrastructure.

Marie Jo Fremont indicated airplane noise should be a Council Priority. Airplane noise affected the health and quality of life of many Palo Alto residents.

Bret Andersen suggested the Council review the goals and actions contained in the Sustainability Implementation Plan (SIP) to ensure the City was on track to attain the goal of an 80-percent reduction in emissions by 2030.

Bruce Hodge asked the Council to make climate mitigation a Council Priority.

Jennifer Landesmann hoped the Council would protect Palo Alto from industrial waste.

John Guislin believed the Council had to engage with residents and ensure residents remained engaged. When residents were engaged in projects, the projects were better. The Council needed measurements that would aid it in drafting specific goals.

Mila Zelkha, Palantir Technologies, advised that the private sector hired Joint Ventures Silicon Valley in order to convene public and private stakeholders across seven cities to explore cross-jurisdictional Transportation Management Association (TMA coordination). She hoped the Council would participate in the stakeholder talks.

Bob Moss suggested the Council talk with Leland Stanford Junior University, major employers, local retailers, and business associations about expanding

FINAL MINUTES

or supporting bus transportation in Palo Alto. As a last resort, the City could consider operating a bus system instead of the shuttle.

Arthur Keller recommended Priorities of transportation and parking, housing and jobs, and safety and flood protection.

Don Jackson urged the Council to define, cost, and implement a municipal FTTP service.

Pat Burt remarked that traffic and housing were both local and regional problems. The root cause of those problems was the unsustainable rate of big technology growth. A business tax could generate funding for trip reduction, grade separations, and affordable housing.

Becky Sanders suggested the Council preserve the office cap, de-incentivize office growth, build more Below Market Rate (BMR) housing, direct incentives toward developers of 80-percent or less of area median income (AMI) housing, prevent the replacement of local retail uses with market-rate housing, and study the impacts of new housing projects on existing residents.

Megan Kanne hoped the Council would consider sustainability, housing, and bike infrastructure as 2019 Priorities.

Council Member Kniss favored climate change as a Priority because of its importance to Palo Alto and the President's attitude toward climate change. The Council may need to work through a process to address climate change. Grade separations should continue as a Priority. Transportation, whether buses, shuttles, or the TMA, should be a Priority.

Council Member Cormack concurred with Vice Mayor Fine's suggestion for the Council to revisit its Priorities in six months. She proposed Priorities of traffic and transportation, and Cubberley Community Center. Planning the Cubberley site would require a different kind of work than the City had done in the past. Grade separations and climate, environment, and ecology should be Priorities. The Council needed to do something with respect to climate, environment, and ecology, whether selecting it as a Council Priority or including it in all Council initiatives. The current time was extraordinary because of the construction of City infrastructure.

Council Member Kou believed the highest Priority should be regaining the public's trust and confidence in government. The Council had to implement a business tax. She expressed concern about the number of vacant Staff positions in the City. City staffing should be a Priority. She requested an update regarding staffing by April. Aligning the budget, staffing, and work

FINAL MINUTES

plan would be helpful. A chart of all City projects and timelines along with periodic updates would also be helpful. The Council needed to consider communications with the public and opportunities to engage the community in City projects. Climate change could be an overarching goal for all policies. The grade separation process had progressed significantly thanks to the citizens advisory panel. The Council should revisit FTTP.

Mayor Filseth noted proposed Priorities were climate/Sustainability and Climate Action Plan (S/CAP), grade separation, transportation and traffic, Cubberley Community Center, public trust and confidence in government, business tax, City staffing, and FTTP.

Council Member Kniss suggested City staffing was an ongoing responsibility of the City Manager.

Mayor Filseth felt grade separation, transportation, long-term fiscal sustainability, and community engagement/community alignment had to be Council Priorities. A business tax would be part of fiscal sustainability.

Council Member Tanaka questioned the influence of Council Priorities on Staff's and the Council's work and the Council's effectiveness in achieving its Priorities. While transportation was a key issue for the City, transportation as a Priority was not sufficiently specific. He wanted to prioritize the City's infrastructure projects. Climate change as a Priority should be more specific and actionable.

Vice Mayor Fine proposed Priorities of mobility, climate change, communications, economic diversity, and grade separations.

Mayor Filseth added Council Member DuBois' Priority of a focus on Ventura. The Council Priorities had led to actions such as adopting the Housing Ordinance and revising the pension discount rate.

Mr. Shikada reported the Council achieved specific milestones in 2018 for each of its Priorities. Staff could present a work plan based on the 2019 Priorities or Council Members could submit Colleagues' Memos for specific policy proposals.

Mayor Filseth added that the Council could form an Ad Hoc Committee to draft deliverables, action items, and Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for Priorities.

Council Member Cormack suggested climate change and the S/CAP could include a report on S/CAP objectives and a cost/benefit analysis as a performance metric. For grade separations, the Council should consider

FINAL MINUTES

Measure B funding and details of a Downtown coordinated area plan. Traffic and transportation should include a baseline understanding of traffic in order to identify problems. A plan for shuttles could be drafted under the Mobility Priority. Cubberley as a Priority could include development of a final design and identification of funding options in partnership with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD).

Mayor Filseth asked Council Members to state their top three choices of the Priorities proposed.

Vice Mayor Fine selected climate change, mobility which encompassed traffic and transportation, and economic diversity.

Mayor Filseth chose grade separation, mobility, and fiscal sustainability meaning a structural, long-term fiscal environment in which costs did not outgrow revenues.

Council Member Kniss indicated climate change, grade separations, economic diversity including fiscal sustainability and a business tax, and Cubberley.

Council Member Cormack supported grade separations, traffic and transportation, and Cubberley with a caveat that climate change could be woven into all Priorities.

Council Member Kou favored public trust and confidence including traffic and transportation, airplane noise, grade separation, mobility options and neighborhood shuttles, noise in the neighborhoods with an overarching goal of climate and sustainability. Fiscal sustainability would be a component of a business tax. Grade separations would be part of traffic and transportation. Council Member Kou's choices were transportation, business tax, and public trust and confidence.

Council Member Tanaka selected grade separations, traffic and transportation, and fiscal sustainability.

Vice Mayor Fine noted Council Members supported traffic and transportation, and business tax/fiscal sustainability/economic diversity. Grade separations were a part of a mobility discussion and a critical issue.

Mayor Filseth believed grade separations and traffic and transportation should be separate because grade separations deserved a focus of its own. Grade separations could be a fourth Priority. Traffic and transportation had a lot of momentum and was consistent with the National Citizen Survey.

FINAL MINUTES

Vice Mayor Fine stated Council Members had mentioned business tax, fiscal sustainability, and economic diversity. Economics as a Priority was probably too vague. A Priority that encompassed financial issues could be economics, or finance and budget.

Mayor Filseth noted the public rather than Council Members raised preservation of community-serving businesses as a potential Priority.

Council Member Kou asked if subsets of economic diversity could also be Priorities.

Mayor Filseth indicated the Council would discuss that point in the near future.

Council Member Cormack wanted a Priority for fiscal sustainability to include the concept of funding projects in the future.

Mayor Filseth suggested a title of long-term fiscal sustainability.

Vice Mayor Fine remarked that long-term was redundant.

Council Member Cormack proposed removing Cubberley.

Mayor Filseth suggested public trust and confidence could be combined with community engagement and community alignment.

Vice Mayor Fine advised that economics/finance/budget could be viewed as long-term topics such as balancing revenues and expenses over the long term, medium-term topics such as funding transportation efforts and affordable housing, and short-term topics such as preservation of local retail.

Mayor Filseth viewed fiscal sustainability as ensuring the City could pay its bills without cutting services or neglecting infrastructure maintenance. Economic diversity included retaining retail businesses and personal services, balancing independent and chain retail businesses, and determining the correct number of similar businesses.

Vice Mayor Fine did not mean economic diversity focused only on retail issues. It included housing issues of creating more rental units and funding affordable housing, a business tax, and funding shuttles.

Mayor Filseth asked if the title should be socio-economic diversity as opposed to business diversity.

Council Member Kniss believed fiscal sustainability and economic diversity could be combined to address the same issues. If climate and the S/CAP

FINAL MINUTES

was not selected as a Priority, the Council should implement a plan that would allow measurability to occur over the next ten years.

Mayor Filseth proposed combining fiscal sustainability and economic diversity.

Mr. Shikada agreed that the two were aligned. The City was a key player in and influenced by the local economy. Staff could weave the two together in a work plan.

Mayor Filseth commented that economic development typically meant a tax break for a business.

Vice Mayor Fine did not feel Palo Alto had a business development problem but did have some of the externalities of business development. People had mentioned a business tax, local retail, and the socio-economic makeup of the community. Maybe an appropriate title would be economic mix.

Council Member Kniss stated combining fiscal sustainability and economic diversity could include City staffing.

Council Member Cormack suggested another straw poll based on the reduced number of proposed Priorities.

Mayor Filseth proposed Priorities of: (1) grade separations; (2) traffic and transportation (mobility); (3) fiscal sustainability which included prioritization of infrastructure projects, business tax, and economic mix; and requested Council Members indicate their preferences for either climate and S/CAP or improve public trust and confidence in government as a fourth Priority.

Council Member Tanaka preferred fewer and more specific Priorities. If he had to choose between climate, and public trust and confidence, he would choose climate.

Council Member Kou supported improvement of public trust and confidence in government. More community engagement would build community trust and confidence.

Vice Mayor Fine remarked that climate and S/CAP and communications cut across all the other options. He selected climate and S/CAP.

Mayor Filseth assumed the Council and Staff would continue to work on climate and communications regardless of which one was chosen as a Priority. The community probably cared more about the Council focusing on

FINAL MINUTES

improve public trust and confidence than on climate; therefore, he supported improve public trust and confidence in government.

Council Member Kniss commented that one avenue to improving public trust was the S/CAP. She hoped the Council always attempted to engage the community. She chose climate and S/CAP as a fourth Priority.

Council Member Cormack supported climate and S/CAP. She was prepared to work on improving public trust and confidence and to use different approaches.

Mayor Filseth announced improve public trust and confidence was removed from the list of proposed Priorities.

Mayor Fine commented that improving public trust and working on communications was implicit in all the work and Priorities of the Council.

Council Member Kou added that improving the public trust and confidence was also incumbent on Staff. She proposed it as a Priority to ensure the Council did not forget to engage and communicate with the community.

Mayor Fine felt transportation should be the first word in the Priority because the problem was more than just cars. Transportation also complemented the climate goal.

Council Member Tanaka proposed removing the subparts of fiscal sustainability.

Mayor Filseth agreed.

Council Member Cormack asked if the order of the Priorities was important.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack to approve the following as 2019 Council Priorities:

1. Climate/Sustainability and Climate Action Plan;
2. Grade Separations;
3. Transportation and Traffic; and
4. Fiscal Sustainability.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0 DuBois absent

Council took a break from 12:30 P.M. to 12:48 P.M.

FINAL MINUTES

3. Discussion of Council Procedures and Protocols as They Pertain to Meeting Management and Participation in Local and Regional Boards Including Council Member Responsibilities.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, reported the City Council Procedures and Protocols Handbook provided limited guidance regarding liaison participation in meetings. The Council could discuss Council Member attendance at local Commission and Board meetings and at meetings between liaisons and chairpersons; periodic updates by Palo Alto organizations to liaisons; verbal reports from liaisons during Council Member Questions, Comments, and Announcements; and Staff's role in providing updates regarding regional organizations. The Council procedures called for Policy and Services Committee (P&S) review of revisions to Council policies and protocols. The Council may wish to consider tracking time spent on individual items and scheduling a second Oral Communications time after scheduled Agenda Items.

Arthur Keller suggested the Council ensure City representatives to local and regional entities attended meetings and provided reports to the Council and community. City representatives should represent the views of the Council rather than the representative's personal views. Two Council Members should be required to remove an item from the Consent Calendar and to present a Colleagues' Memo.

Penny Ellson hoped the Council would prioritize safe, convenient, multimodal mobility and commit to implement the vision for multimodal mobility contained in the Comprehensive Plan. The Council should ensure representatives attended the meetings of regional organizations that provide funding to the City.

Jennifer Landesmann asked the Council to communicate a list of Council Member assignments to regional bodies and the objectives and vision of Palo Alto's role in regional bodies. The Council should receive community input regarding the City's position on issues before regional bodies and provide regular communications regarding regional bodies.

Mayor Filseth inquired whether a list of assignments to regional bodies was posted on the City's website.

Beth Minor, City Clerk, answered yes, on the City Council page.

Mayor Filseth requested comment regarding meeting management, specifically tracking time on Agenda Items.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kniss advised that previous Councils had tried a number of methods to limit Council Member comments. Unless all Council Members agreed to limit the length of their comments, a discussion of methods would be pointless.

Mayor Filseth interpreted Council Member Kniss' comments as voluntary restrictions showed inconsistent success.

Council Member Kou remarked that an unlimited dialogue allowed Council Members to ask all their questions and Staff to respond fully to questions. Council Members could be more aware of time.

Council Member Cormack felt the main issue was a dialogue among Council Members often became a monologue. She suggested the Council consider allowing each Council Member five minutes per round of questioning. Policies for telephonic participation needed updating to allow Council Members who were working in other locations to participate in meetings. Perhaps liaison reports could be written. A specific amount of time should be provided at the beginning and end of an Agenda Item for oral communications. The Council did not have a policy regarding electronic devices on the dais. The procedures and protocols regarding members of the public addressing the Council as a whole had not been observed.

Mayor Filseth requested Staff comment regarding methods to limit the length of Council Member comments.

Mr. Shikada indicated the length of comments was a cultural issue, and the Council tended to discuss matters rather than proceed from questions to action.

Vice Mayor Fine concurred with Council liaisons providing written updates. He asked if the existing rules allowed two Council Members to present a Colleagues' Memo.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported the rules encouraged two Council Members; however, three were permissible.

Vice Mayor Fine remarked that Commissioners and Board Members had suggested the Council direct Boards and Commissions to conduct a study session in which they would propose best practices so that their feedback and participation with the Council could be more effective. He suggested oral communications be limited to 30 minutes and the speaker cards indicate the amount of time provided to speakers based on the total number of speakers. He encouraged Council Members not to speak if they had nothing valuable to add and to submit questions to Staff prior to the meeting. He

FINAL MINUTES

proposed the Council limit rounds of questions and comments to three minutes followed by a round of motions. Telephone participation should be easy or not allowed. Members of the public should address the Council as a body.

Mayor Filseth requested comment regarding altering the format of Agenda Items to Motions followed by discussion and Amendments.

Vice Mayor Fine agreed with altering the format so that the Staff Report was followed by a motion.

Council Member Cormack concurred with the caveat that Staff Reports should be comprehensive.

Council Member Tanaka suggested Council Members submit questions and Staff respond in writing prior to the meeting so that the discussion focused on points of debate. The Staff presentation should be published prior to the meeting. He did not support time limits on Council Member comments. Perhaps a cumulative time limit would be possible. Easier remote participation was important. The Council should utilize Boards and Commissions better so that the Council could focus on bigger issues.

Mr. Shikada reported a lead time was required for questions regarding the Consent Calendar so that Staff could provide answers the week before the meeting. Staff was reluctant to respond to questions regarding Action Items because of concerns about transparency and responding to one Council Member versus the full Council.

Mayor Filseth requested the City Clerk describe the use of a timer for each Agenda Item.

Ms. Minor advised that the Mayor had a clock to monitor the actual time with the times published for Agenda Items. Clocks could be provided for each Council Member so that Council Members could monitor the length of their comments.

Council Member Kniss asked if the clock would provide the time of day.

Ms. Minor indicated Staff could provide a clock or a stop watch.

Council Member Kniss reiterated that Council Members had to agree to limit their comments in order for time limits to be effective. The issue was balancing a complete discussion with ending meetings at a reasonable hour.

Mayor Filseth concurred with Council Member Kniss' comments; however, some approach could help the Council manage the length of meetings. He

FINAL MINUTES

questioned whether liaison updates were necessary when little occurred that was worth reporting. He proposed the Council follow Robert's Rules of Order.

Ms. Stump reported the existing Procedures indicated the Council did not follow Robert's Rules. Staff and the League of California Cities encouraged the Council to utilize Rosenberg's Rules of Order. The Council could adopt a practice to open discussion with a motion.

Council Member Cormack suggested a trial period of one month. The Council needed a mechanism to signal the time limit.

Mayor Filseth preferred a simple mechanism, such as a glaring look.

Council Member Kniss recalled a prior practice that required at 11:00 P.M. the Council approve a Motion to continue the meeting to 11:15 and subsequently 11:30, at which time the meeting ended.

Mayor Filseth inquired regarding the consequences of the Council not approving a continuance.

Ms. Stump indicated the existing rules and procedures provided methods for adjourning the meeting and calling the question. A motion to call the question required a two-thirds vote.

Mayor Filseth requested the meaning of Staff returning with a full draft to P&S.

Mr. Shikada related that Staff needed to present additional issues for P&S review.

Mayor Filseth announced Council Members reached consensus regarding a Motion following the Staff presentation for a trial period and requiring Motions to continue the meeting beginning at 11:00 P.M.

Ms. Stump recalled that existing policies and protocols provided a Council check-in at 10:00 P.M. The practice had been helpful in the past.

Mayor Filseth understood the Council wished to implement a five-minute time limit for Council Member comments. Council Members could have an additional five minutes once other Council Members had spoken.

Mr. Shikada noted the City Clerk would track the five-minute time period and sound an alarm at the end of the five minutes.

FINAL MINUTES

Mayor Filseth wanted to try the motion to continue for a month and then try a timer.

Vice Mayor Fine volunteered to remind the Mayor at 10:00 P.M. to solicit a motion to continue.

Council Member Kou asked if the intent of altering the format was to start the discussion with a motion.

Mayor Filseth responded yes.

Council Member Kou noted the Council usually moved the Staff recommendation.

Mayor Filseth advised that the motion did not have to be the Staff recommendation.

Council Member Kou wanted the public to hear a Council discussion.

Council Member Kniss explained the format could be a Staff presentation, a short round of Council questions, public comment, a motion, and discussion, amendments, and substitute motions.

Council Member Kou wanted to ensure the public understood the Council's intent when discussing items.

Mayor Filseth remarked that the round of Council questions should be questions to Staff rather than statements of position.

Vice Mayor Fine found Council Member statements of support or opposition helpful.

Council Member Kou believed reports from regional body liaisons should be scheduled early in the meeting. P&S could discuss the reports that should be provided. Council Members registering a no vote on Consent items should speak prior to the Council vote.

Mayor Filseth requested the City Attorney's opinion.

Ms. Stump related that speaking prior to the vote became a debate or conversation, which was not appropriate for the Consent Calendar.

Mayor Filseth added that the public would not be allowed to comment.

Ms. Stump clarified that the public was always allowed to comment. The ability to explain a no vote was limited in time and occurred after the vote.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou proposed the number of Council Members required to remove an item from the Consent Calendar be reduced to two. In some cities, members of the public could remove items from the Consent Calendar.

Vice Mayor Fine reported P&S discussed telephonic attendance, number of Council Members required to remove an item from the Consent Calendar, an explanation of a no vote occurring before or after the vote, and other topics. Many items would return to P&S for further discussion.

Ms. Stump noted P&S had discussed updating telephonic participation by removing the emergency description and allowing telephonic participation no more than three times per year. Given the new composition of P&S and Council, a further discussion at P&S would be appropriate. State law and procedures made the telephonic procedure cumbersome.

Council Member Kou asked if the State procedures were posting the notice at the location a specific number of days or hours in advance of the meeting, the agenda, and staff reports.

Ms. Stump disclosed additional requirements of the majority of the body had to be present in the City, the remote location had to be accessible to the public, and public comment, if any, had to be taken from the remote location, and others.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether reports from regional bodies should be written.

Mayor Filseth remarked that the current practice was informal. Typically, only critical matters warranted a report.

Mr. Shikada reminded the Council that the point of the Agenda Item was to streamline Council meetings.

Mayor Filseth remarked that some meetings occurred infrequently and others regularly. He asked if reports would be less work for Council Members.

Council Member Kniss replied no.

Vice Mayor Fine preferred written reports.

Mayor Filseth suggested reports could be optional.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Cormack agreed to provide written reports. A tiering of Board and Commission reports and specification of which bodies warranted frequent reports would be appropriate.

Mr. Shikada clarified that Staff contemplated regular updates regarding City Boards and Commissions rather than regional bodies. Council liaisons could request Palo Alto organizations provide them with updates in lieu of the liaisons attending organizations' meetings.

Council Member Cormack preferred organizations provide written updates because the information could be published without requiring Council Member time.

Council Member Kou preferred to attend meetings in order to hear the discussion among the parties.

Mayor Filseth requested the meaning of coordination with Staff on regional organization updates.

Mr. Shikada explained that Staff and liaisons may attend meetings of regional organizations, in which case Staff could provide regular written updates or distribute minutes from the meetings.

Mayor Filseth believed the liaison should have discretion as to the frequency of reports. He proposed the liaison provide reports when meeting topics merited a report.

Council Member Cormack noted Council Member DuBois felt the distribution of assignments was not equal.

Mayor Filseth requested Council Members contact him if their liaison assignments were burdensome.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Oral Communications

Suzanne Keehn felt the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance should be reviewed in light of privacy concerns.

Terry Holzemer expressed concerns regarding a statement made by the City Attorney's Office and a last-minute revision to an Ordinance during the most recent Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) meeting. The Council needed to discuss Code Enforcement. The Council should inform residents about the effects of legislation and regional initiatives.

FINAL MINUTES

Bob Moss believed the Council missed the significant impact of offices on the jobs/housing balance. The office cap should be no more than 10,000 square feet per year, and unused square footage in one year should not be carried to the following year. No action was being taken to remove office uses located in prohibited zones.

David Page asked the Council to increase public awareness regarding the damage caused by greenhouse gas emissions.

Jennifer Landesmann suggested the Council draft objectives and mandates for participation in regional bodies.

Arthur Keller remarked that the City had not exerted its rights under the Tri-Party Agreement with Stanford University and the County of Santa Clara with respect to the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP). Staff Reports needed to be provided ten days in advance of meetings so that the Council could submit questions to Staff and the public could provide meaningful input. The Council could reduce the number of Agenda Items to allow the Council to have meaningful deliberations and make appropriate decisions.

Wrap-up and Next Steps

Ed Shikada, City Manager, reported Staff would present items discussed during the Retreat to the Council for adoption.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 2:13 P.M.