



POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

Special Meeting
June 22, 2010

Council Member Price called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Yeh (Chair) arrived at 7:15, Holman, Price, Shepherd

Absent: none

1. Oral Communications

None.

2. Discussion of 2010 Council Priorities Workplan – Emergency Preparedness

Annette Glanckopf, 2747 Bryant Street, spoke regarding emergency preparedness being a Council priority. The Palo Alto Neighborhoods emergency preparedness committee has prepared objectives that were clear, obtainable and measurable to enhance the City's resiliency.

Al Dorsky, 3846 Corina Way, spoke regarding the accomplishments and goals of Palo Alto Neighborhoods (PAN); in 2009 they served as a catalyst for the Citizen Corp Council which developed the relationship between PANDA and PAN. He stated the 2010 goals required funding for a variety of items in order to maximize the effectiveness of the program.

Lydia Kou, 708 Matadero Avenue, asked the Committee to adopt September and October as Emergency Preparedness months. She requested the City's assistance in setting up tent cities to prepare the residents regarding the scope of disasters.

Sheri Furman, 3094 Greer Road, stated PAN was an umbrella organization made up of the leaders of the various Palo Alto neighborhoods and was donation funded. The organization sponsored the Emergency Preparedness program and expressed the cost was extensive. She suggested not reducing

funding in the budget for Emergency Preparedness and requested that PANDA and PAN organizations funding be incorporated in the Emergency Preparedness Work Plan.

Reserve Police Officer Ken Dueker gave a brief presentation on the philosophy and origins of the Citizen Corps Council. He stated the Citizen Corps Council was the umbrella group for emergency preparedness. Their function was to engage with community resources that were available to assist in an emergency. The Citizens Corps Council was a way to capture threats that were not part of the traditional emergency systems. It was how the City was reaching out to the neighborhood groups, Stanford University, the Hospital and the private sector. He stated the priority of the Citizens Corps Council was to ensure that residential community was prepared for a disaster of any nature. He noted the Foothills Management Plan was to be under the umbrella for the Citizens Corps Council.

Police Chief, Dennis Burns stated the new Mobile Command Vehicle was purchased through a combination of City funds and both State and Federal grants totaling \$700,000. He clarified the vehicle was contracted to specifics designed to communicate on multiple radio frequencies and could support a number of various issues in an emergency or disaster situation.

City Manager James Keene stated the Mobile Command Vehicle was not a full Emergency Operations Center (EOC) although it had the capacity to manage a large scale emergency.

Mr. Dueker stated with the possible loss of police and/or fire infrastructure the Mobile Command Vehicle would allow the City to carry on some of the lost functions while being able to maintain a first response capability.

Mr. Keene stated the information received had sufficient detail and clarity for an accurate and thorough response. It was important to maintain a continuous renewal of the community based involvement.

Council Member Holman stated although the City relied on modern methods of communication there was a need for an audible, community-wide alarm.

Mr. Dueker stated that until the early 1970's the City had a civil defense air raid type alarm notification system. He noted due to the geography of the City, it would be difficult to cover some of the denser areas. The current notification systems were KZSU 90.1, the emergency alert system and the CANS system.

Council Member Holman stated she was in favor of instituting the air raid siren system without a great deal of studying. She suggested researching the coverage area and the cost. She stated how important it was to maintain a secondary source of power in the event of a full power outage. She asked how the Fire Department participated in the emergency preparedness program.

Mr. Dueker stated historic evidence had shown that the PANDA/CERT Program had evolved out of the Fire Department while the PAN Block Preparedness Program evolved from the Neighborhood Watch Program. He clarified the Fire Department was involved with different organizations. He recommended having the programs unified under one command in an effort to minimize duplication and maximize efficiency.

Council Member Holman recommended that it would be helpful to have an Organizational Chart to help the public and Council understand how things flowed. She suggested that Staff include all the different entities available to the community in time of emergency. She questioned the possibility of available grants for emergency services.

Ms. Glanckopf stated the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) had supplied a \$1,000 grant in 2009 and a second grant had been sought for 2010. She explained the Citizens Corps Council had a grant committee that could research the availability of grant funding sources.

Council Member Holman asked if Staff could have the print shop print some of the materials to save money.

Mr. Keene stated Staff would explore the idea.

Council Member Shepherd stated she had attended one of the PAN emergency preparedness training sessions and was impressed with the level of community participation. She asked which portion of the Stanford Campus the City was responsible for in an emergency situation.

Mr. Dueker stated the Police Department was responsible for 911 dispatches for the entire campus and the Fire Department administered safety watch over the campus, Stanford lands and the Stanford properties in San Mateo County.

Council Member Shepherd asked whether the Stanford neighborhoods were being trained in a similar manner as Palo Alto neighborhoods for emergency response.

Mr. Dueker stated the Fire Department had extended the PANDA/CERT Program training through the campus. There were other neighborhoods within the residential areas that had been invited to participate.

Council Member Shepherd asked for confirmation that PAN requested the City supply \$20,000. She stated the \$100,000 emergency preparation funds that had initially been cut from the budget had been reinstated.

Mr. Dueker stated the funding that was reinstated in the budget was for a Staff position.

Council Member Shepherd asked how the City was assisting the Citizens Corps Committee in achieving their funding goal.

Mr. Keene stated the request for funds had not been brought forth prior to this meeting and therefore Staff had not had an opportunity to discuss funding options with Council.

Council Member Shepherd recommended requesting funding assistance from Stanford since they were included in the emergency preparedness. She asked what type of emergency situations the audible alarm system would respond to.

Mr. Dueker stated the Stanford Campus installed one in response to the Virginia Tech shooting. The City could utilize the system for chemical or hazardous material incidents.

Council Member Shepherd stated she would be interested in exploring the visibility and cost options.

Council Member Price stated the School District was required to have an emergency plan and asked whether the Citizens Corps Council had been linked to or with the School District.

Mr. Dueker stated yes, there was a youth and school sector. He stated there was a tactical survey being completed that would evaluate the schools' ability to respond in a critical incident.

Council Member Price asked whether the Chamber of Commerce was a participant.

Mr. Dueker stated yes.

Council Member Price asked to what degree Staff was working on locating funding opportunities in grant form or community based assistance.

Ms. Morariu stated the City subscribed to a grant locator database and each department had Staff that searched for grant opportunities. She noted that the City's Federal advocacy firm notifies Staff of available grant opportunities and the information is then filtered to the appropriate department.

Council Member Price stated historically taking a regional approach to grant funding had been successful and supplied more opportunity. She asked whether the emergency siren had been explored prior to the current discussion.

Mr. Dueker stated the Fire Department had evaluated an emergency siren system a few years ago and it was determined to not be cost effective. He stated a small study could be conducted by looking at neighboring communities.

Council Member Price stated the request by PAN to suggest an emergency preparedness month was valid and she asked what process needed to be taken to accomplish that.

Ms. Morariu stated Staff was planning for an Emergency Preparedness Study Session in September. She suggested preparing a Resolution declaring September and October as Disaster Preparedness Months.

Chair Yeh stated in the past the City had a self-registration program for individuals who were in need of special assistance in the event of an emergency. He asked whether the system could be re-implemented and asked how it was maintained.

Mr. Dueker stated the Fire Department had initiated a database, although they had difficulty maintaining the updates. He stated the Red Cross and a variety of medical foundations maintained a list. He noted the residents were typically more comfortable having their neighbors manage their information rather than the government. He stated a neighbors-helping-neighbors model was more effective.

Ms. Glanckopf stated PAN had an effective approach; although, more visibility would benefit the program greatly.

Mr. Dorsky stated this type of program worked best at the neighbor level, people know and want to help their neighbors.

Chair Yeh asked what the balance was in the Council Contingency Fund.

Ms. Morariu stated the balance was extinguished to support the HSR Staffing.

Chair Yeh asked if the funding request from PAN was one-time or on-going.

Ms. Glanckopf stated PAN had compiled a matrix for current and expected costs. She clarified the \$20,000 request was for the current year although there were costs associated with the program on an on-going basis.

Chair Yeh suggested a Challenge Grant type of funding where the funds supported the kicking off of a Friends group. He stated there was a Resource Officer position discussed in the budget that supported the Neighborhood Watch program. He asked whether the proposed budget cuts to the Resource Officer had been confirmed.

Mr. Dueker stated the Neighborhood Watch program supported by the Resource Officer position had been folded into the PAN organization.

Chair Yeh agreed to a one-time funding given the loss of support by the City due to the budget cuts.

Council Member Shepherd stated emergency preparedness was a City function and should be funded by the City.

Council Member Holman noted there was an absence of important information on the City website. She asked whether there were Staff members willing to volunteer to update the missing information.

Ms. Glanckopf stated there was a website committee made up of community members and Staff. She noted their availability to volunteer to update the information on the website.

Mr. Keene stated Staff would update the website during the new few months.

Council Member Holman stated she would appreciate seeing the Block Preparedness Coordinator manual and the Hazard Vulnerability Analysis on the website.

Chair Yeh stated the task for the Citizens Corps Committee was to determine what could be achieved through the end of 2010 and what the process would be for the next few years.

Council Member Price asked which items on the workplan were mandatory and what the timeline was for accomplishment.

Mr. Dueker stated the Foothills Emergency Plan was mandatory; although, the legal prerequisite had been met by Council adopting the plan. There was currently no funding available for the execution of the plan which was why the City Manager's office obtained an outside consultant to assist in locating Fire Grant Funding and Mitigation Funding.

Council Member Shepherd asked whether the homeowner was responsible for cutting the vegetation for wild fire safety if there were inspections.

Mr. Dueker stated yes, the homeowner was responsible for clearing vegetation and the Fire Marshal's Office and Cal Fire completed inspections.

Ms. Morariu stated every spring there were community presentations and onsite home visits. She stated the workplan incorporated this area due to the acreage of publicly owned space and the Page Mill Road evacuation route.

Council Member Holman asked whether the organizational chart requested would include outside entities.

Mr. Dueker stated there was an organization chart for City Staff although the remainder was more of a networking map showing the relationship with San Mateo County, Stanford University and the remaining outside entities.

Chair Yeh asked whether the envisioned community emergency plan would be accomplished in the year 2010 or 2011.

Mr. Dueker stated the community emergency plan was a work group within the Citizen Corps Council and they had no timeline at present for completion of the plan.

Council Member Price stated she was unaware what the resources required were nor how they related to the current Staff work load.

Ms. Morariu suggested identifying the top three to five priorities in the workplan which would be the areas Staff time would be focused on first and as time and resources allowed the other projects could be phased in.

Council Member Price stated under Disaster Preparedness in the workplan items 2a: Encourage Community Involvement/Self Reliance and 2e: Earthquake, SUMC Project, were of a priority for her. She stated based on the limited information she was unsure of the required Staff time it would take to complete both tasks at a sufficient level.

Mr. Dueker stated a function of the Citizens Corps Council was to inform the City Manager's office what would be required to accomplish each task.

Council Member Price asked if funding opportunities developed, where the information would be submitted to.

Mr. Dueker stated Dr. Ray Bacchetti was the Chair of the funding working group for the Citizens Corps Council.

Council Member Shepherd requested expanding the participation to include the Medical Clinic and the Veterans Hospital.

Mr. Dueker stated both entities were represented through the Sand Hill Corridor group.

Council Member Holman stated a number of communities fund their neighborhood associations and she hoped to take the initial step toward supporting their function in this troubled economic time.

Chair Yeh wanted to ensure the Federal representatives were aware of the Emergency Power Supply need since it involved a federal agency they could assist in moving the process forward.

3. Recommendation to Council on Proposed Changes to the City Council Procedures and Protocols.

Assistant to the City Manager, Kelly Morariu gave a brief overview of the changes being requested to the Procedures and Protocols.

City Clerk Donna Grider stated that moving the Council packet delivery date forward had implications for Colleagues Memo's and public correspondences. She noted the public and news papers had mentioned their appreciation of

receiving the information earlier. The reasoning behind altering the speaker cards was to create an easier process for the public and to have a unified card for Council and Boards and Commission meetings.

Council Member Holman recalled requesting comparative information from surrounding cities and their packet delivery timeframe. She stated reviewing comparative information would be beneficial. In reviewing the previous meeting minutes the implementation date for early release of packet was during the Council summer break.

City Manager James Keene stated he recalled the discussion of bringing on board an automated agenda management system. That would create a change in the delivery schedule with the deployment of the new management system, which was anticipated by the end of the year. A single change would cause fewer disruptions to the system.

Ms. Grider stated she had received the information from the San Jose City Clerk although had not had the opportunity to analyze it.

Council Member Holman asked about earlier release of information on larger projects.

Ms. Morariu stated Staff was reminded of the desire to release larger projects a week prior to the item being on a Council agenda when possible. She noted the release of items earlier was not necessarily a procedural matter rather an internal one.

Ms. Grider stated in the effort to go paperless, there was a need to change the expectation of a secondary paper copy of an item that had previously been released. The goal would be to have the original copy maintained by the Council, public and Staff so the focus was on less paper generation.

Council Member Shepherd asked about the possibility of not printing the packet items that had fewer than twelve pages although adding a note into the packet notifying people the information was available online.

Ms. Grider stated her efforts had been focused on that direction.

Council Member Holman stated the intention was to support Staff in the process of requiring earlier submission of information from applicants, contractors and the public. Staff could not complete their submission to Council if they were missing information from outside sources.

Ms. Grider suggested the new procedure be the applicant bringing in plans in electronic form so as to alleviate scanning issues.

Council Member Price asked which cities in the Bay Area were considered to be in the forefront of early release packets and electronic approach.

Ms. Grider stated there were not as many as one would suspect. The City of Saratoga's Council Members had laptops and the City of Brentwood, in Contra Costa County was completely paperless. She noted there were a great deal of complexity to being completely paperless and there were legal concerns with the use of iPads or laptops.

Council Member Shepherd stated she felt better reviewing items online if she had the capability to highlight information. She asked whether that would be a probability with the agenda management system.

Mr. Keene stated a system had not been deployed and choosing the one that had the most relevant implementation and features required further review.

Council Member Holman stated there needed to be criteria set to define what a larger project was and she requested placing early release of larger projects in the Procedures and Protocols for ten days to two weeks. She noted there was no pro forma data which had previously been requested.

Ms. Morariu clarified the Applicant was to submit pro formas in addition to the materials that were required in a development application.

Council Member Holman stated the language provided in CMR 286: 10, Section 5) Late Submittals was inaccurate to what was requested by the authors of the Colleagues Memo. The goal was to receive Applicant information with ample time for Staff to review said information prior to submission to Council. If there were significant alterations to the information, Staff may decide there needed to be another review by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) or the Planning & Transportation Commission (P&TC).

Ms. Morariu stated additional language could be added to the section to satisfy the requests of the Council Members on late submissions. She said the Director of Planning and Community Environment, Curtis Williams said that receiving the information a day earlier than the release of Council packet should provide the Planner with sufficient time to review the documentation and determine whether the item needed to be continued.

Mr. Keene suggested the language should read: If the information was not submitted by a certain date or if Staff had insufficient time for review, the item would be continued.

Council Member Holman stated the goal was for projects to receive good reviews and the objective was for Staff and volunteer time to be utilized efficiently in reviewing projects.

Ms. Morariu stated after discussions with the City Attorney's office and the Planning Department, Staff decided it would be Council's purview to continue an item if the Applicant submitted information the date of the Public Hearing.

Council Member Price stated Council was at a disadvantage in determining the significance of the modification as Council relied on Staff's knowledge and history with a project to inform them whether the modifications were significant or minor.

Ms. Morariu stated if there were modifications presented at the Public Hearing without Staff having time to review the changes there needed to be a discussion at Staff level to determine the significance.

Council Member Holman requested to put into place a clear process for Applicants to follow. As a part of the process they should be discouraged against submittals past the Staff deadline.

Mr. Keene stated there needed to be clarity in the Staffs' role in the process as well as the Applicant. There needed to be contingencies in place for unforeseen situations.

Council Member Price stated if the alterations were significant, the notices in the newspaper would be incorrect and therefore the Public Hearing would be invalid.

Mr. Keene stated the procedures needed to be clear. There were going to be gray areas that may not be in the procedures but were common sense.

Council Member Holman stated the last sentence in the proposed language in CMR 286:10, Item 5 needed to be altered. Depending on the change to the plans being submitted they may need to be reviewed by the ARB or the P&TC rather than continued to the next Council meeting.

Mr. Keene stated the language needed to be a part of the development process.

Ms. Morariu stated this was the area for the pro forma discussions as part of the requirement for Planning submittal, rather than a part of the Council protocols and Procedures.

Council Member Shepherd asked if the information seemed right, could two Council Members request the item return on the Consent Calendar.

Ms. Grider stated legally a Public Hearing could be continued although could not be placed on the Consent Calendar.

Council Member Shepherd noted the School District had a two meeting rule which saved them time when an item was fairly large.

Ms. Grider stated there was not a rule in place where an item could not have a two step process; although, Public Hearings needed to remain as such.

Mr. Keene clarified the object was to deal with the timeliness of information flow and the Staff reports to Council. There was a need for a range of changes in application and development processes and procedures.

Council Member Holman stated the requested timeline for receipt of Applicant changes was noon prior to the Council packet release. She felt there needed to be more time for Staff to review the Applicant changes.

Council Member Price added once the Applicant changes were reviewed by the Staff member the changes needed to be reviewed by management prior to being included in the Staff report and added to the Council packet. A few days to a week seemed sufficient dependant upon the significance of the changes.

Ms. Morariu asked whether the changes being referred to were from the P&TC.

Council Member Holman stated any changes could affect the project and Staff needed ample time to ensure the changes were adequate, met all of the standards and requirements, and that they had sufficient information to notify Council.

Council Member Price stated if the Applicants' changes were perceived as minor and Staff merely commented on the changes during the Public Hearing that did not allow the public to understand what changes were made or to comment on

them. If the alterations were not imbedded in the Staff report in a timely manner the public did not have the ability to respond.

Mr. Keene stated the language needed to be more value based than rule based. It needed to show the Council endorsed the public decision making process which required a timely submission of materials and the ability for Staff to review the information and make adequate Staff report changes which gave the public ample time to comment.

Council Member Holman stated that as a guiding principle for the process of regulating the receipt of materials the intention could not be better stated than in the City Council Protocols Section I, A1 the following sentence read: These rules are intended to enhance public participation and Council debate so that the best possible decisions can be made for Palo Alto.

Chair Yeh stated the draft language seemed too prescriptive: all plans and other Applicant materials related to Planning applications being heard by the City Council must be submitted not later than noon one day prior to the release of the Council agenda packet. He felt that was not sufficient time for review.

Ms. Morariu suggested the Director of Planning and Community Environment, Curtis Williams return to the Committee to revisit the language.

Chair Yeh asked the capabilities of the agenda management system. He asked the likelihood of receiving the Council packet earlier than the Wednesday prior to the Council meeting.

Ms. Grider stated once the agenda had been released if there were changes it would cause confusion with multiple versions.

Ms. Morariu clarified the City was in the first stages of the signing the contract with the vendor and forming the implementation process.

Mr. Keene stated the biggest issue with an earlier packet would be the possible confusion to the public.

Chair Yeh clarified this was an incremental change reflecting a new system. The Committee would have further opportunities for discussion in the fall.

Council Member Holman requested the Committee receive the planning processes and procedures in order to better understand the process.

Council Member Shepherd stated at a previous meeting they discussed an eighteen month timeline.

Council Member Holman clarified that Council Priorities refer to process efficiencies. The adherence to existing rules and procedures did not take eighteen months to implement. She was requesting rectifying the adherence of State and local laws.

Chair Yeh requested process mapping for the Colleagues Memo procedures.

Mr. Keene felt the best practice for the planning processes and the Development Center procedures would be to have the Director of Planning and Community Environment, Curtis Williams meet with the Committee to review the current practices and the proposed changes.

Council Member Price stated she felt comfortable with the current applicant process. With the Council using their best judgment in their discussions regarding a project proposal, and with the understanding that Staff would notify the Council during the Public Hearing about any changes.

Council Member Shepherd stated Council needed to be mindful of their responsibilities and review each application.

Council Member Holman stated she was uncertain as to what relevant information could be gained by a closed meeting with the applicant that could not be learned during a public meeting. When a Council Member meets with the Applicant, the Applicant believed they had an indication of the outcome of their project and in those incidents the ARB and P&TC can be left out of the process. She clarified there should be no meetings with the Applicant until post review.

Council Member Price felt that was a reasonable request. In the event there was a meeting between a Council Member and an Applicant said Council Member should disclose the conversation.

Chair Yeh said that if the ARB or P&TC review process were circumvented through a discussion held outside the process it would undermine the whole process. Projects regularly go before Council and return to the ARB or the P&TC. He asked at what point would item 2 of CMR 286:10 be triggered. He stated he would not support a prohibition although he would be mindful of the impacts of what could occur for the ARB or P&TC review.

Council Member Shepherd stated the Planning Department needed to know what could be and should not be submitted.

Council Member Holman stated many projects violate the rules which caused the application to be returned.

Council Member Shepherd asked how larger cities dealt with similar issues.

Mr. Keene stated the processes and acceptances of varying situation was dependant upon who the governing body was. In Palo Alto the determining factor was what type of growth, expansion or type of visibility the Council expected to see.

Council Member Shepherd stated she needed to hear from the Planning Department to see how the proposed language would work for them prior to her support on the verbiage.

Council Member Holman clarified the P&TC practice of not having ex parte conversations was adopted by a narrower margin when it was first implemented on a trial basis. After the process had been in place for a year, it was approved unanimously. She stated she was a proponent of all parties receiving the same information at the same time.

Ms. Morariu stated she could agendize the item for the future discussion on the Planning issues.

Council Member Price stated she supported the use of the term discouraged rather than prohibited in the draft language.

Council Member Holman stated Attachment C of CMR 286:10, the new speaker cards showed improvement. She felt the community may not want to show their address.

Ms. Grider stated the address line was not required but a number of the Boards & Commissions utilize the address information for other purposes.

Council Member Shepherd asked whether we could request their city of residence.

Ms. Grider stated any person was entitled to speak.

Council Member Holman mentioned historically when a speaker spoke on an item they were later notified when that specific item was to be discussed in front of the ARB or the P&TC.

Ms. Grider stated the P&TC did maintain that practice which was one of the reasons the address was important for them.

Council Member Holman suggested an alteration to the card to read: If you would like to be notified please provide address or e-mail.

Mark Petersen-Perez spoke of the Supreme Court decision for public speakers to remain anonymous on forms such as the speaker cards.

Chair Yeh asked whether there was a history in Palo Alto of speakers ceding their time to another speaker who wished to discuss the same subject.

Ms. Grider stated to her knowledge Council has not allowed speakers to cede their time to another.

Mr. Keene stated Council had the purview to establish the rules they choose.

Council Member Holman stated there was a procedure in the P&TC meetings where if there were five speakers who wished to comment on the same topic, one speaker may represent the group; although, that one speaker received less allotted time combined than the group would have had individually.

Mr. Grider suggested she could perform a poll through the City Clerk's listserve to verify if there was a general practice.

Mr. Keene stated there needed to be time between hearing the public speak and giving the Council time to deliberate.

Council Member Price stated ceding time seemed appropriate as long as there was a maximum time allotted.

Ms. Morariu stated the past practice had been speakers could split their presentations throughout their group if they so chose.

Council Member Price asked how the anaerobic digestion group was able to have a single representative speak to Council.

Council Member Shepherd stated it had been her understanding that if there was a group a single representative could speak for them with a maximum time limit of ten minutes.

Council Member Holman stated there was a rule in place where a larger period of time was granted to a single speaker of a group; although the time limit was ten minutes no matter how large the group was.

Council Member Price stated the multiplier should equate to the same time for the single representative as it would for the individual speaks combined.

Council Member Shepherd stated when the time was shortened to two minutes the speakers' predominantly make their point clearly.

Council Member Holman stated she had no issue with reducing the time limit to two minutes. She felt that ceding time was necessary when there were more speakers than the thirty minute time limit designated by the Council.

Ms. Grider stated in the City Council Protocols Handbook on page I-3, section b1 spoke clearly regarding a spokesperson for a group of five or more persons.

Chair Yeh stated he would appreciate receiving information regarding the ceding time from other City Clerk's.

Mr. Keene stated the Council had the ability to alter the rules on a trial basis to review which process was best suited for the flexibility and efficiency of the Council.

Chair Yeh asked when the Procedures and Protocols would be presented to the full Council.

Ms. Morariu stated there was a four week turnaround for the completion of minutes. The anticipated time would be September 2010.

Council Member Shepherd asked for clarification on whom to submit Council questions to.

Mr. Grider stated all of the reports for the City Staff are sent through the City Manager, the Council Appointed Officer's (CAO) reports were not sent through his office. Therefore, if there was a Council question regarding an agenda item from a CAO the question would be referred directly to them, all others would be directed through the City Manager's office.

Ms. Morariu stated the language would be clarified in the City Council Procedures Handbook.

Chair Yeh recommended continuing further discussion on the matter to the next P&S meeting.

Ms. Morariu stated the item would be added to the agenda of the July 13, 2010 meeting.

4. Review and Discussion of Social Media Policy

Mark Petersen-Perez spoke regarding the power of the internet.

Management Specialist Greg Hermann stated the Social Media Policy was an internal policy although Staff felt the Committee should review the policy and supply Staff with impressions on how best to complete the roll out process. He noted a number of City departments had implemented a social networking system into their job function. The goal would be to have a consistency within the City so all departments utilizing the Face Book or Twitter type media are consistent with the City general guidelines and standards.

Council Member Price stated the information on CMR 289:10 referred to the social media as not being the primary tool for emergency notification. She asked whether it could still be used for emergency information.

Mr. Keene stated yes. The systems could be utilized to disseminate emergency information although it was not relied upon as the primary notification system.

Mr. Hermann gave a brief visual presentation on a sample version of the home pages for the social media sites. He stated the home pages for the sites would be hosted by the City Manager's office. He noted the City's home page on the website would have Twitter and Face Book links to follow and allow patrons to sign up.

Council Member Price asked whether there was a standard protocol for commenting on either Twitter or facebook. She asked if someone could send a note about where to locate a comment with a date and time stamp.

Mr. Herman stated when there was a City sponsored social network site the messages and comments were a matter of public record.

Council Member Price asked if there was a standard citation process to reference the exact location of the comment being used.

Mr. Hermann stated there was date, time and user information that could be cited as a reference.

Council Member Price asked whether public comment periods discussed on the network would be printed and placed in the packet behind the item in the next Council packet.

Mr. Hermann stated there was a limit to the characters allowed on a given social network page. There would not be specific detail in a comment or message on the social network pages.

Council Member Price asked whether there was a responsibility to package categorized comments and submit them to the Council.

Mr. Keene stated Staff would seek legal advice on the responsibility aspect; although from a practical aspect if there were a large number of the community responding to a specific item it would benefit Council to be informed.

Council Member Shepherd asked what system would be in place to monitor the severity of negativity of comments.

Mr. Hermann clarified within the policy there were language or comment policies that would be posted on the front page of all social networks sponsored by the City.

Council Member Shepherd asked whether Staff had the ability to black out inappropriate words.

Mr. Keene stated there would be a daily review of the posted information. The comments may be visible for an unknown amount of time prior to it being removed.

Mr. Hermann clarified the language in the policy that would be posted on the front pages clearly specified removal as soon as possible.

Council Member Holman stated there were no parameters on Face Book or Twitter to prevent someone from having multiple names. With that being said, was there any way to prevent distorted input.

Mr. Keene stated all forms of medium had the possibility of similar distortion of fact.

Council Member Holman stated this specific media held a higher level of anonymity that could create distorted data on a given subject.

Mr. Keene stated he understood the possibility of spamming as it were from an individual with multiple accounts although he felt a greater concern for the City was the absence of such media.

Chair Yeh asked what thought had been given to the Boards & Commissions hosting their own pages as well as the individual departments.

Mr. Hermann stated the process was in the infancy stages although he was the Staff Liaison for the Human Relations Commission (HRC) and he had been in the process of addressing the members for their feedback.

Mr. Keene stated there were issues that would need to be reviewed to ensure against violations of the Brown Act.

Chair Yeh stated his thought was to assist in Board and Commission vacancies, the more information available to the public the greater the opportunity would be for the City to benefit from a larger audience.

Mr. Hermann stated the object of interfacing with the public in such a manner was to give them the opportunity to self select the issues or subjects best suited their needs or ability.

Council Member Shepherd stated that social media was how communities were civically engaging.

Mr. Keene stated each department or Board & Commission will be representing the City as a whole with each comment, response and message. There needed to be uniformity in the values and approaches, standardization on look and feel so no matter who opens a page the understanding is what they see is the City of Palo Alto.

Council Member Shepherd asked the frequency postings would be disseminated.

Mr. Hermann stated there was not a frequency standard set. He did note there needed to be a sufficient amount of current information to maintain an up to

date awareness of City business. All of the sites or pages will need to work closely with the City Manager's office and communications to ensure the information was in-line with the standardized series.

Mr. Keene requested Mr. Hermann explain the City's new rBlock program.

Mr. Hermann stated the company was based out of the City of Sunnyvale; it was web-based software that allowed residents to form a private on-line community to share a variety of information, news and safety alerts. The interactions were done through a set of applications similar to the iPhone, so the interactions were limited by the set of applications that were available. The software allowed the City to target or select specific neighborhoods or areas in the City to communicate relevant information.

Mr. Keene stated there was going to be a multi-year pilot that expanded into the community selecting a couple thousand households. He stated the system was similar to CANS with a wide array of experimentation.

Council Member Holman stated the rBlock system may be useful in terms of code enforcement, project notifications, sidewalk issues or a number of informational items.

Council Member Shepherd asked if there would be ads popping up on the pages.

Mr. Hermann stated that for any advertisement available the user would need to select to receive the information.

Council Member Price asked the name of the application.

Mr. Hermann stated rBlock.

Chair Yeh stated since the program was a pilot, he asked whether there was a cost to the City.

Mr. Hermann stated during the pilot year there was no cost to the City.

Council Member Shepherd asked how the management of the social networks would impact the Staff workload.

Mr. Hermann stated the nature of the social network platform was designed to make sharing information simplified. If the goal of the City was to have satellite

sites be mirrors of what was being produced from the main City website the impact should be minimal.

Council Member Price shared her concern of the management of multiple sites with multiple pages from multiple departments. The thought of a build-up then a crash seemed to be an issue to look into prior to the possibility of such an event occurring.

5. Discussion of Upcoming Meetings and Topics.

City Manager, James Keene stated the upcoming meetings in July were the 13th, and 27th. The 27th posed a conflict with the CAO evaluations scheduled for the same date and time.

Council Member Shepherd suggested a morning meeting on the 27th of July.

Chair Yeh stated the options were Wednesday, July 28th at 7:00 PM or Tuesday, July 27th at 8:00 AM.

Council Member Holman stated there was a Council meeting the evening of July 26th.

Council Member Shepherd suggested Wednesday, July 28th at 8:00 AM.

City Auditor, Lynda Brouchoud stated there was an opportunity to bring a discussion before the Committee regarding the survey options for the SEA report. The survey company needed to have the options returned by mid July so she recommended adding the SEA report as an item on the July 13, 2010 agenda.

Council Member Holman suggested scheduling the SEA report first on the agenda.

Ms. Brouchoud stated the second item she would suggest for discussion was the waste, fraud and abuse hotline. She clarified the item had been under discussion for approximately two years, the research had been completed and the Auditor's office was in a position of needing direction from Council.

Council Member Holman asked whether the requested date for discussion was the 13th of July. She noted the agenda was becoming full and suggested the 28th.

Ms. Brouchoud stated the item was not time sensitive and the 28th meeting would be sufficient.

Chair Yeh asked whether the five priority topics under the Workplan had been covered to date.

Mr. Keene stated yes.

Council Member Holman suggested revisiting the Land Use issue. She felt not enough time had been spent on the discussion.

Mr. Keene explained once the Workplan had been adopted there was no reason why any one of the topics could not be revisited in more detail.

Council Member Price asked whether there was to be a discussion on regionalization, various models of how to examine different ways to deliver service.

Chair Yeh suggested July 28th be a brainstorming type of meeting.

Council Member Shepherd requested to see a more comprehensive view of the cuts in the budget. What was the City maintaining, what were they reducing or eliminating and how was that being communicated to the community.

Chair Yeh suggested the Council priority wrap-up be agendaized for July 28th.

Tuesday, July 13, 2010 the agenda items were scheduled as: 1) Council Priorities Workplan and 2) City Finances.

Wednesday, July 28, 2010 the agenda items were scheduled as: 1) Fraud Hot Line, 2) Council Priority Wrap-up, and 3) Service Prioritization Discussion.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 10:59 p.m.