



POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE FINAL MINUTES

Regular Meeting
Tuesday, August 12, 2014

Chairperson Price called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Klein, Price (Chair), Scharff, Schmid

Absent:

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of June 30, 2014.

Harriet Richardson, City Auditor, noted the Quarterly Report was the final one for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014. Audit Staff completed the Solid Waste Program Audit and presented it to the Finance Committee on June 3, 2014 and to the Council on August 4, 2014. The Public Works Department needed to improve the accuracy of its refuse billing and strengthen its oversight of Green Waste Palo Alto to ensure accuracy of refuse service data. Staff made 16 recommendations to improve management of the City's Solid Waste Program. The Franchise Fee Audit has an estimated completion date of December 2014. The objective of the Audit is to determine whether franchisees had accurately calculated and remitted franchise fees in accordance with the Palo Alto Municipal Code and whether the City had adequate controls to discharge its responsibilities. To assist with the audit, the City awarded a contract to the Buske Group to verify franchisee remittances.

Council Member Scharff requested that Staff clarify the objectives of the audit.

Ms. Richardson explained that the City received franchise fees of 5 percent from Comcast and AT&T for residential subscribers and 1 percent of Public, Education and Government (PEG) fees. The Buske Group would verify that

MINUTES

franchisees remitted fees for every subscriber within the Joint Power Authority region. The Audit of the procurement, inventory, and retirement of water, gas, and electric meters resulted from issues identified in the Inventory Management Audit. Field work for the Audit was close to completion, with an expected publication date of October 2014. Auditors identified issues and discussed them with the Utilities Department. Auditors were reviewing the University Avenue and California Avenue Parking Permit Funds, the Residential Parking Permit Fund, and the Parking In-Lieu Fund for accuracy of calculation of fees, timeliness of collection, and proper expenditure of funds. The Parking Fund Audit is expected to be completed in December 2014. The Auditor's Office continued its audit of sales and use tax allocations. Audit Staff and MuniServices identified vendors whose sales tax had been misallocated. MuniServices identified approximately \$65,000 in misallocated sales tax. The Auditor's Office identified approximately \$105,000 in misallocated sales tax. Approximately 42 potential misallocations were awaiting research and processing. Quarterly Reports of sales tax results are published on the City website. The Auditor's Office continued in advisory roles for the Utilities Risk Oversight Committee, Library Bond Oversight Committee, the Information Technology Governance Review Board, and the Information Security Steering Committee. The Quarterly Report did not include work regarding the National Citizen Survey. Those surveys were released last week. Audit Staff will begin work the following month for the Annual Performance Report. The Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Hotline had not received complaints during the quarter. Staff closed the only remaining open complaint as unsubstantiated. Since its initiation, the Hotline had received ten complaints, all of which had been closed.

Council Member Scharff asked about the results of the ten complaints.

Ms. Richardson reported one complaint was substantiated and led to the Contract Oversight Audit. The remaining nine complaints were unsubstantiated. On May 13, 2014, the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) directed her to return with recommended changes to the Municipal Code to clarify which Committee would receive which Audit Reports.

Council Member Klein inquired about proposed new audits.

Ms. Richardson was working on a proposed audit plan for FY 2015 and will present it to the Committee on September 9, 2014.

Council Member Schmid understood the mandate of the Oversight Committee did not provide authority or an ability to examine actions. Perhaps the Auditor's Office could determine ways to provide better

MINUTES

oversight to the Oversight Committee, if that was within the Auditor's purview. Each of the proposed Audits for FY 2015 was a small piece of the overall Budget. The previous evening the Council discussed information needed for it to make intelligent decisions in the Comprehensive Plan Update process. One of the goals of the Auditor's Office was to handle problems important to the Council. He inquired whether the City Auditor could assist the Council with its desire to obtain information.

Ms. Richardson advised that a Public Benefits Audit planned for FY 2014 would be rescheduled for FY 2015. In reviewing topics for FY 2015, she was reviewing Council Priorities and identifying topics that aligned with Council Priorities. When presenting the plan to the Council, she would associate each audit with a Priority.

Council Member Klein did not believe that was the proper role of the Auditor's Office. The September 9 Committee meeting was the correct time for such a discussion. All topics mentioned by Council Member Schmid were more appropriately addressed to the City Manager. The Auditor's Office would need two or three times the current number of staff to address information discussed in the August 11, 2014 Council meeting.

Council Member Schmid clarified that he was not requesting more data, but an analysis.

Council Member Klein remarked that the Auditor responded to concerns. The Auditor's role was to determine whether things were performed properly.

Council Member Scharff agreed with Council Member Schmid that the audits proposed for FY 2014 lacked impact. One role of the City Auditor was to review City processes and ensure processes were good. The contract and inventory audits fulfilled that role. In planning for FY 2015, the City Auditor should consider audits that would drive improvements to City processes.

Chair Price explained that these issues could be discussed in the course of the Committee's evaluation of the Auditor's work. The Auditor's Office did not have the expertise to focus on areas other than efficiency and process. It was not appropriate to hold an extended conversation on items not on the Agenda. Council Members should be more explicit regarding the types of issues to be examined in order to assist the Auditor in defining a work plan.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to recommend the City Council approve the Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of June 30, 2014.

MINUTES

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

2. Recommend Approval of an Ordinance to Amend Section 2.08.130 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code, Office and Duties of the City Auditor, to Reflect Changes in Auditing Practices and Clarify the Requirements for Reporting Work Products of the Office of the City Auditor.

Harriet Richardson, City Auditor, reported that the Policy and Services Committee directed Staff to amend the Municipal Code to clarify which Council Committee should receive which work products from the Auditor's Office. Section 2.08.130 of the Municipal Code had not been updated since 1999. She proposed changes to reflect revisions made in Government Auditing Standards (GAS) in 2002, 2003, 2007, and 2011. To eliminate the need to amend the Municipal Code each time GAS were updated, she included less detail in sections where GAS provided specific requirements. Historically the City Auditor used his judgment to distribute work products to Council Committees. Study Session reports, such as the Annual Performance Report, National Citizen Survey, and information items, should continue to be presented to the Council for discussion and/or approval. Enterprise Fund or primarily financial reports should be presented to the Finance Committee. All other reports and work products should be presented to the Policy and Services Committee. Reports presented to the Policy and Services Committee could have a financial aspect, but they would primarily have an operational focus. These were the same criteria the City Auditor historically used to distribute reports. Municipal Code Section 2.04.210 stated the Finance Committee would consider and make recommendations on matters related to audits. Municipal Code Section 2.04.220 described responsibilities of the Policy and Services Committee, but made no mention of audits. Sections 2.04.210 and 2.04.220 should be amended to align with proposed changes. In addition, language requiring the City Auditor to set and maintain a tone for ethical behavior should be included in the Municipal Code. While GAS contained ethical principles for Auditors, she wanted to include language in the Code to make ethics a priority. She included language to reflect that the Auditor's Office primarily conducted performance audits and nonaudit services. This would eliminate the reference to financial audits which are conducted by an independent CPA firm. However, the Auditor could review financial issues under the umbrella of a performance audit. She proposed eliminating the requirement to comply with the International Professional Practices Framework promulgated by the Institute of Internal Auditors. Those standards were better suited to corporate internal auditors. Another amendment was to establish a two-week standard response time to audits with possible extensions. The current requirement was five weeks. She proposed eliminating the requirement to issue an audit report to the Council within four weeks of

MINUTES

receiving a response as GAS required auditors to issue reports timely. She reorganized some sections for clarity, such as dividing into separate paragraphs the requirements to handle information with prudence and to accommodate a department's daily operations when scheduling and conducting audits. She consolidated into one paragraph provisions regarding the City Manager's response to audits.

Herb Borock suggested including a section to direct the City Auditor to inform the Council of revisions to GAS. The Code should contain language to allow financial audits independent of performance audits. Proposed amendments should be reviewed to ensure they complied with Charter language.

Council Member Scharff expected Section 2.08.130(a)(4) to list transparency as opposed to confidentiality. The purpose of an audit was transparency. He requested Ms. Richardson explain her rationale for including confidentiality.

Ms. Richardson stated that the principles are contained in the GAS. Confidentiality did not mean information was not disclosed. Confidentiality meant staff did not misuse information for personal gain or release information that should be maintained as confidential. GAS requires auditors to produce reports and make them available to the public.

Council Member Scharff asked if the amendments applied only to the Auditor's Office.

Ms. Richardson answered yes.

Council Member Scharff inquired about reasons for eliminating language regarding the adequacy of systems and internal controls. Frequently the City did not have good internal controls.

Ms. Richardson explained that internal controls were a subset of efficiency and effectiveness and incorporated into the definition of performance audit. Many outcomes of effectiveness generally occurred because of a weakness in internal controls; therefore, auditors naturally reviewed for that. It did not need to be specifically stated in the Municipal Code.

Council Member Scharff inquired about the meaning of ethically in the context of Section 2.08.130(b).

Ms. Richardson advised that equitably meant fairness while ethically meant without discrimination. That was part of an auditor's review.

MINUTES

Council Member Scharff asked if there was a code of conduct for auditors.

Ms. Richardson reported the GAS attempted to strengthen auditors' reviews. The meaning was provided in the GAS.

Council Member Scharff noted Section 2.08.130(d) stated the City Auditor may ("will" deleted) review the plan with the City Attorney. That change was inappropriate and could affect the litigation risk of the City. He did not understand why the auditor would not be required to submit a plan to the City Attorney for review.

Ms. Richardson could accept changing that back. She does seek the advice of the City Attorney when appropriate.

Council Member Scharff referred to the annual report on the status of recommendations made in completed audits contained in Section 2.08.130(h). Often implementation of recommendations required long periods of time, and the Council did not track that progress. He inquired whether reports should be issued more frequently or whether the department head should be required to report to the Council.

Ms. Richardson reported in her work experience departments were required to report more frequently than annually. She was not aware of any jurisdictions that required a department to indicate specifically why it had not implemented individual recommendations. That type of requirement would provide accountability. The Auditor's Office works with departments to ensure recommendations are practical and feasible so that the recommendations could be implemented. The requirement could be changed to reflect more frequent reporting.

Council Member Scharff requested Ms. Richardson comment on an appropriate requirement.

Ms. Richardson advised that one jurisdiction required department heads to report directly to the Council every six months, and another jurisdiction required the auditor to follow up on more significant findings. There were a variety of ways to approach it. Having department heads indicate their reasons for not implementing recommendations would allow auditors to understand why recommendations could not be implemented.

Council Member Scharff asked if Ms. Richardson could return to the Policy and Services Committee with further changes.

Ms. Richardson could provide revisions.

MINUTES

Khashayar Alaei, Senior Management Analyst, asked if the item would be presented to the Council for approval.

Ms. Richardson replied yes.

Mr. Alaei inquired whether Ms. Richardson should provide revisions to the Policy and Services Committee or the Council.

Chair Price indicated revisions should be presented to the Policy and Services Committee.

Council Member Klein explained that traditionally the Policy and Services Committee retained an item until it was comfortable with it, and then sent it to the Council. If the Policy and Services Committee unanimously approved an item, then the item was placed on the Council Consent Calendar.

Chair Price agreed that was the preference and standard practice.

Council Member Schmid suggested the City Auditor provide an informational item to the Council when new GAS were published and review the Charter to ensure changes complied with Charter language. Sections 2.08.130(d) and (e) implied that the final step of an audit was to place it on the appropriate Committee Agenda. Committees made a recommendation to the Council, and the Council actually approved audit reports. He requested Sections (d) and (e) state "for approval by Council" at the end. There seemed to be an imbalance in Committee work; therefore, the auditor should present half of audit reports to the Finance Committee and half to the Policy and Services Committee. In that manner, more Council Members could review audit reports and the City Auditor's work. In addition, neither Committee had a unique expertise to review audit reports.

Council Member Scharff concurred with Council Member Schmid's thoughts. An audit report that affected the budget process should be presented to the Finance Committee. He inquired whether the Finance Committee would continue to receive the majority of audit reports if they were divided between the two Committees in that manner.

Ms. Richardson believed the current practice resulted in a fairly even division. Alternatively, audit reports focused primarily on financial matters could be presented to the Finance Committee and audit reports focused on operational processes could be presented to the Policy and Services Committee. Financial matters would be interpreted as accounting issues, the budget process, and rate structures. Under that scenario, the Policy and Services Committee could continue to review audit reports with a financial

MINUTES

impact. The determination would be whether a financial impact was the focus of an audit report.

Council Member Scharff would likely support that approach. He was interested in additional comments.

Council Member Klein did not understand Council Member Schmid's proposed solution.

Council Member Schmid reiterated that the auditor would present half of audit reports to the Policy and Services Committee and half to the Finance Committee.

Council Member Klein felt a different system would be helpful. Distinctions between audit reports were difficult to make in that almost all audits would impact the City's financial situation. He agreed that neither Committee had a particular expertise and that the auditor should be exposed to all Council Members. He suggested the City Auditor alternate presenting reports to the Policy and Services and Finance Committees. Perhaps alternating between Committees would even out which audits were significant and which were not.

Council Member Scharff remarked that the Finance Committee seemed to have far more work than other Committees. The Policy and Services Committee should discuss whether all audits should be presented to the Policy and Services Committee. That would give the Policy and Services Committee a considerable role.

Council Member Schmid noted the four upcoming audit reports could be presented to the Finance Committee. Dividing audit reports between Committees could be an arbitrary decision.

Chair Price inquired whether the proposals provided sufficient guidance for the City Auditor to manage the routing of audit reports and work products.

Ms. Richardson commented that her experience aligned with Council Member Scharff's suggestion for all audit reports to be presented to a single Committee.

Council Member Klein added that many cities had an audit committee.

Ms. Richardson concurred. If a city did not have an audit committee, then they often had a single Committee hear audit reports.

Council Member Schmid believed the disadvantage of using a single Committee was fewer Council Members would have an opportunity to

MINUTES

evaluate the performance of the Auditor. In addition, fewer Council Members would have experience with audit reports.

Chair Price felt the Policy and Services Committee should provide a single statement of guidance for the City Auditor.

Council Member Scharff stated the two best suggestions were to alternate reporting to Committees and to send all audit reports to one Committee. He would probably support presenting all audit reports to the Policy and Services Committee. The auditor would not interact with all Council Members; however, Committee workloads would be more evenly distributed. The auditor does interact with Council Members on informational items. He could accept alternating audit reports between the Finance and Policy and Services Committees as that could be more efficient. Because the Policy and Services Committee should understand the actions of the Utilities Department, audit reports pertaining to the Utilities Department should be presented to the Policy and Services Committee with all other audit reports alternating between the two Committees.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to recommend the City Council adopt an Ordinance to amend Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 2.08.130 with the following changes:

1. Section 2(d), sentence 2, "... and be placed on the Policy and Services Committee agenda."
2. Section 2(d), sentence 5, "... submitting it to the Policy and Services Committee."
3. Section 2(e), sentence 2, "... and be placed on the Policy and Services Committee agenda."
4. Section 2(h), sentence 3, "... and be placed on the Policy and Services Committee agenda."
5. Section 2(g), sentence 1, "... on the agenda of the City Council or Policy and Services Committee ..."

Council Member Klein advised that Council Member Schmid raised a good point as to whether the other five members of the Council would have sufficient exposure to the auditor. However, presenting all audit reports to one Committee was logical.

Chair Price would support the Motion. In the prior year, the Policy and Services Committee had many significant items on the Agenda. She

MINUTES

inquired whether staff would return with modifications at the first meeting in September.

Ms. Richardson would return to the meeting scheduled for September 9, 2014, with revisions and a work plan.

Council Member Scharff felt the Motion should provide explicit direction to Staff.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to change the following wording:

1. Section 2(d), sentence 2, "... and be placed on the Policy and Services Committee agenda for recommendation for City Council approval."
2. Section 2(d), sentence 5, "The City Auditor will review the plan with and seek the advice of the City Attorney prior to submitting it to the Policy and Services Committee for recommendation for City Council approval."
3. Section 2(e), sentence 2, "... and be placed on the Policy and Services Committee agenda for recommendation for City Council approval."
4. Section 2(h), sentence 3, "... and be placed on the Policy and Services Committee agenda for recommendation for City Council approval."
5. Section 2(h) return with suggestions to modify frequency of annual report.

Chair Price assumed the City Auditor would amend the Municipal Code to comply with future revisions to GAS. She requested Ms. Richardson offer an approach to informing the Council of changes in GAS and consequently the Municipal Code.

Ms. Richardson proposed amendments that would minimize the need to update the Municipal Code each time GAS changed. She could include language for the City Auditor to inform the Council of GAS revisions. At that point, the Council could consider whether GAS changes affected any permanent Municipal Code sections.

Chair Price inquired whether that language could be included in the Municipal Code.

MINUTES

Ms. Richardson replied yes.

Chair Price asked if the maker and seconder of the Motion would incorporate that language into the Motion.

Council Member Klein was not supportive of including extraneous language in the Motion. The City Attorney uses her discretion as to which legal changes to present to the Council. The City Auditor should do the same.

AMENDMENT: Chair Price moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff that the City Auditor notify the Policy and Services Committee of changes to Government Auditing Standards.

Council Member Schmid understood the intention of the proposed amendments was not to revise the Code each time GAS changed. That would allow the Auditor's Office to operate more efficiently. The Amendment directed the auditor to inform the Council of major changes to GAS.

Council Member Klein suggested the Municipal Code remain silent as to whether the City Auditor should inform the Council. A failure to inform the Council of a significant change in GAS could affect the City Auditor's performance evaluation.

Ms. Richardson could notify the Council of a major change in her Quarterly Report to the Council. She could revise the Audit Manual to reflect that direction.

Chair Price accepted Ms. Richardson revising the Audit Manual to include the direction for the City Auditor to notify the Council of GAS revisions.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN BY THE MAKER

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 4-0

3. Review and Recommendation to Council for Approval of the Draft 2014 State and Federal Legislative Program Manual.

Richard Hackmann, Management Analyst, recalled that Staff presented a draft of the Legislative Program Manual (Manual) to the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) at the May 2014 meeting; however, the Committee took no formal action. Staff outlined a plan for lobbyists and the Committee to meet twice a year to focus specifically on the Legislative Priority section of the Manual. In anticipation of the October 14, 2014 Committee meeting, Staff requested input and recommendations regarding the Manual as a whole. Staff sought direction on the general framework of the Manual, understanding that the Legislative Priority section would be reevaluated in

MINUTES

approximately eight weeks. The fall Committee meeting would focus on proactive legislative positions for the upcoming legislative year. The spring meeting would focus on responses to proposed legislation or policies. Committee recommendations would be presented to the Council for approval.

Council Member Schmid noted the City's legislative advocates would appear before the Committee on October 14; however, Legislators informally determined priorities for the following year in September. He inquired whether the Committee's legislative discussion should also be held in September.

Mr. Hackmann explained that the state legislative advocate preferred October, because he would have more details of potential issues and agenda items for 2015.

Council Member Schmid asked if the Committee should discuss legislative issues in September in order to direct the advocate regarding issues to promote at legislative discussions held in September.

Mr. Hackmann advised that the extent to which the City could significantly shift policy was small with respect to large issues. The Committee could determine the City's positions regarding large issues at that time.

Council Member Schmid remarked that the arrows in Step 4 of the diagram on Page 4 pointed in the wrong directions. The arrows should point from the City Manager to the Council and then back to the City Manager.

Mr. Hackmann concurred.

Council Member Schmid requested Staff assess the League of California Cities' (League) ability to track issues important to Palo Alto.

Mr. Hackmann reported the League attempted to focus on one or two issues for which it could obtain consensus. The League's selection of issues appeared to be arbitrary. He preferred to set a City position first, and then determine if it aligned with a League position.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the legislative action program on page 6, the Legislative Advocacy Policy on page 7, and the Legislative Program Manual were three different documents.

Mr. Hackmann clarified that the Legislative Action Program was everything legislative including the Manual. He could change the language if the

MINUTES

Committee wished, and suggested "keep Council informed on the status of the City's legislative positions."

Council Member Schmid noted the Legislative Advocacy Policy had initial caps.

Mr. Hackmann clarified that Legislative Advocacy Policy referred to the Guiding Principles for Legislative Advocacy. He could strike that and make revisions as suggested.

Council Member Klein felt it was helpful to have a coherent policy. The League did not always advocate issues which the City supported. He inquired about the meaning of advocating proactively on behalf of the City.

Mr. Hackmann explained that the intent was to communicate with Legislators regarding issues and positions the City would support.

Council Member Klein suggested Staff add more language.

Mr. Hackmann would add language to clarify that the City would not only be responsive to legislation but also would propose policy.

Council Member Klein concurred with adding that language. On page 1, additional legislative priorities should include High Speed Rail and amendments to or deletions of the Affordable Housing Mandate Program.

Chair Price proposed adding language to the Manual "to ensure representatives from the City of Palo Alto who served on California League of Cities committees were advised, informed, and updated before they attended League meetings." She questioned whether the Manual should contain a statement regarding how Council Members should react to actions or positions taken by regional agencies to which Council Members were representatives. Staff could review some agendas from regional bodies.

Council Member Klein felt it was unfair to burden Staff with reviewing agendas from regional bodies. If a Council Member felt the position proposed by regional body staff was not right for Palo Alto, then he should consult with City Staff.

Chair Price clarified that Staff would not read all packets and materials from regional bodies. Council Members had a responsibility to touch base with Staff prior to regional body meetings. The roles of lobbyists were conspicuously absent related to that type of participation.

MINUTES

Council Member Scharff added that that type of situation should be an exception to the one-hour rule. Council Members should be able to ask Staff to clarify the issues.

Council Member Klein requested Council Member Scharff clarify his comments.

Council Member Scharff was unsure how the one-hour rule worked.

Council Member Schmid explained that discussion of any single issue with a Council Member could not require more than one hour of Staff time.

Council Member Klein did not believe anyone would invoke the one hour rule if an issue was sufficiently important to require more than an hour of discussion.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether Chair Price anticipated Council Member/Staff discussion requiring more than an hour.

Chair Price felt the length of the discussion would depend on the subject.

Mr. Hackmann reported lobbyists were extremely responsive to issues brought to them. It would be difficult for Staff to track the packet of every regional body. Council Members should contact him regarding complex issues, and he would request the state or federal lobbyist provide a summary in a timely manner. He could revise the Manual to include "when necessary, Staff support could be needed for regional bodies and may be requested in the spirit of existing Council policies."

Chair Price indicated a limited Staff review of packets could be manageable..

Council Member Scharff asked if the Council would utilize the Legislative Program Manual year after year.

Mr. Hackmann replied yes.

Council Member Scharff asked if Staff would prepare a new Manual each year.

Mr. Hackmann hoped the Committee could agree on a general framework for the Manual. The Manual would be revised and reflect the date on which the Council approved legislative priorities for the year.

Council Member Scharff advised that the Legislative Priorities section should state "the groundwork was Council Priorities" rather than listing each Priority. Otherwise, Staff would need to update the Manual yearly when

MINUTES

Priorities changed. Similarly, legislative priorities should be "as approved by the Council."

Mr. Hackmann clarified that the intent of the Manual, aside from legislative priorities, would remain the same each year. The Manual could reference Council Priorities as priorities of the Legislative Program. The Manual should also contain a statement allowing lobbyists to act on additional policies outside Council Priorities that the Council felt would be significant issues. Rather than listing additional legislative priorities, Staff would prepare an addendum each fall and spring to authorize legislative advocates to act on other issues.

Council Member Klein felt that was a better approach to make the Manual a permanent document. Council Priorities often were not relevant to state and federal issues.

Mr. Hackmann explained that was the purpose of adding issues for advocates.

Council Member Klein remarked that use of the word priority was confusing in that it had two different meanings.

Council Member Scharff stated that Council Priorities were irrelevant to the Manual. It would be better to state the Council held meetings in the fall and spring to outline legislative issues.

Chair Price referred to page 9 regarding referral to the Committee for review. She inquired whether Committee discussion of legislative issues would occur periodically.

Mr. Hackmann advised that an issue would be presented to the Committee if it did not fall under existing legislative priorities and if there was sufficient time to place it on a Committee agenda.

Council Member Schmid asked if Staff would agendaize an item for the Council to prioritize Committee recommendations regarding legislative issues.

Mr. Hackmann reported twice a year the Council would review and approve Committee recommendations from the fall and spring legislative items. He preferred to revise the Manual and present it and priority recommendations to the Committee at the October 14 meeting.

MINUTES

Chair Price reiterated that revisions to the Legislative Program Manual would return on October 14, 2014. The Committee had a meeting scheduled for September 23.

Mr. Hackmann would contact state and federal advocates to determine if they could attend on September 23 or October 14.

Council Member Schmid remarked that no final decisions would be made in October.

Chair Price indicated three substantial items were scheduled for the September 23 meeting. The legislative discussion would remain on the Agenda for October 14.

FUTURE MEETINGS AND AGENDAS

Chair Price referenced the list of items and their status, and requested comment.

Council Member Scharff advised the list was fine.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 8:49 P.M.