



# **POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Special Meeting  
October 14, 2014

Chairperson Price called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Klein, Price (Chair), Schmid

Absent: Scharff

## Oral Communications

Mark Weiss felt Esther Clark Park was an underutilized asset, and suggested a sign for the park be placed on Arastradero Road.

## Agenda Items

1. Review and Recommendation to Council for Approval of the Draft Legislative Program Manual and Draft Spring 2015 Legislative Priorities Addendum.

Richard Hackmann, Management Analyst, reported an Addendum containing specific legislative priorities for the Spring 2015 legislative session was provided along with a draft Legislative Program Manual, as requested by the Policy and Services Committee (Committee). Every fall, the Committee would hold a planning session for the following legislative session in order to inform lobbyists of City priorities outside standing priorities. Each spring, the Committee would discuss current legislative activities in order to plan for August and September legislative activities.

Steve Palmer, Van Scoyoc Associates, advised that the year had been a disappointment in terms of passing legislation, because Congress had been in a state of gridlock on most everything. Congress passed a five-year farm bill, an eight-month extension of transportation programs, and the Water Resources Development Act. Congress did not pass any of the 12 appropriations bills before the fiscal year began on October 1, 2014. He expected Congress to consider three items prior to the end of the year: the final appropriations bill for the year, the Marketplace Fairness Act, and the tax bill. Many people believed Republicans would gain control of the Senate in the coming elections. Legislation still had to be passed such as the

# MINUTES

transportation bill. In 2015, the budget would be a dominant issue and could affect the City. Without any changes, budget sequestration would begin anew in 2015. If Congress did nothing, domestic non-defense programs would receive a slight funding increase under the budget caps, while defense programs would receive significantly less funding. With events in the Middle East, no one expected that to happen. Congress had to deal with the debt limit by March or April 2015. Both parties could cut entitlement programs and raise revenue in an effort to offset spending shortfalls for transportation and other investment programs.

Thane Young, Van Scoyoc Associates, indicated the San Francisquito Creek Project was for the first time included in the President's budget request for Fiscal Year 2015. He believed the Administration requested sufficient funds to complete the study, which would set the project up for the next Water Resources Development Act. The next challenge was obtaining water quality permits from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Power users had been supplementing revenues funding the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, because water users had not contributed as much as they should under the allocation. The Bureau of Reclamation had been overbilling power users in order to keep the fund flush. The Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) recently filed suit to try to recoup some of those payments over the past six years. The NCPA is attempting to change the allocation formula so that power users are not paying such a disproportionate share of the burden. There was an attempt to include that in the appropriations bill. He was working with the City to draft a comment letter regarding the Waters of the U.S. Rule (Rule). The public comment period had been extended to November 14, 2014. The Rule could have some significant cost implications on storm water, roadside ditches, and flood plain management for the City. Without appearing to bash the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or being overly critical, the letter would address the City's concerns about impacts of the Rule.

Mr. Palmer added that if the Senate did change hands, a likely outcome of the budget process in 2015 would be the enactment of many policy riders, such as precluding the EPA from moving ahead with rules regarding Waters of the U.S. or carbon emissions. A prohibition on funding California High Speed Rail (HSR) would probably be included in a bill if the Senate changed hands. If Congress was controlled by one party, there was a higher likelihood that those kinds of policy riders would be included on appropriations bills forcing the President to veto them and shut down the government or accept them.

Council Member Schmid appreciated the broad overview and felt the City should identify topics with a Federal impact such as housing and Federal

# MINUTES

funding for housing. Another topic is the relationship between the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the US Army Corps of Engineers' and the lack of progress with the flood plain issue and the South Bay levee studies.

Mr. Palmer reiterated that some funding was included in the work plan for San Francisquito Creek. With respect to housing issues, he had been talking to Congresswoman Eshoo about Community Development Block Grants, the HOME Program and homeless issues to ensure those programs were fully funded. It was unfortunate Congress had lumped together housing and transportation programs in one appropriations bill, because transportation programs were typically very popular with much support. With domestic funding being relatively flat, he did not anticipate any significant cuts to any of those programs in 2014 or 2015.

Council Member Schmid requested that the Semi-Annual Legislative Update include an update on these issues.

Mr. Palmer would add that.

Council Member Klein was interested in the effects of a Republican-controlled Senate and asked if there would be more legislative gridlock in the Senate in 2015.

Mr. Palmer agreed that was a possibility. In Senate races only, Republicans were favored in 2015 and Democrats in 2016. The question was whether the very conservative part of the Republican Party would enable the party to govern. In the last three years, that had not happened. The Senate Majority Leader had done an effective job of preventing votes from occurring in 2014. That kind of obstructionism would probably go away if there was a different party in control.

Mr. Young advised that one of the big obstructions for the 2014 appropriations process had been the Waters of the U.S. Rule. He had been attempting to craft a different approach that enabled the rule making process to proceed without creating a standoff with the President. He did not want to shutdown the appropriations process or the government because of that Rule. The greenhouse gas rule was a different matter entirely and generated more controversy than the Waters of the U.S. Rule.

Council Member Klein was unsure about the City's interest in the Rule.

Mr. Young explained that the community, City, and region had a fairly substantial flood plain. The Rule stated that any water within a flood plain

# MINUTES

would become Waters of the U.S. which significantly changed the way those waters would be permitted.

Council Member Klein understood that and supported the Republicans rather than the President on the issue.

Mr. Young reported the City was also participating in the Bay water recycling program. The Rule did not respect water recycling programs. The EPA should not over-regulate these things, because water recycling was not inexpensive. To make it unwittingly even more expensive would discourage rather than encourage recycling.

Chair Price hoped the State lobbyist would address the impact of the Rule on State legislation. She inquired whether the Rule and flood plain management of San Francisquito Creek would impact the other.

Mr. Young replied yes. The Rule stated that any water within a flood plain would be a Water of the U.S. Once something was defined as a Water of the U.S., it had to be regulated in an entirely different way than it had been. The Rule did not define the flood plain as 50-year, 100-year or 500-year. It stated the EPA would use its best professional judgment to identify a flood plain. That created ambiguity. He wanted greater clarity in the Rule. There could be legitimate reasons for the EPA considering waters differently in a flood plain, but clearer definitions were needed.

Chair Price asked about a relationship among State and regional water quality control regulations and permitting.

Mr. Young explained that the Rule stated once something was a Water of the U.S., then it was incumbent upon the State to identify the beneficial uses of that water and to then generate the standards for pollutants. It also created the real prospect that many third parties could sue over the intent of the Rule and how well cities complied with it. Storm water features were currently regulated as a point source rather than a Water of the U.S. The Rule created multiple layers of regulation and multiple layers of cost.

Chair Price remarked that the Rule could empower regulatory agencies who were not supporting local and regional water projects.

Council Member Klein requested reasons not to support the Republican position to abolish the Rule unless it was substantially amended.

Mr. Young commented that the Conference of Mayors indicated the Rule should be withdrawn and a new one drafted. They made seven or eight

# MINUTES

specific recommendations to the EPA. That would be a responsible position for the City to take. The EPA should engage state and local governments.

James Keene, City Manager, agreed with the direction of Council Member Klein's comments. The Rule was ambiguous and would require years to clarify. At precisely the same time, the impact for managing flood waters would be pushed onto homeowners while slowing down the ability to manage flood waters. That was one practical near-term point that needed to be stressed. The City needed integration and clarity, not more fragmentation in the regulatory process.

Niccolo De Luca, Townsend Public Affairs, reported the Governor vetoed less than 200 of almost 1,000 bills at the end of September. It had been a good legislative session for the City. One of the first things he did in representing the City of Palo Alto was introduce his firm to Assembly Member Gordon and Senator Hill to let them know he would be working closely with them. Of the bills the City supported, eight were signed into law and six were not. The City took a few positions on the water bond. After City direction, he would speak with Assembly Member Gordon and Senator Hill and others to make them aware of the City's platform. The plastic bag ban was signed into law; however, he had heard the possibility of gathering signatures for a measure in 2016 to overturn it. Regarding Waters of the U.S., he would become more involved and speak to Mr. Hackmann and a member of his firm who covered water policy.

Council Member Schmid noted the 2014 summary did not mention Senate Bill (SB) 498 regarding conversion technology. There was no support whatsoever from the Bay Area. The Council would vote on the issue of anaerobic digestion in the next few months. In three years, the City would renew its waste disposal contract. That would be a huge long-term issue for the City. SB 498 seemed to provide a raft of opportunities.

Mr. De Luca explained that the bills listed were specific bills on which the City took a position. He spoke to the City about many bills throughout the session.

Council Member Schmid felt this was an important issue in the state. The City's lack of a position did not mean the legislation would not have major implications for the City.

Mr. De Luca would watch the legislation more closely and provide more information and any other new events.

# MINUTES

Council Member Schmid indicated the Council voted on Proposition 13 definitions and was aware of some activity in the Legislature. He requested an update of that issue.

Mr. De Luca advised that Assembly Bill (AB) 2372 concerned change of ownership, which the City supported. That bill addressed some of the ownership interests and attempted to close loopholes. Unfortunately, that bill did not get out of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Council Member Schmid asked if the Assembly passed it.

Mr. De Luca answered yes.

Council Member Schmid asked if he recalled the vote.

Mr. De Luca could find that information and provide it.

Council Member Schmid inquired about public discussion in the Senate.

Mr. De Luca believed the Senate Appropriations Committee did not have much discussion, because it came up at the end of the session.

Council Member Schmid noted the City had lost one percentage point share of property taxes every year over the past decade. The commercial share continued to decrease, and that was the City's major source of income. The Committee should discuss that at the six-month review.

Mr. De Luca would determine whether the legislation would be reintroduced.

Council Member Schmid requested any information from the Senate as to why it did not appear on its radar.

Mr. De Luca indicated the California Chamber of Commerce supported the bill when it traditionally did not.

Council Member Schmid explained that a reinterpretation of SB 375 was a critical redefinition of the basis of the housing allocation. He assumed that would impact the nexus study for Development Impact Fees. The State declined the process and procedures and agreed with the change in interpretation. From the proposal to divide California into six districts, he was disturbed to learn that the Silicon Valley district would be the richest per capita district in the country and the state and the Central California district would be the lowest. He inquired about the sense of the Legislature in dealing with that issue.

# MINUTES

Mr. De Luca indicated the Legislators he had spoken with were embarrassed by the proposal. The proposal of six Californias did not go anywhere and most people scoffed at it.

Council Member Schmid believed every citizen wanted to keep the state intact.

Council Member Klein inquired about the Governor's and Legislature's agendas for 2015.

Mr. De Luca advised that the Governor was vested in HSR and pushed that forward. The Governor was also pushing for water infrastructure; the water bond was polling well. Also the Governor was very concerned about continuing the fiscal stability of the State. Proposition 30 would sunset in three years, so there was discussion from the Governor's Office about extending that. There were some very labor-friendly bills on the Governor's desk. The City opposed them as did almost every city in the State. Some assumed the Governor would automatically support those bills, but he opposed them. He had heard that the Governor was very interested in a long-term funding strategy for affordable housing. In addition the Governor was a proponent of ensuring California remained as the innovative state.

Council Member Klein asked about the meaning of innovative state.

Mr. De Luca explained that businesses would want to come to California because of a friendly business environment, and California would remain on the cutting edge.

Council Member Klein asked if the Governor was suggesting subsidies.

Mr. De Luca did not know what the Governor was planning.

Council Member Klein did not believe that was a new agenda except for the affordable housing piece. If the water bond did not pass, then the Governor would have a big problem. HSR was not new.

Mr. De Luca indicated the Governor would announce his main priorities along with the budget in January 2015. He would contact the Governor's Office and request additional information.

Council Member Klein inquired about Legislators' intentions.

Mr. De Luca remarked that Legislators had been relatively silent. Over November 3-4, 2014, Legislators would provide more information about their plans. There had been bills to rein in fundraising. Surprisingly the Governor vetoed some of those bills; however, he believed some of those bills would

# MINUTES

be renewed. There had been discussion of a potential park bond in 2016. Early in the legislative year, there was discussion about a library bond, but that was placed on hold. Voter support for the water bond would dictate the type of bonds proposed in 2016.

Council Member Klein inquired about the expiration date for Proposition 30.

Mr. De Luca answered in three years.

Council Member Klein inquired about the possibility of modifying the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process.

Mr. De Luca advised that the success of a bill depended upon the author and the content.

Council Member Klein requested that be the City's top priority.

Mr. Keene inquired about allies for a bill to modify the RHNA process.

Mr. De Luca believed a more moderate Democrat would take on changes to RHNA. Possibly Assembly Member Gordon would take that. Some Bay Area Legislators would be wary, but some Los Angeles Legislators would take that on. Once the tighter races were determined, the Speaker would determine how the bill would be presented and the mechanics of it. Perhaps a bill would have a better chance in the Senate if a Senator introduced it.

Council Member Klein commented that City support of a bill to modify the RHNA process would not surprise Senator Hill and Assembly Member Gordon.

Mr. De Luca explained such a bill should begin in the Senate because it would need some momentum. With the higher numbers in the Assembly, more Assembly Members would stay off a vote or not take a position such that the bill slowly died. He could speak with Assembly Member Gordon and Senator Hill to determine if they would author legislation. Depending on their response, he would inquire whether other authors were interested.

Council Member Schmid inquired about the types of reform to be proposed in the legislation.

Council Member Klein suggested reviewing earlier attempts to learn what had and had not worked.

Mr. De Luca clarified that the City should determine the content of the legislation.



# MINUTES

Council Member Klein wanted to review previous proposed changes.

Mr. De Luca recalled Assembly Member Harkey attempted something when she first went into office.

Chair Price inquired whether the Speaker of the House had spoken about RHNA numbers, methodology, or allocation process.

Mr. De Luca had not heard her take a position.

Council Member Klein did not believe affordable housing and the RHNA process were necessarily inconsistent with each other. Studies suggested more affordable housing could be provided without the RHNA process.

Chair Price indicated the Committee had noted important issues of Waters of the U.S. and affordable housing. She inquired about bills regarding homelessness.

Mr. De Luca advised that early in the legislative session, an Assembly Member proposed a bill of homeless rights; however, it did not have support. There had not been any major legislation concerning the root cause of homelessness or new funding sources. Supporters of homeless issues had termed out. He would speak with Legislators to determine if homelessness would be a part of their platforms. He inquired about specific topics the Committee would be interested in.

Chair Price felt counties provided resources and programs, and cities were not direct service providers and did not have resources. She had many questions and concerns about ways to address issues.

Mr. De Luca had spoken earlier in the day with a police captain who indicated his priority was coordinating mental health services. The State provided an infusion of mental health funding two years ago.

Council Member Klein noted an individual was attempting to devise a program for mental health providers and police departments. He inquired whether the Committee had received an update on those attempts.

Chair Price reported she last received information approximately two months previously. Mental health boards were providing crisis intervention training for police officers.

Council Member Schmid added that both cities and counties were limited by funding. The key question was the role of the State and whether it could do something to help counties and cities.

# MINUTES

Mr. De Luca recalled a discussion among legislative staff to open block funding to cities, counties, and nonprofit service providers; however, counties stopped that effort. A broad coalition of supporters would be needed to open funding to more agencies.

Chair Price remarked that small and mid-sized cities struggled in a way that counties did not appreciate or support.

Mr. Hackmann reported the Legislative Program Manual would generally remain the same but be updated every two to three years. The Addendum would contain specific, detailed, and timely priorities and would be updated continually.

Chair Price requested comments and questions about the draft Legislative Program Manual.

Council Member Klein recalled that the Committee had discussed some of the information previously. The last line of the Policy Statement should not include other local government entities as they may or may not agree with the City.

Mr. Keene concurred.

Council Member Klein agreed with the first four of the General Legislative Priorities. Legislative priorities should not include Item Numbers 5 and 6 as those were methods of implementing the general underlying philosophy set forth in the first four items.

Mr. Keene viewed that as an organizational issue rather than a content issue.

Council Member Klein would delete Numbers 5 and 6. He did not understand the bullet point under Item Number 2 and suggested "ensure that legislative or constitutional reforms align with the City's values and maintain or enhance local discretion." Of the four remaining items, two were financial and two discussed local discretion. The two financial items belonged together as Items 1 and 2. The penultimate paragraph on Page 6 regarding legislative planning was not appropriate. The Council's annual Priorities by and large did not pertain to State actions. That was addressed in Present Program on Page 21.

Mr. Keene indicated the recommendation to eliminate Numbers 5 and 6 seemed to be accommodated under Legislative Priorities.

# MINUTES

Chair Price disagreed. A relationship between focus areas and legislative work suggested the document was connected and systematic. The list of items in the Addendum should indicate which were Priorities in order to provide context. It provided a context that was defensible.

Mr. Keene offered language of "where relevant the Council's annual Priorities may help inform the City's position on legislation."

Chair Price approved the language.

Council Member Klein concurred. On Page 21, he took exception to listing those four items.

Chair Price felt those items indicated the City had some relationship to what it was doing.

Council Member Klein stated they did not provide any direction.

Council Member Price indicated they were the entry point to the discussion.

Council Member Schmid agreed with Council Member Klein. The City's annual goals were not the same as legislative priorities.

Council Member Klein referred to Page 12, Guidelines for Evaluating Legislation, the last sentence of the second paragraph. Anyone could obtain a copy of the relevant code and did not need to contact the City Attorney. Page 14, Item 3, should be "agendized for a Policy and Services Committee meeting." With respect to the first paragraph under Signatures on Legislative Communication, he agreed with the Mayor signing letters; however, he did not understand the need for the remainder of the language.

Mr. Keene concurred that the remainder was not needed. He requested clarification around time constraints for submitting letters when issues aligned with Council Priorities.

Council Member Klein reported that issue was mentioned later in the Manual.

Chair Price clarified that the Council did not need to tell the City Manager how to do his job.

Council Member Klein referred to Page 16, Meetings, regarding attendance at legislative days. He found the legislative days at the National League of Cities to be almost useless and suggested Council Members not be encouraged to travel to National League of Cities meetings for that.

Mr. Hackmann asked if he proposed deleting "Legislative Days."

# MINUTES

Council Member Klein answered yes. Having contact with legislators was good, but the language should be broader such as "Council Members are encouraged to maintain relationships with State and Federal elected officials." On page 17 regarding editorials, the language should state "must have approval." In reference to page 19, Scheduled Meetings, he asked who were the "other elected representatives."

Mr. Hackmann indicated that was the procedure for City Council meetings with other elected representatives.

Mr. Keene clarified that the language was redundant in that "these meetings" referred to the other elected representatives mentioned above.

Council Member Klein interpreted the language as referring to someone beyond that.

Council Member Schmid advised that the most important and helpful revision was the scheduled semi-annual meetings.

Chair Price suggested adding "keep both the Mayor and Council Members serving on California and/or National League of Cities policy committees advised of status of relevant legislation and correspondence" to page 10, Role of the City Manager's Office. When Council Members attended those meetings, they should be informed in advance.

Council Member Klein wanted to ensure that did not add a great deal to the Staff's workload. The California and National League of Cities provided packets of information. He inquired about additional information City Staff should provide.

Chair Price stated the mandate for California and National League of Cities staff was very different from City Staff. She was not requesting hours and hours of Staff time. Where relevant, Council Members should be updated so that they were prepared for meetings. This was common and standard practice in many cities.

Council Member Schmid suggested any information provided to Council Members serving on policy committees be provided to all Council Members.

Chair Price agreed. Information could be as simple as a chart and a ten-minute conversation.

Mr. Keene understood Chair Price wanted to ensure pending legislation on which the City took a position was shared with Council Members, particularly

# MINUTES

when attending a regional meeting. There were times when the City or Staff was advocating legislative positions that Council Members might not know.

Council Member Klein could agree to the City Manager's interpretation, because it did not appear to expand Staff's workload. The City did not take positions on a number of issues; therefore, Staff did not research them.

Chair Price concurred.

Council Member Klein asked if Chair Price was requesting assistance on those topics.

Chair Price responded no. Each Council Member was not well versed on the status of legislation and the City's position on all items. She wanted to be advised of topics that made Council Members more effective as elected officials representing Palo Alto.

Council Member Klein felt that was much broader than the City Manager's interpretation. It would be an imposition to request Staff assistance with issues on which the City had no position or no interest.

Chair Price clarified that Council Members should be informed regarding the positions the City had taken in advance of meetings. The one-hour rule applied to requests for Staff assistance.

Council Member Klein suggested the one-hour rule apply to this work as well.

Chair Price wished to ensure Council Members were briefed and well prepared with appropriate information.

Mr. Keene suggested adding language to clarify that "Staff would maintain a database of active legislation and, to the extent possible, identify relevant links to any regional body." Any Council Member could review the database to locate information. Then Council Members could contact Staff for more information, at which point the one-hour rule would apply. That was different from Staff doing any survey work about possible issues, which Chair Price was not requesting.

Chair Price requested Staff also review agendas of regional bodies and flag topics or update representatives about relevant items. The goal was to ensure Council Members were ably representing the City of Palo Alto.

Council Member Schmid assumed Chair Price was talking about something such as the list of current legislation. The California League of Cities

# MINUTES

discussed only the blandest of issues and never dealt with an issue that would impact the City.

Chair Price stated her comments were related to Page 10, the Role of the City Manager's Office.

Mr. Keene offered language of "attempt to inform Council Member representatives/liaisons to other organizations with relevant legislative updates from the City's legislative agenda." He did not believe that would create new work as it was different from performing new research on topics.

Chair Price inquired whether Council Members accepted that language.

Council Members Klein and Schmid answered yes.

Chair Price requested comments on the Addendum.

Council Member Klein suggested deleting the first four.

Mr. Keene inquired whether those four would begin with San Francisquito Creek.

Council Member Klein replied yes. He asked about the source for the last one.

Nicolas Procos, Senior Resource Planner, reported the Utilities Department requested that addition. It was related to the gas utility, but also had implications for the water utility.

Council Member Klein felt it needed to be more specific.

Chair Price added that the phrase "City-owned infrastructure" covered far more than the examples Mr. Procos provided.

Mr. Procos advised that the focus was on the Utilities Department, but "infrastructure" would cover all the different departments.

Council Member Klein remarked that a commitment to safety and reliability was too general. The Addendum should tell Legislators what the City wanted done.

Mr. Procos noted gas and electric safety issues were a focus for Senator Hill; therefore, Staff felt it was appropriate to focus on that.

Chair Price inquired whether Council Member Klein was suggesting a reference to utilities.

# MINUTES

Council Member Klein wanted to send it back to Utilities Staff to suggest specific information.

Mr. Procos indicated the Utilities Department developed its own guidelines which were approved by the Utilities Advisory Commission (UAC) and the Council. Utilities Staff did not want to place utility-specific issues in the legislative forum. He would review that with Mr. Hackmann.

Mr. Hackmann could draft language as specific to Utilities as the Committee directed. If an opportunity arose for State funding to be directed towards cities to upgrade vital infrastructure, then the City should ensure the State and Federal lobbyists acted on that. He viewed it from a funding standpoint versus specific bills.

Mr. Keene did not believe the issue was the end result; it was the definitions used in the process. The Addendum should focus on specific proposals for legislation. Being vague weakened the goal of being more proactive in advancing legislation. For San Francisquito Creek improvements, Staff could explore regulatory reform and relief. Too many topics in a specific legislative Addendum would result in bill fatigue.

Chair Price advised that the Committee could direct Staff to revise the Addendum according to suggestions so that the list was more useful in working on legislative priorities.

Mr. Keene felt the Committee and the City was making good, disciplined progress to get ahead of the State legislative session.

Chair Price commented that the draft was a great improvement and more systematic than previous efforts. It would return to the Committee on November 13, 2014.

Council Member Schmid agreed with Council Member Klein's proposal to drop the first three. He found it helpful to talk about legislative actions that might impact the City. He recommended deleting flood plain from San Francisquito Creek improvements, because lobbyists had discussed changes in the flood plain that would affect current and future issues. He preferred to retain sustainability and zero waste, because the Legislature was passing laws that could have a major impact on planning for the City's future.

Council Member Klein asked if Council Member Schmid favored deleting the last one.

Council Member Schmid suggested Staff return with more specific changes.

# MINUTES

Chair Price would withdraw her suggestion regarding focus areas. "Obtain grant funding" needed more details.

Mr. Keene would review the Council's annual Priorities and discuss specific concerns with the Leadership Council to present to the Council.

Chair Price concurred.

Council Member Schmid commented that housing, homelessness, and mental health would fall under funding search.

## Future Meetings and Agendas

Chair Price announced the next meeting on October 21, 2014 would begin at 5:00 P.M. The Agenda was filled with a robust and intense series of discussions. She was unsure whether the Agenda included two new items presented in the prior two weeks.

Council Member Klein requested a discussion of the Waters of the U.S. Rule be included in the Agenda for the November meeting in order to provide a recommendation for the Council to take a position.

Richard Hackmann, Management Analyst, reported Staff was drafting a letter to submit to the Council prior to the November 14, 2014 deadline for the comment period.

Council Member Klein inquired whether the letter would include comments adopted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mr. Hackmann indicated comments of the Policy and Services Committee aligned with the spirit of the draft letter.

Chair Price clarified that the two new items were the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) Roundtable and recruitment changes.

James Keene, City Manager, noted the tentative Agenda for the remainder of the year was filled beyond capacity. Mr. Alae would provide an update of remaining items in late November.

Chair Price advised that one option was to add a meeting for the Policy and Services Committee.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 7:55 P.M.