



# **POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Special Meeting  
October 21, 2014

Chairperson Price called the meeting to order at 5:03 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

Chair Price had requested Agenda Item Number 4 be continued to a subsequent meeting due to the length of the Agenda.

Council Member Klein concurred.

Council Member Schmid preferred to reach the item on the Agenda before deciding to continue it.

Council Member Scharff did not believe a great deal of time would be involved.

Chair Price inquired about notice of the meeting.

Khashayar Alae, Senior Management Analyst, reported Staff was not present to address Agenda Item Number 4.

Council Member Scharff wanted to retain the item on the Agenda. The presence of additional Staff was not necessary. The item was noticed for the meeting.

Chair Price asked if Agenda Item Number 4 could be placed on the Agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Alae answered yes.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Klein explained that Agenda Item Number 4 would remain on the Agenda as a vote would be 2-2.

Mr. Alae would request the City Attorney attend the meeting.

Council Member Schmid suggested the Policy and Services Committee reach the item on the Agenda, determine the time, and then discuss continuing the item.

Chair Price agreed.

1. Health and Safety Funds (Stanford Development Agreement) Related to Community Partners: Avenidas and Stanford Hospitals.

Minka Van Der Zwaag, Community Services Senior Program Manager, was present to further the discussion of policies and procedures for the distribution of Health and Safety Funds. The item pertained to community health needs as identified by Avenidas, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital and Stanford Health Care. Knowledge of these needs would assist the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) in identifying and categorizing specific needs in the community.

Council Member Schmid asked if Agenda Item Numbers 1 and 2 would provide information for the Committee to discuss Agenda Item Number 3.

Council Member Klein understood that was the purpose.

Chair Price answered yes. The needs assessments and materials sent to the Committee was background information.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether Staff would provide information about and from the three community partners in order to discuss Agenda Item Number 3.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag replied yes.

Council Member Klein felt the Committee was familiar with the programs and services offered by Avenidas and Stanford Hospital.

Chair Price indicated Agenda Item Number 2 would be an update and discussion of Project Safety Net.

Council Member Schmid stated discussion of Project Safety Net would be in the context of the Stanford funds.

Chair Price noted both fell within the identified formula.

# FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Van Der Zwaag inquired whether the Committee wished her to continue with background information.

Chair Price requested she continue at a global level. The Committee received many materials in the packet and wished to provide time for community partners to speak.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag reported Avenidas highlighted health and wellness, transportation, and engagement programs as the community health needs of local seniors. Health and wellness programs focused mainly on exercise and physical activity to help older adults gain flexibility, mobility and strength. Transportation of all types continued to be a community issue. A need for door-to-door transportation for seniors arose in the Human Relations Commission's (HRC) needs assessment several years ago. Avenidas provided a wide variety of programs that engaged seniors in learning and activities. In collaboration with community partners, Stanford Hospitals conducted annual community needs assessments to identify unmet needs and services in the community. Lucile Packard Children's Hospital (Packard) focused its needs assessment on infants, children, adolescents, and pregnant women. Packard identified three priority needs of improving access to primary healthcare for children, teens and expectant mothers; providing preventative and education programs with special attention to pediatric obesity; and improving the social and emotional health of youth. Stanford Hospital's needs assessment identified four primary needs: cancer, access to healthcare, chronic disease, and unintentional injuries. From those four major needs, Stanford Hospital developed three major health initiatives as part of their multiyear strategic investment in the community. At the direction of the Committee, Staff could conduct further research or invite additional key community agencies, stakeholders or health experts to a future meeting.

Sherri Sager, Chief Government and Community Relations Officer, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital at Stanford, wanted to provide the Committee with information regarding Packard's programs in order to leverage resources and programs. The Committee and the Council would need to determine whether funds would be expended in one year or over two or three years or used to establish an endowment. The Committee could not fund programs for recently identified needs over two or three years, and then expect those programs to be sustainable. One-time funds would be best spent in support of nonprofit agencies' capital needs. Whether funds would be spent in one year or over two to three years or placed in an endowment would determine the criteria for a grant process. The Committee should discuss this funding in relation to Project Safety Net; however, the discussion should consider broader mental health issues.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Schmid advised that Stanford's definition of community extended to the entire county while the Committee's purview was the City of Palo Alto.

Ms. Sager agreed that Packard utilized a larger geographic area. Issues identified in the community needs assessment were common to every community in the state and country. The assessment identified needs concerning mental health, services for adolescents, obesity, asthma, and prenatal care. Packard prioritized three needs, because it could not tackle all of them.

Council Member Klein agreed the Committee's first task was to identify a method to expend funds. He requested Ms. Sager's advice regarding expending funds and inquired about a need within Packard's three priorities that was not being addressed.

Ms. Sager would expend money over three years to support one-time needs and would require agencies to match grant funds. In that manner, different agencies could apply for funds to support one-time needs, and the grant process would not be an excessive burden on Staff. Access to care was a primary concern. Grants could be utilized for remodeling facilities or obtaining new equipment. Grants could support schools in hosting onsite mental health counselors. The City could be involved in making communities more walkable to improve health and reduce traffic.

Council Member Scharff inquired about transportation in relation to access to care, whether individuals were dropped off at healthcare providers or attendants accompanied the individuals.

Ms. Sager advised that her experience with transportation was that individuals were dropped off and picked up. Assisted living facilities did ensure individuals went into the correct office.

Council Member Scharff noted Ms. Sager recommended matching funds be required under any program the City chose. He inquired whether she recommended the City or the nonprofit agency determine the use of funds.

Ms. Sager recommended the City solicit proposals of no more than two or three pages about an agency's need and requested amount of funds. Some proposals would request \$10,000-15,000; some would request \$100,000-\$150,000. The review process should consider the agency, the request, and whether the proposal was fungible from another source.

Council Member Scharff ask if Ms. Sager alternatively proposed the City solicit proposals for a lasting capital need that otherwise would not be met.

# FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Sager replied yes.

Council Member Scharff asked if that scenario should also require matching funds.

Ms. Sager indicated it could. Nonprofit agencies could sell matching funds to donors.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether the City should ask agencies about their capital needs.

Ms. Sager would request agencies provide timelines in terms of the amount of funds to raise and when funds would be obtained.

Council Member Scharff felt there was a difference between constructing a building and purchasing a van. He inquired whether the City should limit funding to an asset with a 30-year life or a 5-year life.

Ms. Sager reported there were needs for both types of assets. A smaller organization would need shorter-lived assets and may not have other sources for those types of things. The City should consider funding assets that other sources were not willing to fund.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag advised that agencies in Palo Alto often did not qualify for grants because of the socioeconomics of the City.

Ms. Sager agreed.

Chair Price felt the Committee was at a disadvantage in not knowing the magnitude of community needs. She assumed experts would review applications and make informed recommendations. She questioned whether the Committee should determine priority areas based on needs assessments or request applicants justify their requests. The Committee had to decide the criteria and the focus areas based on input from experts.

Ms. Sager recommended the Committee select three to five priorities and then encourage agencies to qualify within those areas. Otherwise, proposals would be scattered. In addition, the Committee could choose to subsidize attendance at recreational and sports programs offered by the City; however, not all funds should be awarded to City programs.

Andy Coe, Chief Government and Community Relations Officer, Stanford Health Care, reported Stanford Health Care, as a not-for-profit hospital, was required to invest in community benefit activities by State and Federal law. Stanford Health Care participated in community needs assessments every three years. Stanford Health Care's service area was San Mateo and Santa

# FINAL MINUTES

Clara Counties. Stanford Health Care invested approximately \$400,000 annually and coordinated other hospital programs. Community needs had remained virtually the same over the past six years. The key was matching resources and expertise with programs to make a difference. Stanford Health Care had expertise in aging adult services; therefore, it invested many resources in those programs. Because of the service area and Palo Alto's socioeconomic status, Stanford Health Care did not invest many funds in programs that directly served residents of Palo Alto. Stanford Health Care provided funds to the MayView Clinic and Peninsula Healthcare Connection and had contributed in the past to Avenidas.

Chair Price asked if Stanford Health Care was involved in the Opportunity Center.

Mr. Coe stated they were not currently involved in the Opportunity Center.

Council Member Klein inquired about three areas that Stanford Health Care was not currently funding.

Mr. Coe believed mental health issues were a primary concern.

Council Member Klein requested Mr. Coe elaborate on mental health issues.

Mr. Coe meant issues affecting young people, issues that Project Safety Net addressed. That was the larger issue throughout the country. Stanford Health Care was struggling to identify methods to improve overall mental health services and to collaborate with the County of Santa Clara (County).

Council Member Klein asked if Stanford focused on adolescents.

Mr. Coe responded no. Stanford Health Care was not an expert on mental health issues; therefore, it did not focus community investments on that particular issue. Stanford was attempting to gain knowledge in order to work with the County to provide better care for mental health patients who received health services at Stanford.

Council Member Klein requested Mr. Coe's advice regarding actions the Committee should take.

Mr. Coe was not an expert. He was offering his observations.

Council Member Klein asked if there were any service gaps not presently being funded for which Stanford Hospital had expertise.

Mr. Coe reported needs that surfaced in the assessments affected communities such as Palo Alto. He had no insight into a specific issue.

# FINAL MINUTES

Stanford Health Care matched its expertise and resources with programs to make the greatest impact.

Council Member Scharff recalled Ms. Sager's suggestion to separate needs into three parts, one of which could be needs Stanford Health Care was interested in supporting. He did not believe Mr. Coe indicated any needs in which Stanford Health Care might be interested.

Mr. Coe advised that Stanford Health Care focused on access to care, programs for seniors, and reducing health disparities particularly in the field of cancer care. Those were the areas Stanford Health Care believed were community needs.

Council Member Scharff asked if the community needs in Palo Alto were also countywide.

Mr. Coe reported data was collected from both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. He could not segregate information solely pertaining to Palo Alto.

Council Member Scharff asked if Mr. Coe could identify a community need in Palo Alto among the needs on which Stanford focused.

Mr. Coe could not parse the information.

Council Member Schmid noted Stanford Health Care provided good data regarding average scores, disparities, and prevention opportunities. Palo Alto did not resemble California, San Mateo County, or Santa Clara County numbers. He inquired about a method to determine the priority needs for Palo Alto.

Mr. Coe suggested the Committee utilize data from focus groups or consult with organizations that worked in the community.

Council Member Schmid asked if Stanford primarily utilized the expertise of County agencies.

Mr. Coe answered yes, to gather information. Both Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties hired consultants to perform research assessments.

Council Member Schmid believed cities did not have primary responsibility for providing healthcare, which was the reason for experts being located at the county level. A review of Palo Alto needs could identify different needs that did not fit the normal category of needs.

Mr. Coe indicated that could be possible. The 10 or 11 identified needs would be found in Palo Alto as well.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Schmid suggested an enrollment grant could be effective in supporting and encouraging residents to participate in existing programs. He inquired whether that could be a logical use of funds.

Mr. Coe replied yes. Stanford Health Care attempted to fund programs that provided services for people. Access to care enrollment would be a component of that.

Council Member Schmid felt greater participation in programs could provide a real benefit.

Chair Price recalled that Mr. Coe mentioned the lack of hospital capacity for emergency psychiatric hospitalization throughout the county. Those kinds of services were extraordinary expensive. Health and Safety Funds would not be an answer to that need; however, it underscored the need for collaboration and other opportunities.

Mr. Coe would be happy to act as a resource or expert for the Committee.

Amy Andonian, Avenidas President and CEO, advised that the true focus of all Avenidas' programs and services was healthy aging, access to healthcare, and social engagement. Whether funds were expended one-time only, over two or three years, or ongoing affected any proposal submitted. Funds could subsidize general operating expenses to support existing services and to ensure continuing service to existing clients and new clients. She was most attracted to the concept of funding community needs that were not addressed. A community needs assessment had not been conducted for quite some time in Palo Alto. There should be an opportunity to conduct a thorough community needs assessment before determining priorities.

Mary Hohensee, Avenidas Vice President of Development, reported Avenidas raised a large portion of its budget from the community. Aging could place some of the harshest strains on community resources if it was not addressed properly. The people who founded Avenidas wanted to help people as they aged to be in charge of their own lives. Services could not be isolated from community needs. Funding of capital needs would always be attractive to Avenidas. Avenidas had not expanded programs because of lack of space.

Council Member Klein asked if the Committee should support infrastructure projects or ongoing programs.

Ms. Andonian loved the idea of matching grants. Capital needs such as space were a primary focus for Avenidas. She assumed one-time funds could be utilized for fundraising needs and infrastructure needs.



# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Klein inquired whether other agencies serving seniors would have the same needs as Avenidas.

Ms. Andonian could not speak for other agencies. All agencies had wish lists; however, items on the lists would be different based on an organization's needs. With respect to allowing organizations to propose uses for funds, each organization should speak to its needs and how it addressed identified needs of the community. She shared her experience of identifying community needs while working at the County.

Council Member Klein suggested the City obtain the procedures the County used in that instance.

Chair Price asked if the County operated the program.

Ms. Andonian responded yes. The Board of Supervisors oversaw the program.

Council Member Klein inquired about who made the decision regarding awards.

Ms. Andonian answered the Board of Supervisors with Staff input. The County hired staff to evaluate proposals based on criteria it drafted. It was a scientific process.

Chair Price asked which department administered the program.

Ms. Andonian believed it was Family and Senior Services. The process required a great deal of time, but the outcome provided services to a diversity of ages. The County focused on case management and transportation for senior services.

Council Member Klein asked if Supervisors were involved in the process.

Ms. Andonian answered yes. Funds were awarded for general operational expenses and new programs. The County also provided some one-time funding.

Ms. Hohensee supported the use of matching grants. If an organization could not make a case for support to the community, then it could not make a case for support to the City. Matching grants could be obtained from foundations as well as the community. The Committee should engage the many foundations within the community for additional expertise and information.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Scharff was excited by Avenidas' expansion and was interested in utilizing some funds to support that. That seemed to provide a lasting benefit to the community.

Ms. Andonian reported Avenidas was raising funds to construct the building. The fundraising campaign manager and staff were discussing new programs and services for the building. One concept was to integrate the fields of technology, design, and engineering into the folds of Avenidas to identify solutions that would assist older adults. The new building would provide an age-friendly environment.

Council Member Scharff wondered whether a gym to replace the closing YMCA would fill a community need and bring more people into Avenidas. Gyms tended to become a community.

Ms. Hohensee did not want to duplicate services available elsewhere in the community. The fitness center would have special flooring, special grab bars, and instructors well-versed in senior exercise.

Ms. Andonian suggested in the future Avenidas could consider a fitness center for more active seniors.

Council Member Scharff asked if Uber services could be an alternative to purchasing a van.

Ms. Andonian reported a start-up called Lift Heroes used the Uber model to transform senior transportation. Aging 2.0 was working with Lift Heroes to provide services. Other funding sources were available for a new bus. The general consensus was to do something different and better than purchasing a bus.

Chair Price remarked that the issue was sustainability of funding and programs.

## 2. Health and Safety Funds (Stanford Development Agreement) Related to Youth Well-Being and Project Safety Net.

Carolyn Digovich, Youth Speaks Out, understood Project Safety Net (PSN) was being considered for restructuring. Youth Speaks Out originated under the Youth Collaborative and provided a safe environment for children to express themselves through the arts. Youth Speaks Out had some interventions every year.

Brenda Carrillo, Palo Alto Unified School District Student Services Coordinator and Project Safety Net Co-Chair, reported Palo Alto Unified

# FINAL MINUTES

School District (PAUSD) valued the strong partnership with the City. The collaborative efforts of community partners had assisted PAUSD to better serve children, youth, and families struggling with mental health issues and to promote youth well-being. She looked forward to enhancing partnerships with the City.

Judy Jaramillo Argumedo, Palo Alto Unified School District Education Services Coordinator, advised that PSN collaborated across agencies and began a dialog about mental health and stigma. She participated in shaping a new vision and mission for PSN to begin new endeavors. She was proud of the work PSN achieved and hoped for further collaboration between the City and PAUSD.

Susan Usman, Parent Teacher Association Council President, indicated the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) had utilized PSN programs regarding Developmental Assets and building youth resiliency and well-being in most schools. The PTA hosted many parent education events with the focus of youth mental health. PSN was powerful for youth well-being.

Rob De Geus, Community Services Assistant Director, remarked that the Palo Alto community had a long history of collaboration for youth well-being. Past programs included Safer Summer, the Youth Master Plan, and the Youth Collaborative. Because the community valued collaboration, Project Safety Net was born and achieved some success. PSN began with a plan that included 22 strategies under education, prevention, and intervention. PSN was subjected to a second Strategic Plan process that resulted in a more focused strategic plan.

Minka Van Der Zwaag, Senior Program Manager, reported the Strategic Plan process began in the spring of 2013 and concluded in the fall of 2013. The collaborative could look back at significant accomplishments, but wanted to focus on the future. Discussions considered philosophy, core strategies, and structure. Compass Point led a collaborative planning process to revise the Strategic Plan. Community meetings resulted in a Strategic Plan with four elements. A collaborative needed a shared understanding of the spirit in which it wanted to work. Strategies crossed the spectrum from Developmental Assets to creating and nurturing meaningful connections to educating and training youth and adults access to mental health services for all youth. More work was still to be done. PSN's mark of success would be having children feel they were heard, valued, and supported.

Mr. De Geus commented that the partner organizations performed the work of PSN. No single organization could perform the work of youth well-being and suicide prevention. PSN had three working committees that

# FINAL MINUTES

collaborated regarding community Engagement, community education, and mental health.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag advised that the Leadership Team was now comprised of longstanding and new participants. Over the past five years, the collaborative had learned that willing partners were necessary. PSN partners had a long history of good work in Palo Alto. Due to limited resources, partners could not do more or support greater capacity. PSN needed leadership beyond the City. Filling the position of PSN Director was difficult because of the high level of work and the lack of employment benefits. There was value to bringing the collaborative together to build relationships; however, it was difficult to find leaders for PSN committees.

Mr. De Geus felt it was important for PSN to document its work; however, PSN had not done as good a job as possible. PSN needed to document and measure effectively its work in order to maintain interest. The benefit of a collaborative was each partner working a little bit more and a little bit better.

Council Member Schmid asked if PSN instituted an annual survey.

Mr. De Geus indicated PAUSD performed several surveys. A survey of Developmental Assets was performed every five years and provided good data to guide PSN's work.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag reported PSN's next steps included embedding PSN's work in the community, bringing PSN's efforts into schools, and considering a shared leadership model. PSN was exploring the possibility of offering grants to agencies and individuals to work on suicide prevention and youth well-being. PSN was also considering the extent to which funding choices included sustainability.

Council Member Klein inquired about PSN expenditures.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag indicated PSN had spent about \$350,000 of the \$2 million the Council gave it. Over the past three years, about 48 percent of funding covered staff costs, 38-40 percent covered Track Watch, and the remainder covered program expenses

Council Member Klein inquired about funds in the present fiscal year with no Director and no Track Watch.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag clarified that Track Watch continued to be a component of PSN. In the current year, personnel costs totaled approximately \$17,000. In FY 2014 costs were approximately \$40,000. With a full-time Director, costs increased to approximately \$94,000.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Klein asked if the City provided all funds.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag responded yes.

Council Member Klein asked if Staff conducted exit interviews with the two Directors.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag replied yes.

Council Member Klein requested the Directors' comments from those interviews.

Mr. De Geus reported the key concern was the provisional nature of the hourly position with no benefits.

Council Member Klein wondered whether that reason masked deeper concerns as the Directors knew the terms of employment before being hired.

Mr. De Geus explained that one Director's husband lost his job which provided benefits for the family. Working with different organizations and personalities could be difficult.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether a search was being conducted for a new Director.

Mr. De Geus answered no. Staff felt it was not prudent to expend funds for a Director at the current time. Staff wanted to discuss options for the position with the Council and PAUSD.

Council Member Klein inquired about additional concerns the Directors may have had.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag indicated a concern was identifying new leaders and workers from partner agencies. A deep concern to make wise decisions often led to paralysis such that new initiatives stalled.

Mr. De Geus added that the Director position had to build relationships across many organizations. PSN did not have the structure and funding to attract a high caliber professional needed in the position.

Council Member Klein asked if PSN was concerned with suicide prevention, youth well-being, or both. Youth well-being seemed to be an afterthought.

Mr. De Geus reported suicide prevention and youth well-being were equal. Some participants were passionate about suicide prevention, others about youth well-being.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Klein asked why the two should be kept together.

Mr. De Geus advised that the collaborative thought it was the right thing to do. All kids were at risk in some way. Most participants subscribed to youth well-being as opposed to suicide prevention.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag remarked that the collaborative addressed a balance between the two through the Strategic Plan.

Council Member Klein inquired whether PSN received real cooperation from PAUSD.

Mr. De Geus noted PAUSD had adopted suicide prevention policies and Developmental Assets and provided activities in support of those initiatives. PAUSD provided less support for keeping the collaborative together and guiding the vision for the community. The City largely managed the collaborative effort. Staff wanted PAUSD to have a stronger role in programming, services, and financial contributions.

Council Member Klein calculated expenditures of approximately \$50,000 per year would allow funding of PSN for the next 34 years. Expending those funds more aggressively would be wiser.

Mr. De Geus reported the Strategic Plan had a compelling vision of anticipated changes. The collaborative wanted to make funding available to partners. Partner organizations were doing the real work with programs. The Committee could obtain input from partner organizations.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag was excited by the possibility of using funds to provide grants to partner organizations. She supported grants for programs rather than administrative purposes.

Council Member Klein inquired whether utilizing funds for grants would mean the end of PSN.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag believed some core aspects of the collaborative could continue with little funding. A role for the collaborative and the Leadership Team would continue. PSN committees addressed the efforts needed to bring people together to address needs in the community.

Mr. De Geus felt the lack of a collaborative would result in a different kind of proposal to expend funds. If the collaborative continued, proposals would be much richer and deeper in terms of collaboration among the partners.

# FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Van Der Zwaag suggested partner organizations could take on the work of PSN committees with the aid of grant funding. In that manner, the work of the committee could continue without City Staff leadership.

Council Member Schmid noted the City had been funding the infrastructure for the collaborative. A number of community partners had a deep interest in PSN initiatives. Staff appeared to be indicating that organizations would need new funding to support the goals of the new Strategic Plan.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag explained that Staff wanted partner agencies to consider outcomes of the new Strategic Plan that they could impact with additional funding.

Mr. De Geus added that partners helped write the new Strategic Plan. New investments would allow partners to do even better work in the community.

Council Member Schmid understood agencies were stating they could not continue existing programs with current resources.

Mr. De Geus advised that partners were not doing all they wanted to do. Partners were nonprofit agencies that constantly sought additional support in order to do more.

Council Member Schmid asked if Staff felt a larger investment and more funding was needed to help PSN achieve identified goals.

Mr. De Geus viewed the issue as community partners investing and sharing in the leadership of the collaborative. The City being the only contributor to the foundation was not a sustainable model for the long term. Larger organizations needed to participate as well.

Council Member Schmid recalled that a parent group established a program utilizing art to contribute to PSN initiatives.

Mr. De Geus indicated Youth Speaks Out could not have occurred without the collaborative process. Youth Speaks Out surrounded children with support from partners of PSN.

Chair Price felt continued work was needed in suicide prevention and youth well-being. She expressed concern around not having a PSN Director. Without that focus, it would be difficult to achieve success. In a shared governance model but with no additional support from partner agencies, PSN would remain under the auspices of the City. PSN had the foundations for a meaningful work plan. A stipend could provide benefits for a Director without committing the City to long-term benefits.

# FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Van Der Zwaag reported the City offered the prior two Directors an increase that could support healthcare and time off after a specified length of employment. Staff was searching for methods to make the Director position attractive. Since the last Director departed, the collaborative had not fully discussed alternative models for grants. The collaborative wanted to get the work done. Grants for partner agencies would be a real way to get the work done. Perhaps the City could work with a partner agency to provide salary and benefits for a Director.

Chair Price suggested the Director position could be embedded within a nonprofit partner or a nonprofit partner could provide matching funds for salary and benefits. Financial engagement of partner agencies was important to sustaining PSN efforts. The City could learn from comparable collaborative efforts to make PSN more feasible and accountable.

Council Member Scharff felt PSN was not working and was not achieving its goals under the current model. The collaborative was the valuable component of PSN; however, partners were not willing to financially support the collaborative. He would oppose PSN becoming a grant organization unless Staff provided clear reasons for that. He was unclear as to the decision the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) was being asked to make. The Staff Report did not offer concrete suggestions for Committee action.

Mr. De Geus believed the item was intended to be a Study Session and update regarding Project Safety Net. Staff was not asking the Committee to make a decision. Staff was struggling with the City's role in PSN and with ways to execute the Strategic Plan.

Council Member Schmid believed the next step was a conversation about partnerships and PSN's role.

Mr. De Geus was concerned about the path forward.

Council Member Scharff wanted options for the Committee. A grant funding model seemed separate from retaining the collaborative. The first step was to determine goals.

James Keene, City Manager, explained that the challenge was outside Staff's experience and expertise. Project Safety Net had two aspects: providing a safety net for at-risk children and holding partners together to achieve human happiness. The collaborative was an activity, not an outcome. Council Members questioned the impact \$2 million could make on such a large issue. An important question was, what would the conversation be if there was no money. The money was secondary to ensuring youth well-



# FINAL MINUTES

being. Funds could be seed money with an explicit expectation of return on investment. Staff needed basic policy direction with respect to the Committee's desires.

Council Member Klein struggled with youth well-being. Project Safety Net did not address the happy children in Palo Alto. Many organizations provided programs for children with no problems. He recalled a Children's Hospital speaker stating that 95 percent of children were born with no physical problems. Children's Hospital dealt with the remaining 5 percent.

Council Member Klein believed Project Safety Net focused on children who needed crisis intervention and was not in the youth well-being business. It would be difficult to change the expectation that the City would fund PSN. If funding of \$1.7 million earned \$85,000 a year in interest, PSN would never run out of funds because it was not spending \$85,000 a year. When he voted to award \$2 million to Project Safety Net, he expected part of the funds would support costs for Staff. Staff should provide information regarding Project Safety Net remaining as a collaborative or hiring a Director and increasing programs.

Council Member Schmid felt Project Safety Net should focus on youth well-being rather than suicide prevention. The success of PSN resulted from collaboration. Many community organizations were devoted to children's mental health issues. The City's role was to build a collaborative from those organizations. The City and PAUSD were responsible for leading the collaborative; however, the City should determine the extent of its partnership with PAUSD with respect to funding and structure.

Chair Price felt strongly about the characterization of mental health, mental illness, wellness, suicide prevention, and suicide ideation. The issue was not simply happy versus unhappy children. An individual's wellness covered a spectrum of issues. Statements made by the Committee were an oversimplification of the issues.

Council Member Scharff agreed mental health issues were complex. He wanted the City to spend funds wisely. Funds could support programs other than the collaborative.

Chair Price asked who would organize efforts if there was no collaborative.

Council Member Scharff clarified that without a Director, an approach other than a collaborative could be instituted.

Mr. De Geus would review that concept.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Scharff wanted Staff to provide and analyze options. He did not believe PSN should be a funding agency. Annual interest of \$100,000 combined with funds from collaborative partners could support a collaborative for the next 20 years. He supported the use of matching grants.

Mr. De Geus agreed that both youth well-being and suicide prevention were important. The issue was the City's role as a convening agency that brought people together around social issues. Staff was seeking commitments from partner organizations.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag advised that Staff was aware of their role in the collaborative and the initiatives they wanted to promote. However, they wanted to be responsible stewards of funds. Staff wanted Committee feedback.

Chair Price inquired about next steps for Staff returning to the Committee.

Mr. De Geus needed to meet with the City Manager to discuss the Committee's feedback, meet with PAUSD, and return with specific options for proceeding.

Mr. Keene did not believe Staff could provide options without direction from the Committee regarding mission and guiding principles.

Council Member Klein felt (inaudible) was a different category. Before the Committee could disburse the \$2 million, it needed to know (inaudible).

Mr. Keene suggested a larger discussion could determine the amount of money provided to Project Safety Net or youth well-being.

Council Member Klein wanted Staff to suggest a model. He did not believe establishing principles for health and welfare and adding another \$1 million would help.

Chair Price asked if Council Member Klein was suggesting preliminary efforts be made on the guiding principles, mission, and objectives for use of Stanford University Medical Center Development Agreement funds simultaneous with options for Project Safety Net.

Council Member Klein answered yes.

Chair Price believed deferring a discussion of guiding principles, mission, and objectives would prevent resources in the fund from being utilized to the best advantage. Staff capacity would determine how quickly they returned

# FINAL MINUTES

with both or either item. She asked the City Manager if he had sufficient information to begin drafting guiding principles, mission, and objectives.

Mr. Keene suggested the Committee determine whether it had provided sufficient guidance or boundaries for Staff. If not, then Staff could make a first attempt at drafting those items.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether they were discussing a model for Project Safety Net.

Mr. Keene replied no.

Chair Price asked if the Committee needed to address Agenda Item Number 3 in more detail.

Mr. Keene responded yes. Some of the thinking about Project Safety Net could carry over to the Health and Safety Funds. A subcommittee could provide additional guidance to Staff.

Council Member Klein was comfortable with creating a subcommittee or with drafting general guidelines for Health and Safety Funds. The Council was not interested in establishing an endowment for other Stanford Development Agreement Funds, but this could be different.

Chair Price suggested the Committee discuss Agenda Item Number 3. A subcommittee could be created in the future if needed.

Council Member Schmid asked if Staff had sufficient information to proceed with Agenda Item Number 2.

Mr. De Geus was not sure Staff had sufficient information; however, Staff would make an attempt.

3. Health and Safety Funds (Stanford Development Agreement) Related to Guiding Principles, Mission and Objectives; Determine the Pace of Fund Disbursement; and Review Ways to Preserve or Extend the Funds Depending on Option Chosen.

Council Member Schmid understood from the earlier discussion that funds should be expended as one-time only funds. Programs should focus on the City's needs that were outside the purview of many organizations. Perhaps the first area could be access to care. A second area could be issues that were within the purview of the City such as homelessness. He was interested in the concept of designing a city that offered services that the elderly needed. Emergency preparedness was another option.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Scharff supported matching grants for one-time only funds. Outcomes should provide impact and meaning and be measurable. He concurred with focusing on issues within Palo Alto. Grants should demonstrate a preference for programs supporting the elderly. He hoped proposals would be innovative.

Chair Price felt Staff could draw on guiding principles promulgated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and on the Healthy Cities initiative. Some funding should support special projects that did not require ongoing operating funds. The key to success would be leveraging funds through creative recommendations from partners. Useful information could be obtained from foundations in the community as well as the County of Santa Clara (County).

Council Member Klein was intrigued by the County's process for awarding one-time funds. Reviewing proposals would be time consuming.

Chair Price inquired whether Council Member Klein was suggesting Staff utilize elements of the County's process.

Council Member Klein responded yes.

Council Member Schmid believed the Committee should identify three or four areas to focus proposals.

Council Member Scharff concurred.

Chair Price concurred.

Council Member Schmid suggested each Committee Member propose one or two areas.

Council Member Klein recalled Council Member Scharff suggested seniors.

Council Member Schmid proposed seniors, homeless, and access to care.

Council Member Scharff would not support homeless as an area.

Chair Price proposed broadening the area of seniors. Mental health issues affected the whole range of the community. The Committee could propose several areas and then narrow those to three or four areas.

Council Member Scharff wanted to focus on the programs of Stanford Health Care, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, and Avenidas.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Klein did not agree. He wanted new nonprofit agencies to apply for grants.

Chair Price concurred with extending the scope beyond the three partners. She asked if Staff had sufficient information.

James Keene, City Manager, replied yes.

4. Discussion Regarding Possible Procedure to Vote to go Into Closed Session.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Chair Price to continue Agenda Item Number 4.

Council Member Schmid felt the question was the amount of time needed to discuss the item.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to hear Agenda Item Number 4.

Council Member Scharff advised that the question was whether to have a Motion to move into Closed Session. That would not require a great deal of discussion.

Council Member Klein asked if Council Member Scharff was proposing the San Francisco process.

Council Member Scharff replied no. The Council should vote to move into Closed Session rather than simply holding a Closed Session. Council Members should think about holding a Closed Session.

Chair Price asked if there would be any criteria or guidance for holding a Closed Session.

Council Member Scharff noted any discussion of whether to hold a Closed Session would be part of a public meeting.

James Keene, City Manager, understood the Motion would not change the definition of a Closed Session or the reasons for holding a Closed Session. The current practice was to notice a Closed Session, and at the appointed time the Council moved to the Closed Session. Under the Motion, Staff would agendize a Council vote to move into a recommended Closed Session. The public would have an opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of holding a Closed Session. The City Attorney would advise the Council as to whether State law allowed the Council to hold a Closed Session.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Scharff understood from the City Attorney that the Council had a choice whether to hold a Closed Session for almost all topics. Certain matters were required to be discussed in Closed Session. The better process would be a Council vote to retire to a Closed Session.

Chair Price inquired whether Council Members would vote without any input from Staff regarding their recommendation for a Closed or Open Session.

Council Member Scharff advised that a Council Member could move not to hold a Closed Session, at which point a Council Member could inquire about Staff's reasons for a Closed Session.

Mr. Keene reported the discussion would focus on holding an open meeting beyond the standard of the Brown Act. Some situations could compromise Staff's ability to explain the need for a Closed Session. In that situation, the City Attorney could provide the Council with a confidential memorandum, but that might occur after the fact.

Council Member Scharff suggested Staff simply state that Staff's reasons were confidential.

Council Member Schmid recalled two instances in which the Council questioned holding a Closed Session. In circumstances similar to those two instances, a brief discussion of the issues would be helpful.

Council Member Klein recalled moving an Open Session regarding interviews of finalists for the City Manager position in 2008.

Council Member Schmid felt a formal process to raise concerns would be beneficial.

Council Member Klein felt raising the issue of Closed Sessions encouraged future Council Members to vote against a Closed Session.

Council Member Schmid noted five votes in support of an Open Session were needed.

Council Member Klein believed Council Members would not support a Closed Session even though they knew a Closed Session was appropriate, because their vote would generate publicity.

Council Member Schmid was concerned that a vote and discussion would further lengthen Council meetings.

Council Member Klein would not support the Motion because the process was already in place.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Schmid inquired whether a Council Member could call for a vote prior to every Closed Session.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported that was permissible.

Council Member Scharff noted some Council Members did not attend the proceedings in Chambers prior to retiring to a Closed Session.

Council Member Klein believed a Motion could be offered at the beginning of a meeting when all Council Members were present.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to recommend the City Council vote to go into Closed Session before going into Closed Session.

Council Member Schmid stated a vote was permissible; however, the Motion provided an official process.

Council Member Scharff added that a vote would increase transparency. This process would signal the community that a discussion could occur.

Council Member Schmid asked if a topic could be agendized as a Closed Session and an Open Session.

Ms. Stump responded yes. In order to hear an item in Open Session, the item had to be agendized as an Open Session.

Mr. Keene clarified that a topic had to be agendized as an Open Session to be heard at the same meeting.

Ms. Stump indicated the topic could be continued to a future meeting. A topic could be agendized as both a Closed and an Open Session if there was some question as to the Council's wishes. Although not legally required, a note on the Agenda indicating one or both of those sessions might not occur would be good.

Council Member Schmid believed the statement should clearly indicate a Closed Session or an Open Session was possible.

Mr. Keene explained that any discussion held in Closed Session required by law would be effectuated subsequently through a public discussion and action by the Council. The public should understand that the Council, in a Closed Session, was giving direction to Staff who would return to the Council for action in a public forum.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Klein did not believe there was a problem that warranted this action. A solution already existed.

Chair Price concurred with Council Member Klein.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED:** 2-2 Klein, Price no

5. Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of September 30, 2014.

Council Member Klein inquired about the amount of time needed to discuss Agenda Item Number 5.

Chair Price felt the item should be heard.

Council Member Scharff indicated some time would be required to discuss the future status of policy.

Harriet Richardson, City Auditor, reported the Franchise Fee Audit contained three objectives; two being performed by the City Auditor's Office and one by a consultant. Staff had almost completed their work on the two objectives. Information regarding the consultant's objective would be presented at a later time. The Utility Meter Audit was close to completion. Field work for the audit of Parking Funds was approximately 75 percent complete. With respect to the National Citizens Survey, the correct number of respondents was 796. The response rate was 27 percent, 2 percent lower than the previous year; however, 3,000 surveys rather than 1,200 were mailed to residents. Marketing efforts did not increase the rate of participation. The Sales and Use Tax Audit recovered \$31,699. The City received two hotline complaints during the quarter, and Staff closed both as unsubstantiated. In the future, Departments would report directly to the Policy and Services Committee regarding the status of responses to audit recommendations. Within the quarterly report, she would provide a summary of overall activity during the quarter.

Council Member Schmid suggested Audits of Franchise Fees and Utility Meters would not provide the greatest payback.

Ms. Richardson indicated the Utility Meter Audit resulted from issues identified during the Inventory Management Audit.

Council Member Schmid noted the numbers were higher for the National Citizens Survey. He requested a categorization of hotline complaints.

Ms. Richardson advised that most complaints pertained to employees' use of time. In most instances, there was no evidence to support complaints.



# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Schmid was interested in whether complaints concerned personnel or sexual orientation.

Ms. Richardson remarked that most complaints were related to personnel.

**MOTION:** Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to recommend the City Council accept the Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of September 30, 2014.

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-0

## Future Meetings and Agendas

Chair Price wished to review the status of Agenda Items.

Council Member Scharff did not find the issue of Council Minutes on the list of Agenda Items.

Khashayar Alae, Senior Management Analyst, would add it to the list.

Council Member Scharff felt the item would not require a long discussion.

Council Member Schmid noted three Council Boards and Commissions utilized verbatim Minutes. That should return as soon as possible.

Mr. Alae would request a report from the City Clerk's Office. The Agenda for November 13, 2014 contained five items.

Council Member Scharff inquired about amendments to the Fire Code.

Chair Price inquired about the status of the amendment of the Municipal Percent for Art Policy. She had requested a potential date for a second meeting in December if necessary.

David Carnahan, Deputy City Clerk, reported a date of December 3, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Alae reported the Municipal Percent for Art Policy could return in either November or December.

Council Member Scharff preferred to hear the item in December as November's Agenda was full.

Council Member Klein reported online companies such as Airbnb.com could be violating the City's Zoning Code.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Scharff recalled the Planning Director indicated she could not provide information until April 2015.

Council Member Klein could not believe the issue would require that much time.

Chair Price requested Staff place the item on the December 2014 Agenda.

Mr. Alaeë inquired if that issue was the same as implications of online travel companies.

Council Member Klein clarified that the Transient Occupancy Tax portion of the item had been taken care of. The question was whether residents were operating a hotel in a neighborhood zoned R-1.

Mr. Alaeë would consult with Staff.

Chair Price indicated the issues of the Airport and recruitment were not primary concerns.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 8:42 P.M.