



CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL FINAL MINUTES

Special Meeting
October 28, 2019

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 5:19 P.M.

Present: Cormack, Fine; Kniss arrived at 7:28 P.M., Kou, Tanaka

Absent: DuBois, Filseth

Study Session

1. Study Session With Assembly Member Marc Berman.

Assembly Member Marc Berman reported the State had an incredible Budget surplus of approximately \$20 billion. Almost \$3 billion of the surplus was invested in housing and homeless services, and more than \$3 billion was allocated to the unfunded liability of the California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS). In addition, \$3-\$5 billion was deposited into the Rainy Day Fund. The State was facing challenges of homelessness and the high cost of living in California. He had introduced a bill pertaining to homeless students. Half of the State seemed to be on fire. The current structure of utility systems was not meeting the needs of residents. Decades of neglect and greed had led to utilities' inability to withstand heightened weather events. As Chair of the Assembly's Select Committee on the Census, he wanted to ensure the City of Palo Alto focused on counting each individual living in Palo Alto.

Council Member Cormack requested Assembly Member Berman's thoughts regarding natural gas, hydroelectric power, and nuclear power.

Assembly Member Berman remarked that Palo Alto's carbon neutral power portfolio made Palo Alto a test bed for phasing out the use of natural gas, particularly in new construction. The State needed to create the regulatory framework for more buildings to be 100 percent electric. He was not aware of the complications and challenges to electrification that existed in other parts of the State. A reliance on hydroelectric power was not wise given the uneven rate of precipitation across the State and the recent drought. Cities were able to test solutions to climate change, and hopefully those solutions were able to be scaled to solutions for the State.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka inquired about the possibility of allocating some of the surplus to grade separations.

Assembly Member Berman had requested \$1 million of State funding for Palo Alto to study grade separations, but the request had been denied. The Budget Reserve probably was not able to be used to fund grade separations. There were regional transportation measures that the City may be able to use for grade separations.

Council Member Tanaka commented that grade separations in Palo Alto would help commuters across the district and region.

Assembly Member Berman explained that the State did not control Caltrain's budget allocations.

Council Member Tanaka suggested funding should be prioritized according to station usage because it provided the maximum benefit per rider. Perhaps the El Camino Real Project was able to be moved forward.

Assembly Member Berman remarked that the improvement in the City's roads had raised people's awareness of the condition of roads throughout the district.

Council Member Cormack related that Assembly Member Berman's and Senator Hill's offices were aware of the need for temporary repairs to El Camino Real.

Assembly Member Berman indicated his staff was working with Caltrans staff regarding repairs to El Camino Real. Senate Bill (SB) 1 had dramatically increased funding for cities and counties to repair roads. However, the poor condition of roads had overwhelmed the funding.

Council Member Tanaka explained that the City could not purchase carbon offsets that would benefit the region and State because of the lack of certification of projects.

Assembly Member Berman agreed to learn more about the issue.

Council Member Kou shared a resident's request for televised broadcasts of the Legislature's hearings.

Assembly Member Berman reported the State had no control over the California Channel and could not prevent its ceasing operations.

Council Member Kou inquired about an alternative to the California Channel.

FINAL MINUTES

Assembly Member Berman advised that the State was seeking an alternative.

Council Member Kou inquired about funding for cities to implement the new housing legislation.

Assembly Member Berman related that the State had allocated \$2.75 billion to housing and homelessness services. Of that amount, \$250 million was allocated to planning grants to help local jurisdictions with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The Budget included funding to implement housing mandates even though the legislation for those mandates did not contain funding.

Council Member Kou suggested the Legislature link funding to the appropriate legislation.

Assembly Member Berman asked if certain bills had created high-cost, unfunded mandates.

Council Member Kou replied legislation that reduced impact fees.

Vice Mayor Fine requested comments regarding legislation pertaining to congestion management and reorganization of Caltrans.

Assembly Member Berman explained that the reorganization of Caltrans was intended to focus Caltrans' projects on active and multimodal transportation. Many Legislators were surprised by the Governor's veto of the bill.

Vice Mayor Fine clarified that legislation had been proposed to allow cities to charge drivers for traveling in congested areas.

Assembly Member Berman was not familiar with the details of the bill but would provide information at a later time.

Vice Mayor Fine inquired about innovative housing programs being tested in cities around California.

Assembly Member Berman was not aware of any programs around the State, but Seattle and Vancouver were testing programs to increase housing supply and affordability.

Council Member Cormack inquired about funding for early childhood education and the Schools and Community First ballot initiative.

Assembly Member Berman advised that the Budget contained \$1.8-\$2 billion for early childhood education, but the majority of the funding was allocated to

FINAL MINUTES

infrastructure. The Governor had created task forces for some issues, and early childhood education could be one of them.

Council Member Cormack commented that some members of the community would be happy to serve on a task force for early childhood education.

Assembly Member Berman supported assessing commercial property at current valuation and providing more money for education.

Council Member Tanaka inquired about possible State actions to address cities' pension liabilities.

Assembly Member Berman explained that the State implemented pension reform in 2010 or 2011 for future employees. The benefits of pension reform was to be realized as employees hired since 2012 reached retirement. The State encouraged cities to reduce their pension liabilities whenever possible. The State was not providing funding for cities to reduce their pension debts.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Closed Session

2. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY-POTENTIAL LITIGATION
Subject: Application From the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), Local 1319, for Leave to sue in quo warranto
Attorney General Case No. LA2019103723
Authority: Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2).

MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Council Member Tanaka to go into Closed Session.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0 DuBois, Filseth, Kniss absent

Council went into Closed Session at 6:03 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 7:00 P.M.

Vice Mayor Fine announced no reportable action.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

MOTION: Vice Mayor Fine moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack to hear Agenda Item Number 6A, "Approval of Amendment Number 1 to the Facilities Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the Friends of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo ... ," after Agenda Item Number 9, to become Agenda Item Number 9A.

FINAL MINUTES

MOTION PASSED: 4-0 DuBois, Filseth, Kniss absent

City Manager Comments

Ed Shikada, City Manager reported he had attended the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) conference. The Architectural Review Board reviewed a paralleling station as part of the Caltrain Electrification Project in early October, and construction would begin in the summer of 2020. PG&E had shut off power to more than 27,000 customers in Santa Clara County. Fire Staff had monitored conditions in the Foothills over the weekend and were going to continue to monitor conditions and potential power shutoffs. Palo Alto Fire Engine 65 had been dispatched to the Kincaid Fire in Sonoma County. The Cubberley Community Center Track and Field Renovation Project was complete, and a ribbon-cutting ceremony was held the prior week. The Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) for grade separations were going to meet on October 30, 2019. Project Safety Net was hosting a "Strengthening Families and Development Relationships" workshop on November 2, 2019. The City's veteran recognition event was scheduled for November 4, 2019. The deadline to submit an application for City Boards and Commissions was November 5, 2019 at 4:30 P.M. Staff had scheduled a Council discussion of Building Code updates and local amendments in two parts. The Energy Code was scheduled for discussion on November 4, 2019.

Oral Communications

Andy Turner reported he had been hit twice by vehicles at the roundabout at Ross and Meadow. He was a bicyclist and was wearing a highly visible vest on both occasions. He requested the installation of signage instructing vehicles to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk.

Ken Horowitz suggested the Council reject the proposed extension of the lease with Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) for Cubberley Community Center. PAUSD was not interested in developing the site. Ventura could be a good site for a community center.

Fred Balin remarked regarding Planning and Transportation Commissioner Alcheck's participation in a review of his own project.

Consent Calendar

MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Fine to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-6.

FINAL MINUTES

3. Approval of Amendment Number 2 to Contract Number C18172676 With Dixon Resources to Extend the Term to June 2020 and Revise the Scope of Work for Parking Project Support With no Additional Costs.
4. Policy and Services Committee Recommends the City Council Accept the Nonprofit Service Agreements Audit.
5. Approval of Amendment Number 4 to Contract Number C15155208B With Mead & Hunt, Inc., and Approval of Amendment Number 7 to Contract Number C15155208A With C&S Engineers, Inc. for Contract Extensions to Complete Phase II of the Airport Apron Reconstruction Capital Improvements Program Project (AP-16000).
6. Resolution 9863 Entitled, "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving an Updated Standard Form Master Renewable Energy Certificate (REC) Purchase and Sale Agreement, Approving Master REC Agreements With two Counter-parties, and Modifying the Approval Process for Future Individual REC Master Agreements, Thus Amending Section 2 and Recital J of Resolution Number 9652 (Continued From October 7, 2019)."
- ~~6A. Approval of Amendment Number 1 to the Facilities Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the Friends of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo, and Budget Amendments in the Capital Improvement Fund and Community Center Impact Fund.~~

MOTION PASSED: 4-0 DuBois, Filseth, Kniss absent

Council took a break at 7:17 P.M. and returned at 7:28 P.M.

Action Items

7. Policy and Services Committee Recommends the City Council Accept the Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of June 30, 2019.

Don Rhoads, Special Advisor to the City Auditor's Office reported Staff presented the City Auditor's quarterly report ending June 30, 2019 to the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) in September, 2019. A Status of Audit Recommendations Report was provided to the Committee every six months and was last presented to the Committee in June, 2019. At the Committee meeting, Council Member Tanaka questioned the fact that all complaints to the Fraud, Waste and Abuse Hotline had been closed. After review, he determined all cases had been closed. Calls to the hotline had not been categorized but would be categorized in the future.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kniss concurred with Mr. Rhoads' summary of the Committee meeting. The City Auditor's Office fell under the auspices of the City Council rather than the City Manager.

Council Member Cormack noted priorities for Code enforcement and Business Registry audits.

MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to Accept the Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of June 30, 2019.

Council Member Tanaka appreciated the revisions made to the report.

Vice Mayor Fine inquired about the implementation of green purchasing practices.

Mr. Rhoads said he would provide information at a later time.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0 DuBois, Filseth absent

8. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 874 Boyce Avenue [18PLN-00030]: Adoption of an Ordinance Amending Chapter 20.21 of Title 21 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Allow the Creation of a Flag Lot Where the Residence on the Front Portion of the Existing lot to be Subdivided Would be Protected Under an Historic Covenant; and Approval of a Preliminary Parcel Map to Create two Lots With an Exception Allowing: 1) a Narrower Than Standard Front lot in the R-1 Zone District (Single-family Residential); and 2) a 28-foot Longer Access Easement Than the 100-foot Long Easement Allowed Without Exception. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Guidelines Section 15308 (Protection of the Environment) and 15332 (Infill Development).

Vice Mayor Fine disclosed no ex parte communications.

Council Member Cormack disclosed no ex parte communications.

Council Member Kniss disclosed no ex parte communications.

Council Member Tanaka disclosed no ex parte communications.

Council Member Kou disclosed no ex parte communications.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official reported the Boyce Ashby Tract was subdivided in 1906 to create lots 100 feet wide by 247 feet deep. Flag lots had occurred at various times since 1906. 874 Boyce Avenue did not comply with the Subdivision Incentive for Historic Preservation Ordinance as there

FINAL MINUTES

was not a second home on the lot. 874 Boyce Avenue was a double-sized single-family residential parcel containing more than 12,000 square feet. As written, the Municipal Code prevented approximately 25 over-sized Historic Inventory properties from being subdivided. Development on flag lots was limited to one-story homes. The applicant proposed to preserve the home at 874 Boyce through a covenant for historic preservation, to create a new full-sized residential lot at the rear of the lot, and to grant an easement for access to the rear of the lot. The Historic Resources Board (HRB) and the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) had recommended approval of the proposal. The project met the required findings with approval of the exception. Comprehensive Plan policies supported the project.

Council Member Kniss inquired regarding the date when flag lots were prohibited.

Ms. French responded in the 1980s. Flag lots were not permitted in single-family residential (R-1) zone districts.

Council Member Kniss asked if the Preservation Ordinance was appropriate for the situation.

Ms. French indicated the Preservation Ordinance was intended to encourage historic preservation.

Council Member Kou inquired about the existing easement.

Ms. French explained that the existing easement had been granted for use by 874, 872, and 876 Boyce Avenue.

Council Member Kou asked if the existing easement would be extended to the rear of the property.

Ms. French responded yes, with some adjustment of the width of the easement. Visually, the driveway was to appear the same with the modification of the easement.

Jonathan Lait, Planning and Development Services Director advised that the applicant had chosen not to make a presentation.

Public Hearing opened at 7:47 P.M.

Herb Borock recommended the Council reject the Staff recommendation as the proposal was not exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposal was a segment of a larger project, and the proposed adjacent easements were effectively a public street that should be deducted from the lot area. The applicant was proposing a method of access that would

FINAL MINUTES

not reduce the lot area so that the applicant could apply for an increase in floor area. If the Council chose to approve Staff's recommendation, the Council needed to condition the application to prohibit an increase in floor area on the existing property and to prohibit use of Section 18.16.140. The applicant/property owner was knowledgeable about historic properties and knew to submit applications for segments of an overall project.

Public Hearing closed at 7:51 P.M.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack to:

1. Find the project exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15308 (Protection of the Environment) and 15332 (Infill Development);
2. Adopt the proposed Ordinance amending Title 21 (Subdivisions and Other Divisions of Land), Chapter 21.20 (Design), Section 21.20.301 (Flag Lots) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC); and
3. Approve the Preliminary Parcel Map with Exceptions based on findings and subject to conditions of approval included in the Draft Record of Land Use Action.

Council Member Kniss indicated the presentation and Staff's answers had addressed her concerns and concerns raised in the past.

Council Member Cormack noted the PTC had raised her concerns, and Staff had responded to those concerns.

Council Member Kou asked if the Code Amendment would apply to all lots that could be subdivided into a flag lot.

Ms. French replied that other property owners could submit applications for subdivision under the Proposed Code Amendment.

Council Member Kou asked if the amendment was specific to historic homes.

Ms. French answered yes.

Vice Mayor Fine related that approving the proposal would preserve a historic home and allow redevelopment of the rear of the parcel.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0 DuBois, Filseth absent

FINAL MINUTES

Vice Mayor Fine suggested the Council take up Agenda Item Number 9A next.

Action Items

9A. (Former Agenda Item Number 6A) Approval of Amendment Number 1 to the Facilities Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the Friends of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo, and Budget Amendments in the Capital Improvement Fund and Community Center Impact Fund.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Fine moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack to approve Amendment Number 1 to the Facilities Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the Friends of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo, and Budget Amendments in the Capital Improvement Fund and Community Center Impact Fund.

Council Member Kniss requested an update regarding the project.

Kristen O'Kane, Community Services Department Director reported construction at the Junior Museum and Zoo (JMZ) was slightly behind schedule. Construction was expected to be complete in the spring with an anticipated opening date in October 2020. Loose in the Zoo and the Treehouse allowed patrons to interact with animals. The proposed funding was the final transfer to the Friends of the JMZ.

Council Member Tanaka inquired about operating costs and admission fees for the JMZ.

Ms. O'Kane anticipated charging entry fees with tiers for the general public and JMZ members, but the amount of fees had not been determined. Staff planned to present a proposal to the Finance Committee in early February, 2020.

Council Member Tanaka suggested a discount for Palo Alto residents because their taxes supported the JMZ.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether Council Member Tanaka was suggesting a different pricing structure for Palo Alto residents.

Council Member Tanaka answered yes. Most programs offered residents a discount and sometimes a preference.

Ms. O'Kane indicated a discount for residents was a component of the fee discussion.

Council Member Kniss inquired about possible prices for fees and membership.

FINAL MINUTES

Ms. O’Kane reiterated that fees had not been set and discussions were ongoing.

Ed Shikada, City Manager advised that Staff would present information about fees to the Council at the appropriate time.

Council Member Kniss looked forward to a celebration of the reopening of the JMZ in 2020.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0 DuBois, Filseth absent

Rail Communications Update

9. Update From the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) and Potential Community Engagement Efforts Planned.

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor, Chief Communications Officer reported in September, 2019 Staff presented three phases for Connecting Palo Alto to the City Council. The first phase, Understanding Options, was underway. The second phase, Community Connections, was an opportunity for community-wide awareness and engagement, stakeholder advocacy for and against options, and integration with regional initiatives. The third phase, Decision Making, would be informed by community conversations and Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) recommendations and would provide information about regional funding viability and local funding strategies. Community engagement included online surveys, small-group conversations, and large-group presentations and conversations. Staff had launched a new website and a new blog series and was considering a digital newsletter, community meetings, fact sheets and one-pagers, social media messaging, and frequently asked questions (FAQ). A community meeting was planned for November 7, 2019 at Mitchell Park Community Center from 6:00 to 8:00 P.M. The City was going to host transportation talks in the community; three Town Hall meetings between February and April 2020; and tables at upcoming community meetings.

Ed Shikada, City Manager requested Council input regarding the events scheduled for the February and March, 2019 timeframe. The Town Halls would include XCAP and Council participation.

Nadia Naik, XCAP Chair advised that the XCAP had elected a Chair and Vice Chair, received Brown Act training and adopted Guiding Principles. The XCAP was exercising flexibility and creativity in finding solutions. The XCAP had altered its processes and meetings to include agendas, timely distribution of materials, roll call, balancing discussion with reaching consensus and an ongoing list of questions and answers related to grade separation issues. The

FINAL MINUTES

XCAP had learned about the relationships between crossings and surrounding streets, physical constraints, and the impacts of grade separations on the traffic network. Many in the community were not aware of grade separations. The XCAP was not receiving key information, particularly from Caltrain. The XCAP anticipated presenting a report with recommendations or findings for topics on which the XCAP did not reach consensus. The XCAP wanted to vet new ideas and present them to the Council after determining the ideas had merit.

Steve Carlson indicated Southgate residents were concerned about the option to close Churchill. Proposed mitigations without widening Embarcadero or Oregon would not be sufficient. Residents who lived on Mariposa adjacent to the railroad tracks were concerned about the impacts to property values. Perhaps the Council could discuss some type of reimbursement for those residents.

Rachel Kellerman endorsed the plan to engage in person-to-person conversations. Information was not readily available or easily found to share with the community.

Susan Newman remarked that a number of important questions about specific designs had not been answered. Southgate residents strongly supported the XCAP considering new designs and concepts.

Bob Moss suggested the community should be informed regarding impacts, costs, and potential corrective actions. Guest editorials and ads in the local papers were good outreach. Traffic counts needed to be conducted at all times of the day. The impacts of continued job growth had to be included in traffic data.

Rob Levitsky did not understand why the option to leave Churchill alone had been eliminated. Closing Churchill did not make sense. He suggested pilot programs to close Churchill for two weeks and to simulate a sixth train crossing during rush hour to learn the possible impacts.

Council Member Cormack expressed concern that the XCAP was not receiving key data. Building community awareness was crucial. The opportunities for dialog were important. Channels for broadly distributing a digital newsletter were important. She requested the agenda for the November 7, 2019 community meeting.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor indicated the goal of the community meeting was to build awareness and to update the community with information learned since the last community meeting in the spring of 2019. Tables to answer residents' questions were going to be organized by topic.

FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Shikada added that the community meeting was an opportunity to update the community.

Council Member Cormack suggested the Town Halls be scheduled at different times of day and in various parts of the City and include Council Members.

Council Member Kniss remarked that the community would attend meetings where decisions about options were made. She inquired about measurements to determine the level at which information had penetrated the community.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor related that analytics would provide data about digital interactions. In-person contacts and online surveys were to be tracked.

Council Member Kniss concurred with Council Member Cormack's comments about meeting residents in the community. Costs were an important part of the conversation. She inquired about the decision to be made in April or May, 2020.

Mr. Shikada related that the plan was for the Council to choose a preferred option for each of the intersections under consideration.

Council Member Kniss asked if the data for the Council decision would include costs.

Mr. Shikada replied yes.

Council Member Kniss asked if the XCAP would provide the Council with a proposal in six to eight months.

Ms. Naik explained that the XCAP would prepare a list of questions for which it needed information. The Council had tasked the XCAP with developing recommendations for Meadow and Churchill and Charleston by April 30, 2020.

Council Member Kou suggested an XCAP representative attend the Town Halls.

Ms. Naik related that at least one XCAP member should be able to attend the Town Halls.

Mr. Shikada reiterated that the intent of the Town Halls was to receive community input. Council Members and XCAP members were invited to share information and answer questions.

Council Member Kou requested details about the digital newsletter.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor advised that the newsletter would share information about rail as well as transportation initiatives.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou asked Staff to include neighborhood associations in the distribution of the newsletter.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor agreed to do so.

Council Member Tanaka inquired regarding the new structure of the XCAP.

Ms. Naik indicated the XCAP had been resolving old business and would deliberate about a new process at the next meeting.

Council Member Tanaka asked about the data the XCAP needed.

Ms. Naik related that the XCAP needed information from Caltrain. The newest members needed to review information provided prior to their joining XCAP. In addition, the XCAP needed to compile data to inform and support its recommendations.

Council Member Tanaka suggested the XCAP compile a wish list of data and then prioritize the individual items to determine the cost and effort needed to obtain the data.

Ms. Naik reported she intended to prepare that list prior to meeting with the Council in December.

Council Member Tanaka requested the method for conducting surveys.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor advised that surveys would be both print and email.

Council Member Tanaka suggested Staff utilize surveys with few questions and post surveys to Facebook and Twitter. Low-cost test programs could provide valuable data

Vice Mayor Fine asked if a Town Hall could be planned for 2019. Council Members needed to participate in community meetings. Perhaps key Council decisions were able to be planned in advance so that the community could plan to attend and the XCAP could prioritize its work. Perhaps the XCAP was able to provide some discussion of funding strategies, cost considerations, and assumptions.

Council Member Kniss requested an update regarding Caltrain ridership.

Ms. Naik related that ridership had decreased recently, but it had not affected the trend line. Caltrain officials had stated that trains had reached their maximum capacity. With electrification, Caltrain's plan was to extend its peak hour schedule to all day. The construction cost of grade separations was going to escalate because of the limited time during which construction could occur.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou suggested Staff add the timeline to the website.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor agreed to do so.

Council Member Kou reported she had learned at a meeting of the Local Policy Maker Group that Caltrain would move to a high level of service in its Business Plan.

Vice Mayor Fine remarked that Caltrain had routinely under-projected its ridership.

Ms. Naik announced the Caltrain Board of Directors would discuss the Caltrain vision on November 21.

Ms. Naik noted the XCAP needed information from the Council regarding the Palo Alto Avenue area.

NO ACTION TAKEN

State/Federal Legislation Update/Action

None.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Vice Mayor Fine expressed positive thoughts for public safety personnel and individuals dealing with the wildfires.

Council Member Kniss asked if City Fire personnel had been dispatched to Sonoma County.

Ed Shikada, City Manager replied yes.

Council Member Kniss asked if personnel utilized City equipment while deployed and about the length of the deployment.

Mr. Shikada reported a City fire engine was in Sonoma County. Typically, personnel remained onsite for a specific period of time before returning to Palo Alto. Fire Station 8 in the Foothills was being staffed during red-flag days.

Council Member Kou inquired about the possibility of the City listing homes available for wildfire evacuees.

Mr. Shikada indicated regional efforts were focusing on emergency housing located near the affected area.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 P.M.