



## P&S COMMITTEE

---

Regular Meeting  
July 15, 2009

Chairperson Espinosa called the meeting to order at 7:18 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Ave, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Espinosa (Chair), Kishimoto, Yeh  
Absent: Barton

1. Oral Communications

None.

2. Report from City Attorney: Recommendation Regarding Addition of Ad Hoc Committee Policy to City Council Procedures.

Law Clerk Bahareh Samsami said that the Council directed the City Attorney to consider a policy on Ad Hoc Committees. Any Ad Hoc Committee should consist of Council Members only; members of the public may not serve on an Ad Hoc Committee. No more than four Council Members may be on an Ad Hoc Committee. There can not be a Motion setting the meeting schedule by the Council. An Ad Hoc Committee can not have continuing subject matter; its purpose must be specific and finite, and it should dissolve after its purpose is met. No Ad Hoc Committee should be in existence for more than six months, after that it should dissolve or it should, at the direction of the Council, become a Standing Committee subject to the Brown Act. Either the Mayor or the Council can create an Ad Hoc Committee. The Mayor should make a public announcement stating the purpose of any newly formed Ad Hoc Committee. Standing Committees are subject to the Brown Act and can have a fixed meeting schedule, they can be in existence for longer than six months, and they can have on-going subject matters. The policy that Staff has drafted reflects all of these requirements. The P&S Committee can decide whether to recommend the policy to the Council, amend it or, decline to recommend it.

Herb Borock, PO Box 632 spoke regarding the status of the Stanford Liaison Committee as it was subject to the Brown Act, and should have

been a Standing Committee. He said according to the Municipal Code appointments of the Mayor are required to have approval of the Council. This is the first time he has seen an explanation saying these procedural rules don't have the force of law.

Chair Espinosa pointed out the list of items regarding the Stanford issue was prepared by Staff not by the Committee and that the Ad Hoc Committee had been announced publicly.

Council Member Yeh asked about reportable actions. He questioned whether there should be formal documentation going to Council when there is a formal decision coming from the Ad Hoc Committees.

City Attorney Gary Baum stated that issue was not covered in the policy, but it could be. He offered to make suggestions, but suggested that it would be more appropriate for the Committee to do so. There is nothing in the law on reporting structure. The point of an Ad Hoc Committee being created is to advise the Council so looking for direction from them would be appropriate.

Council Member Yeh asked about potential issues with staffing for Ad Hoc Committees. Planned staffing for Ad Hoc Committees would create resource and time issues, but he could see value in having that documentation from the Ad Hoc Committee for the Council to review.

Mr. Baum said that he didn't know if, other than in our culture, formal reports are needed, as long as there is an oral report.

Mr. Keene said that the purpose of an Ad Hoc Committee was to study city business in greater depth. It's reasonable to add language that requires a report from the City Manager on the scope of impact on the budget. If there were suddenly 10 Ad Hoc Committees it would become a staffing issue to keep Council notified. He asked if Staff wasn't available, could three members of the Council meet to talk about anything at any time.

Mr. Baum said that three members of the Council would be able to gather.

Mr. Keene stated that if there was a formal reason for Council to want to have a study done it would be to benefit the whole Council. This would almost always involve Staff work. It would be good to give the Committee an estimate of the scope of work. Staffing helps with transparency also, Brown Act or not. It could be a situation that affects adopted Council priorities and the Council should be aware of

that. It may have an impact on something if there is no feedback. The Stanford project and Fiber to Premises has taken some work, but not a lot. For Stanford we would have been doing that work anyway. Fiber was responding to a Council initiative. Staff was putting new work in that project anyway. He stated that either he or the City Attorney could come with a sentence or two to report to the Mayor or Council reporting what the estimated impact would be so that everyone is clear.

Council Member Kishimoto asked if every Ad Hoc Committee would have to have minutes.

Mr. Baum said no, they would not be expected to have minutes.

Chair Espinosa reminded the Committee that this was brought about by a Council Member that had concerns about these issues. He stated that the first question would be how to put this policy together, and secondly what would be the parameters of an Ad Hoc Committee. As the Committee works through that process, they will address whether or not there is a different type of meeting that sometimes needs to happen, such as for short term issues, and what the reasons for that would be. They will need to address the differences, between a Standing Committee and an Ad Hoc Committee. Then the concern would be that when groups of Council Members are meeting there should be a level of transparency in terms of the expectations, the amount of time it's taking, the issues to be covered, and that instead of decisions being made, only recommendations to Council will be made, and during this process the Committee will need to determine how to build in guarantees of transparency via reports to Council. He stated that this staff report takes great steps in getting there. There may be steps to build in for transparency to make sure there is no perception of acting behind a curtain. Building a policy that includes that transparency may be the discussion to have with the Council.

Mr. Keene said that the value of Ad Hoc Committees he's worked on in the past has been studying an issue in greater depth. One of the great benefits for Staff is that they get a sense of the reaction from elected officials. Even though it's not a majority of the Council it's still different than Staff proceeding on their own creating efficiency from Staff's point of view. As City Manager, he said, if he's casually talking to three members of the Council the others might not appreciate that. But if there is a process, as with an Ad Hoc Committee, there is validity there and community feedback from the perspective of the elected officials. He then asked if the Committee should address the balance of Ad Hoc Committee assignments.

Mr. Baum said that the policy could be made to address the issue of spreading the Ad Hoc Committee assignments through out the Council, but with every layer we add we are narrowing Mayor's powers and more importantly reducing efficiency. If we seat three Council members on an Ad Hoc Committee only because they aren't on another one, they may not have the expertise that it needs.

Council Member Kishimoto asked if only Council Members can be a part of an Ad Hoc Committee or can the Council invite other community members join?

Mr. Baum stated that other community members may join, but then it becomes Standing Committee subject to the Brown Act.

Ms. Samsami agreed that the Brown Act is very clear in stating that if there are any non-Council Members on an Ad Hoc Committee, it then becomes a Standing Committee and must abide by the Brown Act rules.

Mr. Baum stated that we could contrast that with advisors to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Chair Espinosa wondered if Staff wanted to work through some of those issues, and come back with a revised policy. He would also want to see reporting either oral or formal included in a revised policy.

Mr. Baum has drafted some language that addresses the concerns for reporting, stating that the Ad Hoc Committees must report their results no less than once per quarter and the City Manager shall prepare a report to the Council addressing the time commitment for Staff in supporting the Ad Hoc Committee.

Chair Espinosa asked for the City Attorney's thoughts regarding Council voting on the Mayor's selections for Ad Hoc Committees.

Mr. Baum said that this is designed so that an Ad Hoc Committee may be created by either the Mayor or the Council.

Chair Espinosa asked if there would be an issue with the Mayor assigning Ad Hoc's without Council voting.

Mr. Baum said that is typically how Ad Hoc Committees are formed, differentiating them from Standing Committees. The Council may adjust that component in the policy if they choose.

Mr. Keene said that the Mayor would be announcing to Council what has been appointed, and the City Manager would submit a report on the scope and impact of work. The Council would then be able to agendaize an item for further discussion. He then reiterated that there is that protection with the check and balance system. He also stated that it's good for the Mayor to have some discretion.

Chair Espinosa said that he agrees with that approach. He recognized that Palo Alto doesn't have the rough politics other towns have, but the question needed to be explored. Adding extra voting layers adds a level of bureaucracy that hasn't been necessary, but may need to be thought about as we create a policy.

Mr. Baum asked if Staff should add verbiage indicating that any Council Member may agendaize the membership of an Ad Hoc Committee.

Council Member Kishimoto reminded the Committee that this question was raised with the Composting Committee. At that time it was decided ultimately to interview and vote.

Mr. Baum noted that the Composting Committee was different, as it was a Standing Committee.

Council Member Kishimoto asked if it was a Standing Committee because it was more than six months.

Mr. Baum stated that it was a Standing Committee because it had non-Council Members.

Council Member Kishimoto asked if these decisions are up to the Chair unless a majority of Council challenges it.

Mr. Baum said that Staff can add language stating that "subject to the majority of Council they can terminate a committee".

Council Member Kishimoto questioned if the majority rule applies to everything, she said she thought the Council procedures stated that the Chair has powers over the majority.

Mr. Baum stated that both Roberts Rules of Order and Palo Alto's procedures say that everything is subject to the majority of the Council.

Council Member Kishimoto asked if that applies to an Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Baum said that the majority rule does apply to Ad Hoc Committees.

Council Member Kishimoto stated that it would not be a matter of order.

Mr. Baum said that it would have to be placed on the agenda should Council wish to vote on the Mayor's Ad Hoc Committee appointments.

Chair Espinosa thought that adding some wording to this affect would be helpful.

Mr. Keene said that with some of the other committees there is language saying that the Committee will dissolve in six months. He asked if the Committee would like to make that more formal.

Chair Espinosa said he didn't know if it would hurt to have that language in the policy.

Council Member Kishimoto said the Mayor's announcement of a newly formed Ad Hoc Committee should be included in the minutes.

Mr. Baum said a public announcement should be made at the conclusion of each Ad Hoc meeting. He then asked if Staff should add these revisions or if the Committee would rather go to Council as is.

Chair Espinosa said that he thought they had covered everything, by establishing quarterly reports, as well as discussing the differences between Standing Committees and Ad Hoc Committees.

**MOTION:** Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Council Member Kishimoto, that 1) the P&S Committee recommends that the City Council adopt the Ad Hoc Committee policy allowing Ad Hoc Committees to be used on a limited basis to study City business in greater depth than possible in the time allotted for Council and Standing Committee meetings, and 2) Ad Hoc Committees will report to Council quarterly.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0 Barton absent

3. Recommendation for Council Approval of the City's Legislative Program and Structure.

Assistant to the City Manager Kelly Morariu explained that back in May 2009 the Committee gave Staff four key issues to follow up on. The Committee wanted to have a more in depth conversation with the City Manager about lobbying efforts in Sacramento. She stressed that this program is a work in progress. Staff is interviewing firms for the Federal lobbying effort. Once a firm is selected, the discussion can start about how to engage the Council in advocacy and what ways this can further improve the process. Staff is coming to the Committee and Council with some structure but it will continue to evolve. To define the roll of Council in the legislative process, Staff is interviewing lobbyist firms and should have one on board by August. The Council will meet with this firm in September and discuss interests around lobbying at the Federal level. One item the Committee wanted to discuss was legislative travel; language has been added to the policy saying that Council legislative travel should be consistent with existing travel policies. A discussion offering guidance on the most effective way to engage Council in travel to Washington, DC and Sacramento is pending. Another suggested role for Council is leveraging existing relationships with influential members of the community, and documenting those relationships so that they may contact legislators on our behalf. Staff also was asked to follow up on effective legislative action in Sacramento and regionally. One of the things discussed was having an expert speak to the Council. The League of California Cities Legislative Director is interested in coming to speak to the Council about how their efforts can be more effective in Sacramento, but he will not be able to come until the fall due to the budget issues Sacramento is having. There was also discussion about involvement with regional agencies. This raised three key issues: 1) what agencies should be utilized, 2) how should the Committee report back to Council on the regional agency actions, and 3) how Council Members serving on regional agencies obtain key positions. Staff was also asked to follow up regarding best practices in other cities. Most cities are reactive to legislation; there is an opportunity for Palo Alto to structure something more unique and proactive. That being said, there were some best practices that were effective, such as some agencies have a Staff person dedicated solely to legislative action. Staff is also looking at ways to bring in community stakeholders and then leverage them with trips to Sacramento or Washington to become part of the advocacy process. Another idea was building relationships with legislators on a Staff to Staff level as well as having periodic meetings between the Council and the legislators and having a legislative action team internal to the organization that can take quick action by tracking legislative action per department. Having a Federal lobbying firm seemed to be effective for cities similar to Palo Alto,

whereas a state lobbying firm seemed to be not very effective. The City of Roseville for example has both a state and a Federal lobbyist. Their experience was that the Federal lobbyist was more effective but they wouldn't necessarily recommend a state lobbyist. Publicizing Palo Alto's legislative goals and priorities more effectively by having a presence on the website also seemed valuable. For example, the City of Lakewood has an interesting detail of the legislative process, providing more information for the public. She also mentioned a new Staff led effort in Santa Clara County is a regional inter-governmental relations committee that has been forming. It brings Staff members together through out the county to connect the dots from a Staff level. Lastly, as a follow up action, there were changes to the guiding principals and some language in the Legislative Action Manual.

Chair Espinosa stated that the legislative policy had been put together with guidance about how Staff should operate on a detailed level and the feedback was good. He thought that now the discussion should have been about Council's role. The Council needs to know what they are doing in Washington and Sacramento. The Council needs to decide if they want to have a lobbying role and then regionally how to decide who sits on what board. Some decisions still have not been made. He asked if Staff was bringing the Committee a proposal that answered some of the questions from before and fixed some of the language regarding travel and now would like to have some of the program implemented. He asked if Staff thought there is nothing wrong in the process, so the Committee should move this forward to Council. He also asked how Staff sees having that conversation with the Council once the Washington and Sacramento teams are in place. He stated that he was still unsure what the role should be for the Council in the legislative process

Ms. Morariu said that a lot would depend on who the City partners with from a Federal perspective. This is an opportunity to strategize. She agreed that this report was the Staff piece of it, and the Council conversation is still pending.

Chair Espinosa asked how Staff sees this process happening and if the Council should sign off on this piece and then move forward or wait for the entire policy to be developed.

City Manager James Keene said that he wasn't sure if going to the Council with this now was needed. The policy is evolving and some quick progress will be made in the fall, once the Federal lobbyist is on board. He asked if the Committee would provide Staff with some direction now so they can come back with a more specific policy. He



stated that the most important piece of the legislative policy is what role the Council has, everything else is secondary. An elected official can have more impact generally than anyone the City can hire. Even if the City hires the best lobbying firm, if they don't have a clear idea of how to leverage Council the City is wasting money. Palo Alto has a Council that is interested in developing an effective and strong legislative strategy and program, and everything else falls from that.

Chair Espinosa agreed that this Council is receptive to engagement. The reason this policy came to the P&S Committee was to provide Council with an understanding of the cost benefit and ROI for what is being done at a Federal level. The Council would be happy to go to Washington but what is the plan once they arrive, how much will it cost, and what will that look like. There is certainly no hesitation on Council Members involvement but they want to know what Staff is recommending.

Council Member Kishimoto said that she's learned a lot through High Speed Rail, she asked for clarification on Staffs recommendation for no generic Sacramento consultant.

Mr. Keene said Staff hasn't gotten that far yet. He reiterated the importance of Council involvement.

Council Member Kishimoto said that her experience is being involved for a Council Member is very time consuming. She stated that on an issue by issue basis they will need to decide the priority. In order to achieve that priority, State or Federal leverage will be needed. It is a lot of work to follow year round, and then in June and July there is this crunch period. She said that it's been helpful in her experience to have volunteers to track the bills, and lobbyists in Sacramento to follow legislative action, then the City can piggy back on them. The Congressional Representatives staffs are helpful as well, so those relationships are important.

Chair Espinosa said that he thought the Committee was expecting to see a recommendation for the Federal plan, as well as an outline for a regional level plan so that Staff and the Committee could discuss Council's involvement.

Mr. Keene agreed that a discussion can be started, while putting the regional part aside. He said there are three core pieces for the State and Federal components. One is the Council's interest; it should be a hands-on approach rather than just delegation, even with the reporting and feedback from Council. There has to be some Staff

dedication to this. He said that the most effective legislative program in his experience was when a dedicated high level person was on board rather than a contract lobbyist. The City has part of that, but how the City is going to add Staff support is key. The City could have interns, or other low-cost people that can track legislative items. It wouldn't be prudent to pay an expensive firm for tracking. Lastly, there is the reactive vs. proactive portion of the policy, and Staff needs to be clear on what the Council wants. Lobbying firms will say that in order to be proactive you have to narrow the focus to a couple issues at most, otherwise no one will listen. The Committee should be clear that being proactive is the approach that should be used, but at the same an adequate mechanism for being informed reactively on things that can hurt us is important as well. He said that for the most part reactive things are going hurt other cities too. Palo Alto could piggy back on those cities since they are already involved. High Speed Rail, for example, is Palo Alto's issue; we will be concerned about reactivity with cities. The focus is on insuring we are on top of stuff. He said that any lobby firm will agree that having your Council focused and invested in a couple of critical issues will be crucial. For Washington, he recommended the City engage in a new contract with a Federal lobbyist. The return will be easy to measure. If the City spends \$100,000 a year for travel, we have to be able to demonstrate that we got \$100,000 worth of funding from Washington to justify it. One reason why Council travel is so important is because the legislature is moving away from ear marks so just having a representative be able to stick something in a bill on the City's behalf will be harder to do. We will have more criteria based program awards that shift authority back to agencies. The right person who gets a visit on an issue that matters can have tremendous influence. Having our well spoken Council Members there, with fact sheets in hand, to speak on the City's behalf will be effective.

Chair Espinosa said the goal is to have that plan from Staff laid out with how Staff will be looking at the investment, return and objectives and what role Council will play at each stage of development, implementation and roll out. We need to know how Council will set priorities, where is Staff going to want decision points, how does Council work with lobbyists, and how do we, as a group, evaluate costs. It's that layout that will lead to the identification of policies this Committee could recommend to build a structure.

Council Member Kishimoto said they need to connect with the right Staff and determine where the leverage points are. She reiterated that it doesn't make sense to have someone in Sacramento all year.

Council Member Yeh said that the Northern California Power Agency has an active division with an active coaching model. In laying out a concrete process, the city could look to them. They use a discipline and messaging that reflects the interest of their membership, and dedicated local staffing that are subject matter experts. Whether or not they are expert Staff, he does agree with a local staffing approach to provide the ongoing discussion between Council and Staff. He questioned whether Palo Alto has enough pull in and of itself to make a statement within agencies at the Federal level, framed within regional cooperation. He said he supported a study session to get feedback from the rest of the Council, and he would be able to speak briefly on the effort with Senator Joe Simitian about the RPS bill. Without the level of expertise of the Utilities Staff, this wouldn't have been possible.

Council Member Kishimoto said that regarding the Staff issue, for High Speed Rail, Steve Emslie was working with her and the City Attorney's Office. She wasn't sure if the City Attorney's Office was involved in reviewing and drafting the bill. The City should have a person that knows the most about a subject analyze the bill, which can take a lot of time as well.

Chair Espinosa said that they've had a great debate. At the last meeting they had discussed four areas. They intended to define the role of the City Council, to understand the Federal, State and regional strategy plans, to get the list together for the regional plan and lastly they wanted to take a look at other cities for best practices. He stated that he would like to move forward as he thought they were going to have that conversation at this meeting.

Council Member Kishimoto suggested the Committee include that wording in the Legislative Action Manual.

Chair Espinosa wanted to know if they should bring the policy to Council even though it's not fully comprehensive as far as a full legislative plan goes. Or did they want to put it out there, since it is such good work, and then make a broader decision later.

Mr. Keene said he wanted to insure Staff had clear direction. His recommendation was not to go to Council yet, as it's just a piece of what has to be done. He suggested they bundle it with some recommendations on the Federal lobbying program. If Staff could get feedback on the State piece they could put more structure into it. He stated that Palo Alto should not hire a general State lobbyist. And he does think Palo Alto should be more formally involved with the League

of California Cities, Palo Alto should have someone on the Executive Board. The City Council should be known more in Sacramento and around the League of California Cities.

Chair Espinosa said that he thought that's what they were going to talk about at this meeting. What the Committee requested from Staff, is specific detail about what the goal is, exactly what a strong legislative statement looks like, whether or not a State lobbyist should be hired, what the cost of that is, and what the pros and cons would be. The Committee needs Staff to create a plan around engagement with the League of California Cities. Staff should lay all of that out, and then with in that framework, discuss what they see the role of Council being on all those levels.

Council Member Kishimoto stated that she felt that any appointment should be made early so that there is enough experience gained by the appointee.

Chair Espinosa agreed about not going to Council at this time. He asked Mr. Keene if he had a sense now of what the Committee was asking for.

Mr. Keene stated that he did understand, and asked when the next meeting is.

Ms. Morariu stated that there isn't another P&S Committee meeting until September.

Mr. Keene stated there is some value in coordinating the decision on the Federal lobbyist. Staff has told all the lobbying firms that basic principals would be in place, determined through a session with the Council and the P&S Committee. This will assure a tailored process right from the beginning. He said that Staff could recommend a firm to Council on August 3, 2009, but he was concerned with the outstanding policy issues taking too long.

Chair Espinosa asked if his concern was because the decision on the Federal lobbyist will have already been made, or because it will take too long for it to come back to the P&S Committee.

Council Member Kishimoto said that it wouldn't come back to the P&S Committee.

Chair Espinosa clarified that Mr. Keene was talking about if the engagement role would go to Council or to P&S and then asking if that timing was off.

Mr. Keene said this could get to Council by August 3, 2009 Staff would have not only awarded the contact, but had a meeting with a lobbying firm with the Council. That would inform us before coming back to the Committee.

Council Member Yeh suggested that due to the legislative season September is good timing, and he would be agreeable to it.

Ms. Morariu said the contract could be awarded on August 3, and then in September the lobbyist could come in.

3. Staff recommends that the P&S Committee review the purpose and scope of the P&S Committee and provide direction to Staff.

Chair Espinosa said that this is a good time to discuss the role of P&S with new Council Members coming on soon.

Assistant to the City Manager Kelly Morariu stated that she and the City Manager reviewed the Municipal Code and the defining parameters of the P&S (P&S) Committee. The parameters include parliamentary, administrative procedures, and inter-governmental relations. There has also been issues that haven't always been referred to P&S, including personnel, planning and zoning, traffic and parking, public works, and community and human services. The Human Resources Commission can refer items to P&S or to the Council. Some specific issues that have come to the Committee have been regulating transportation issues, and the Zero Waste Plan. There is opportunity to broaden what issues come before P&S. Strategic issues need to be addressed, and how the community and Council wish to set the context for addressing key issues. As an example she cited the pending retirement of so many baby boomers. Council will want to position the City as an employer of choice. The Council will want to explore the goals as the City moves forward with an economic development strategy. Those were just examples of issues Staff might want to have a more in depth discussion with P&S about. Staff also wants to know if that's the way the Committee wants to have a conversation about these issues, or should it continue to be the Council referral method currently in place.

City Manager James Keene said that there are two standing committees that help shape direction in Palo Alto. There is more clarity about what gets referred to the Finance Committee. One could say that anything that isn't directly related to Finance should be referred to P&S. Rather than only getting policies about administrative issues, this is policy about services. One thing that might be effective is to have a session where we identify work or a general work plan over the course of a year.

Herb Borock, PO Box 632 spoke regarding the history of the P&S Committee; it used to be called Policy and Procedures. The change was made because the Council realized there was an imbalance of the work loads. The names of the Committees are just names not definitions. It's a Council question of changing jurisdiction of the Committee. Economic Development strategy belongs to Land Use and Zoning which is State Law, and Municipal Code concerns, not the concerns of the P&S Committee.

Council Member Kishimoto asked the speaker if this Committee has played a larger role in planning and transportation issues in the past.

Mr. Borock said that he did not recall that they did. There was a change in the flow of recommendation of bringing items to the Committee. Until the previous City Manager changed procedures every item was always a referral from Council. Typically the higher body refers items to the lower body and expects it to come back but lately it's been the Staff recommending things to the Committee.

Council Member Kishimoto asked if P&S has the authority to set agenda items.

Mr. Keene said the Committee exists for the Council, in order to do the work. Parameters for sub-committees are defined, but it can even be by practice. The Municipal Code does include planning and zoning for this Committee. These committees and sessions are made to make Council more effective, it's easier to have a conversation in this type of group. Mr. Borock's comment about economic development could be true, or it could be we just focus on retention. Things that are important to the Council or issues I would like to bring to Council, but may not need that level of discussion, are good issues for a Committee.

Council Member Kishimoto said she would be excited to develop a work plan that addresses some issues Council doesn't have time to

work in depth on and then the Committee can bring recommendations back to the Council.

Council Member Yeh said that San Francisco and Oakland are cities where the committees are the work horses of the larger elected body. There is trade off though; the committees and elected officials have a lot more authority. If this committee were to move forward opportunities open up for Council to get into a level of detail that is more directive.

Mr. Keene said Palo Alto has a Council-Manager plan and a Charter whereas Oakland and San Francisco don't.

Council Member Yeh said that from a Council members perspective that's really exciting and a lot of the reason Council members chose to run for office. The work plan and economic development are things that go on for a long time. Coming up with clear framework for how the Council discusses it so it doesn't become a bureaucratic process would be beneficial.

Chair Espinosa asked if the Committee sees that conversation for year one with the Committee or Council.

Council Member Kishimoto suggested the Council.

Chair Espinosa asked how they would build in that directive, when that should occur from the Council.

Council Member Kishimoto said it could be that the Committee could propose it and bring it to Council and then Council could change it.

Chair Espinosa hesitated because of relying on individual issues of Council Members, rather than looking across the board at what the body deems most critical.

Council Member Kishimoto suggested the City Manager might be a better approach.

Council Member Yeh said the Council does that at its annual retreat and he has seen the work plan as list of discrete activities, which does not make a strategy. He asked how to provide that frame for a comprehensive strategy regarding economic health and if that is pulled into a strategic discussion.

Chair Espinosa asked if the Committee thought Staff should pull together a policy to launch for the coming year or in an abbreviated format now.

Council Member Kishimoto said Staff could build on the three priorities that Council has adopted already.

Mr. Keene said it would be easy to use See-It and he suggested the process might work faster if Staff and the Committee worked together and then got Council's blessing rather than other way around. He said he was in the process of working with the department directors and will meet with them again in August, and then the Committee will meet with him in September. He asked if there were key things the Committee wanted to see happen. He suggested the P&S Committee could refer some issues they want to work on to Staff. With any work plan it's a work plan. If something comes up it can be reprioritized.

Chair Espinosa said, in looking to the next meeting, they could layout what had been planned to discuss and then discuss how it will work in years to come at the Council level and the Committee level.

Council Member Yeh fully supported the plan and, with the See-it program as a way for the community to see progress it should be an integral part of the discussion.

Council Member Yeh said that the Council had a full agenda last time and couldn't discuss this so a chance to get deeper into it would be good.

Chair Espinosa said that everyone seemed clear and stated they do not need a Motion.

##### 5. Discussion for Future Meeting Schedules and Agendas

Assistant to the City Manager Kelly Morariu said that the regularly scheduled September meeting is during recess. Then the week of September 14<sup>th</sup> Mr. Keene and Ms. Morariu are scheduled to be at a conference. She suggested the week of September 21, 2009 for the next meeting.

Chair Espinosa asked if Council was still on recess for the first week of September.

Ms. Morariu said Council does not return until September 14<sup>th</sup> and the regularly scheduled meeting would be before that.



Chair Espinosa asked the Committee what their schedules will be the week of September 8<sup>th</sup>.

Council Member Kishimoto said she is not currently scheduled to be out of town.

Council Member Yeh said that if he were going to be away he would be back by Wednesday.

Chair Espinosa said that his intent was not to push things off, but he suggested that that week September 21st might be better. He stated that he does not have a conflict either week.

Council Member Kishimoto suggested they look at September 10<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Espinosa agreed with the 10<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Morariu agreed with the 10th. She stated that they would follow up on the role of the P&S Committee, and the sewer lateral issue would come up again, and the legislative policy.

ADJOURNED: The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.