



Policy and Services Committee MINUTES

Regular Meeting
Tuesday, February 10, 2015

Chairperson Burt called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. in the Council Chambers, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Berman, Burt (Chair) DuBois, Wolbach

Absent:

Oral Communications

None.

Agenda Items

1. Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of December 31, 2014.

Harriet Richardson, City Auditor, presented the quarterly report for the second quarter of Fiscal Year 2015. There were three audits close to completion; the Franchise Fee Audit, the audit of Utility Meters Procurement Inventory and Retirement, and the Parking Funds Audit. The Franchise Fee Audit and the audit of Utility Meters Procurement Inventory and Retirement have been sent out for initial review where edits and updates were accepted. Once the information was returned they would be sent out for final review and comments. Staff was anticipating returning to the Policy & Services Committee (Committee) with those audits by March, April at the latest. The Parking Funds Audit was reviewing the parking in lieu fees for University Avenue, California Avenue and residential parking permit funds. The Parking Funds Audit, as of December 2014 was 75 percent complete. Staff was anticipating an April return date for Committee review. Staff was considering issuing two reports for the Franchise Fee Audit because the work was split into two areas. Staff performed some of the audit and an outside consultant performed other areas of the audit. Staff released the results of the National Citizens Survey on January 26, 2015. The results would be presented to Council with the Annual Performance Report. In 2014, Staff was requested to streamline the annual reporting process for the Services Efforts and Accomplishments Report (SEA).

MINUTES

One change will be moving the data tables to the end of the entire report by department. There would be themes throughout the report to provide more of a Citywide picture on performance such as stewardship and community services, financial, environment and sustainability. The three themes would be community, stewardship and public service. The Sales and Use Tax allocation reviews were performed by Staff and an outside consultant. By the end of the second quarter the City had received \$3,000 in refunded misallocated Sales and Use Tax revenues. The consultant prepared quarterly reports on sales tax updates which provided an economic view of the happenings of the City. The Auditor's Office administered the Fraud, Waste and Abuse Hotline. There was little activity in recent months and no complaints were logged during the last quarter.

Council Member DuBois confirmed the National Citizens Survey would not be released to Council until May 2015.

Ms. Richardson stated that was correct. The results were published although generally there was a Study Session regarding the results and the annual report because they were both based on performance types of issues.

Council Member DuBois asked when the data was collected.

Ms. Richardson stated with the National Citizens Survey, the data was collected during the fall. The National Research Center conducted the survey for the City; they compiled the data and produced the report.

Council Member DuBois asked if Staff was going to alter the report with customized fields for the 2014 report.

Ms. Richardson stated no, the National Research Center completed the report. Staff compiled a summary of the information because the full report was lengthy. The summary was pulling the relevant issues to the forefront in an executive summary.

Council Member DuBois was under the impression Council had asked for more data so they could decipher it themselves.

Ms. Richardson explained Staff had the raw data and using a new software program; Tableau, they were able to interact with the data.

Council Member Berman asked about the external quality control review (Peer Review). He recalled the City had fallen behind on it, although best practices it should occur every few years.

MINUTES

He believed upon Ms. Richardson's employment it was a focus of hers. He asked for information on how and if the Peer Review was helpful to Staff.

Ms. Richardson stated the Auditor's Office had passed the Peer Review. She wanted to express the City had not fallen behind on having the Peer Review performed, but had fallen behind on the reciprocity requirement and updating the office policy and procedures. Staff performed two Peer Reviews in 2014 which caught the City up to date on their requirements.

Council Member Berman asked if it was helpful to have outside auditors' review the department.

Ms. Richardson stated the Peer Reviews were conducted through the Association of Local Government of Auditors. They have training programs for auditor's in various jurisdictions throughout the country and those auditors were assigned different areas to complete a Peer Review. Since it was a reciprocal process Palo Alto did not pay for the service but they did cover the travel costs. The benefit to Staff was receiving different ways in which to complete processes for more efficiency.

Chair Burt asked if the end dates scheduled were current.

Ms. Richardson stated the Franchise Fee Audit may move out 30 days. She was working with the City Attorney's Office for clarification. She clarified once completed it would only be part one of the two reports. She was confident the Utility Meter Audit would remain in March. The Parking Fund Audit remained good for April.

MOTION: Council Member Berman moved, seconded by Council Member DuBois that the Policy & Services Committee recommend the City Council accept the Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of December 31, 2014.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

2. Discussion and Direction to City Manager Regarding Air Traffic Noise Impacts on Palo Alto Citizens.

Khashayar Alaei, Senior Management Analyst, stated on October 6, 2014 Council referred the topic of air traffic noise impacts to the Policy & Services Committee (Committee). Staff had been working with citizens to conduct a joint presentation.

Staff recommended the Committee refer the topic to the City Council to direct the City Manager to continue to work with residents, to utilize the

MINUTES

City's federal legislative consultants and to work with neighboring cities, counties and other governmental organizations on a regional approach in advocacy to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Jim Harriot, Sky Posse, asked the Committee to take up the issue and consider funding a study at a cost of approximately \$30,000 which would be shared amongst other communities. He felt the matter was one of urgency. The FAA needed a clear and unified voice. The aircraft noise was affecting the health, livability, sleep and productivity of the community. There was a way to repair the issue. The work the FAA and government agencies do would be better performed if there was a unified, clear voice from the community. When planes get congested they tend to remain overhead for longer periods of time causing a louder and longer noise effect.

Lee Christel, Sky Posse, spoke to the data generated on traffic volume. He shared the traffic volume data by year from 2001 to 2013, calculated in the month of September. There was a total volume of growth of six percent; although, a 350 percent increase over the past six years for Palo Alto alone. In 2001 there was an agreement signed by Anna Eshoo and Gary Fazzino that the flight pattern be above 5,000 feet. At present there were a fair number of flights well below that threshold. On November 13, 2014 the altitude data was collected in a four-hour window. The noise impact varied by type of plane and altitude. He said, if 41 percent of the flights could fly above 5,500 feet in altitude why could the remaining numbers not comply. The San Francisco International (SFO) airport had a complaint system in place and although it was used by a great number of citizens, as long as the air traffic controllers were within the FAA regulations the complaints were not validated. The goal would be for the air traffic control system, NexGen, to disburse the flight patterns equitably. Congress created a Quiet Sky's Caucus of which Congresswoman Eshoo was a member.

Mr. Harriot stated there were professionals in the FAA realm who were looking toward cities to express the standard of livability. The suggestion for Palo Alto was to reroute the pattern over the Bay, thereby alleviating the noise volume over citizenry. There were four lower flying aircraft patterns that crossed over Palo Alto.

Mr. Christel showed a list of items that could be done by level; federal advocacy, regional actions, and local action. The request at the federal level was to reassess the environmental impacts and reinstitute higher flying levels above Peninsula areas. They felt they did not receive fair and accurate route change information and would be requesting transparency with future changes. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had an Office of Noise Abatement that had not been funded and they were requesting Palo Alto

MINUTES

push for continued funding. On the regional level there could be outreach to the air traffic controllers to determine the power the office held and what were the possibilities of change. They suggested joining or creating a regional commission to address the issues. They recommended hiring a consultant to draft a re-route of the air traffic alternative and present it to the FAA. On the local level they wished for it to be declared that airport noise was a viable concern. The Quiet Sky's Caucus was to have noise monitors but none had been installed. As for the Palo Alto Airport itself, they wanted to be certain the citizens were aware of the growth and that best practices were used for noise abatement.

Mr. Harriot summarized the main issue was a large volume and a continued increase in volume of low-level aircraft flying over Palo Alto. There needed to be detailed information of the standard of livability and health brought to the attention of the FAA so they understood what was occurring. He was proposing the Committee take action to approve the funding for a study that would include data and data analysis to understand what was currently happening and what alternatives existed. They believed the study would be in the range of \$30,000 which would be shared by neighboring cities, but that Palo Alto should be the lead agency.

Chair Burt asked Staff if it was their recommendation that the Committee continue to hear from other members of the public.

Mr. Alae stated yes.

Council Member DuBois asked if it was possible to move the Menlo Initial Approach Fix (IAF) point.

Mr. Harriot stated the IAF was an imaginary point in the sky. A different way point could be used.

Council Member DuBois clarified there was no actual beacon in the location.

Mr. Harriot stated that was correct. The positive note would be because of that, it was possible to relocate the GPS point in the sky.

Council Member DuBois asked if Oakland Airport approaches were was routed over Palo Alto.

Mr. Harriot stated it was rare; outside of the San Francisco Airport the San Jose Airport impacted the City.

MINUTES

Council Member DuBois asked what other cities had done to find and accomplish a solution to similar problems.

Mr. Harriot acknowledged the John Wayne Airport resolved the noise issue although he was unaware of the method they used. He noted the FAA was accessible.

Council Member Berman asked whether the FAA had ever accepted an outside flight plan from outside entities.

Stewart Carl, Sky Posse, clarified the FAA had accepted tailored arrivals or approaches from airlines. The airlines frequently suggest routes which were accepted by the FAA.

Mr. Harriot stated there were companies such as Navaris that designed routes for airports.

James Keene, City Manager, asked if there was any evidence that could be looked at in other jurisdictions who had presented data related to an alternative flight path that had actually been accepted and implemented by the FAA.

Council Member Berman agreed that knowledge would be appreciated.

Marc Landesman, Sky Posse, stated NexGen has unprecedented technology which was creating radical changes all over the country. The FAA had specifically responded to the Phoenix Airport situation and had made specific adjustments to correct noise issues.

Mr. Keene stated in the case of the City of Phoenix, the city ran the Phoenix Airport.

Jennifer Landesman, Sky Posse, noted the FAA was a federal organization that was willing to hear from cities and work with them. The current paths being utilized were flying over schools and it was not a matter of direct noise but also side noise from the aircraft that caused a louder disturbance.

Council Member Berman stated Mr. Harriot mentioned other communities had expressed an interest in engaging in the process of change. He asked which communities.

Ms. Landesman stated East Palo Alto and Menlo Park had expressed concern over the noise and were interest in a change. She noted Atherton and Woodside could be approached as well as a benefit to them.

MINUTES

Council Member Wolbach noted one of the potential accesses was to move the flight path but that appeared to pass our issues to another community. Moving the flight path over the Bay was a lesser of two evils although he asked whether there was an economic cost that may be faced in moving the IAF or to the airlines for moving the route.

Mr. Harriot stated it may be possible that in changing the routes the path would shorten for some and lengthen for others. The cost to the aircraft in fuel was \$4.00 per second to be in the air. The requested study would ask and answer that question.

Chair Burt noted the presentation attested the routes were set in March of 2015. He asked if the change being requested was prior to the setting.

Ms. Landesman stated the FAA was being asked to consider the people on the ground. The NexGen system had a great deal of benefit and was more than likely going to happen. The question was when the FAA and NexGen were reviewing what was working and what was not; the group wished for their concerns to be considered.

Mr. Landesman stated NexGen was a work in progress and it was going to last through 2020 so there was an outside consultant firm, Mitra, which outlined the various obstacles faced by the FAA as NexGen was implemented. NexGen's technology saved airlines billions of dollars throughout the flight world.

Chair Burt asked if Palo Alto was seeking to have the routes changed prior to their finalization in March or was there a hope to have them changed after.

Ms. Landesman stated there was an implementation being completed on March 5, 2015 which was a gradual implementation process. The goal of the FAA was to increase the capacity at the airports. She did not believe there could be changes made to the impending implementation on March 5, 2015.

Mr. Harriot stated the study, if approved, would not be completed by March 5th. He believed once the study was completed the possibility of an adjustment could be made.

Chair Burt asked for clarification that one route would be finalized in March.

Bert Ganoung, San Francisco Airport, stated the route being referred to was an overlay for arrivals coming from the south. The procedures for

MINUTES

implementation were approved last summer and it was determined to complete the rollout in stages so as to avoid a mass change at one time.

Chair Burt asked if there would be a succession of rollouts for various routes.

Mr. Ganoung noted the March 5 rollout was the third of three rollouts.

Chair Burt asked what the understanding was of the ability to modify a route subsequently.

Mr. Ganoung stated the routes had been finalized and were to be released March 5, 2015. That was not the finalization, but the release date of what was finalized in the summer of 2014.

Chair Burt asked if there was a potential to subsequently modify a finalized and released route change.

Mr. Ganoung stated he had no knowledge of the ability; that would be an FAA decision.

Mr. Keene announced there was evidence of other localities in the country who were able to effectuate or impact a change on the FAA in a similar situation.

Mr. Ganoung was aware of other airports and localities that had made modifications to the metroplex procedures; Denver and Dallas to mention a couple. Those modifications were made prior to the finalization of the route.

Chair Burt asked how far out the changes were made.

Mr. Ganoung stated the requested changes were more than 20 miles out. The current requested change was to the direct overlay and he did not anticipate an FAA allowed change.

Chair Burt asked the role San Francisco Airport (SFO) had in the selection of the routes to date.

Mr. Ganoung stated none.

Mr. Keene had heard two issues; 1) could the flights be higher, and 2) could the flights travel across the Bay. He asked if there was knowledge as to why those requests had been not made in general or during the planning process. He asked why SFO had not suggested those as preferred alternatives given the impact on surrounding communities to the airport.

MINUTES

Mr. Ganoung stated there was a 3D glide slope used in the approach on the Instrument Landing System (ILS). When the flights come off of Menlo and join the line, they are at approximately 4,000 feet. The FAA explained there was a 1,000 foot difference between Menlo and the final approach. The equipment could not run an Instrument Weather Procedure with a difference in distance.

Mr. Keene asked if the conclusion was that the requests being made would not be amenable with the FAA.

Mr. Ganoung stated it would take considerable convincing.

Juan Alonso, Sky Posse, noted albeit difficult to make changes once an FAA procedure had been made it has been done in the past. There were other approaches to having the FAA listen more closely to a community such as in redesigning the air space in Long Island and New York. He mentioned the larger the voice heard as one the greater opportunity for the FAA to hear.

Chair Burt mentioned approximately a year ago the matter was first brought to Council's attention but the issue before the Committee was different. He asked for clarification on which of the routes had been finalized at the time and how much worse it might get for the present and future.

Mr. Carl acknowledged the matter was complex and last year when he first presented the issue to the Council he did not have a full understanding. There were several different issues that were in an overlay; 1) the flights dropped from 5,000 feet to 4,000, 2) there was a banning of the Visual Flight Rules (VFR) which created a ban on the noise abatement routes, and 3) the rollout of NexGen which began in January 2013.

Chair Burt acknowledged there was a series of impacts that affected the City in different ways. He asked if there was a sense of how impactful the San Jose Airport (SJC) lower flights were.

Mr. Carl stated the Bay Area had prevailing weather which caused a reverse flow landing pattern. That caused the SJC flights to fly low and hold over Palo Alto air space.

Chair Burt asked when the louder plane noises were heard but less frequently, they were more than likely SJC planes.

Mr. Carl stated yes.

MINUTES

Chair Burt asked if there would be funding available for the study, if the Committee was to recommend the Council move forward with it. Staff confirmed the cost of \$30,000.

Mr. Keene stated his understanding was to move forward with the proposal in conjunction with neighboring cities. He shared his concern with the line of questions; changing the routes over the Bay seemed to be non-threatening although other options may cause strife for other communities. He noted there were letters from influential parties that had yielded no effect.

Chair Burt wanted to frame the study into two segments; 1) was the City willing to commit to the full study costs of up to \$30,000, and 2) a political discussion on whether or how to gain a stronger voice by having a unified voice through being representative of multiple cities.

Mr. Keene agreed and mentioned being able to fund the \$30,000 was the least of the issues. The outreach to other communities would be to gauge the breadth of support more so than a request for funding support. The goal would be to tailor the efforts in ways that would mimic areas that had achieved success with similar situations. He wanted to verify whether there were specific people in Congress and the FAA that Staff should contact.

Chair Burt noted that was the other side he was referring to with the advocacy points he requested Staff pursue. Did the Committee wish to recommend to the Council, Palo Alto would pay up to the full amount for the study.

Council Member DuBois asked who was financially responsible for the installation of the noise monitors mentioned in the 2001 initiatives which were never installed.

Mr. Keene was uncertain whether Staff could answer that question or if it needed to be a member of the Sky Posse.

Council Member DuBois believed the measurement of noise could be as beneficial to proving the disturbance point as paying a consultant. The cities that had been successful had use of noise monitors.

Ms. Landesman clarified the Sky Posse has requested raw noise data for the past 10 years which was available through the FAA. The data was necessary to inform the recommended study.

Council Member DuBois asked where the noise data was from and was it centered over Palo Alto.

MINUTES

Mr. Landesman stated the noise data was needed to determine the type of noise and whether it was a problem.

Council Member DuBois was referring to having the proper data to present to the FAA.

Mr. Carl stated his understanding was SFO was scheduled to fund the noise monitors. They had over 29 noise monitors sprinkled throughout the Peninsula. It was determined with the economic downturn in 2000 there was no need to install a noise monitor in the Menlo IAF.

Mr. Harriot noted the ANons data, the AN stood for Airport Noise, but the data contained the radar traces of every last aircraft that had flown over Palo Alto every 4.7 seconds. With the ANons data there was definitive proof of what had historically flown over Palo Alto.

Chair Burt asked if the Sky Posse had requested the data but not yet received it.

Mr. Harriot stated that was correct.

Chair Burt asked when the request for data was made.

Ms. Landesman stated last week.

Chair Burt asked if the City had joined the request or had made a separate request.

Mr. Alae stated no.

Mr. Keene asked if Staff was being requested to make a request.

Ms. Landesman stated no, the Sky Posse was at SFO where they were able to view the data, see how it worked and how to request a copy. She asked if City sponsorship was necessary and was informed no.

Chair Burt asked if it was her understanding whether or not it would be beneficial for the City to co-sponsor the request for data.

Ms. Landesman stated yes, it was not necessary but would assist in the expedition of the process.

MINUTES

John Slike, Sky Posse, noted the FAA was up for reauthorization in Congress in 2015. The directive of the FAA was safety and efficiency while the safety of the groundlings was not part of their mission statement. Noise was registered in a process called Day/Night average (DNL) and the FAA's objectionable noise level was above 65 decibels. If you lived in an objectionable level area the airport was obligated to provide noise mitigation. The noise effecting Palo Alto did not meet the qualification.

Chair Burt mentioned the Staff Report referred to the City making efforts to become full members of the Community Round Table but the basis was not clear why they determined Palo Alto would be a non-voting member. He asked the importance for Palo Alto to be active in the Community Round Table.

Mr. Keene was uncertain if their participation would make a significant difference in the current challenge.

Andrew Swanson, Palo Alto Airport Manager, understood there had been three attempts over the years since 1998 to become a seated voting member. The Community Round Table was made up of San Mateo County cities which Palo Alto was not in the jurisdiction.

Chair Burt asked if there was a rational for not allowing Palo Alto and how important would it be to be an active member on the Round Table.

Mr. Swanson stated in order for Palo Alto to become a member, the Community Round Table would need to return to each city to request authorization to change the borders and the Ordinances would need to be changed; the process was quite complex. Whether there was a seated voting member from Palo Alto or not, being actively involved with the group could only benefit the City.

Chair Burt stated it was unclear what influence the Round Table had over the issues at hand.

Mr. Swanson stated collectively, as a group it was clear there were different issues from north and south.

Mr. Keene asked what evidence Staff had that members within the Round Table were able to identify a significant problem and had been able to effect a meaningful policy change.

MINUTES

Mr. Swanson stated nothing to the magnitude of the noise issue the City was experiencing. The closest matter would have been the 2001 issue with the Anna Eshoo letter which was worked out.

Mr. Keene stated the initial goal of pursuing participation was because that was the only existing forum. He understood it was a county boundary order and Palo Alto was out of the boundary.

Chair Burt stated the annual assignments form did not have the Community Round Table as a selection therefore no one was appointed as a non-voting member in 2015.

Council Member Berman asked if the votes or results of votes to the Community Round Table were public.

Mr. Swanson stated yes, the meeting was a public forum.

Council Member Berman asked for Staff to return with results from the vote on Palo Alto becoming a seated member.

Mr. Swanson stated he would retrieve the results and notify the Committee.

Jim Lions, a seated member of the Community Round Table, explained the reason to not include Palo Alto was because the Charter for which the Round Table was based only included the San Francisco Airport and the cities within San Mateo County. In order to add Palo Alto the Charter would need to be changed.

Chair Burt posed to the Committee; whether the Committee would support recommending to the Council that Palo Alto fund up to the \$30,000 anticipated for the Technical Study; if neighboring cities elected not to participate financially Palo Alto would cover the entire cost.

Mr. Keene suggested any recommendation be dependent upon receiving more specific information on the request, the expected outcome from the study and how that could be effectively used with the FAA. He felt they needed the countervailing data because the FAA relied on that type of information.

Chair Burt agreed. He believed \$30,000 appeared low for a meaningful study. He hoped the study provided the necessary level of information.

MINUTES

Council Member DuBois believed the study was worth moving forward although the issue may be concentrated and there may not be much external support.

Ms. Landesman considered Palo Alto as stateless; the City had been rejected three times by the Round Table and therefore did not have representation. She advised against making the study contingent upon how the issue might turn out. She believed it was an important diagnostic for Palo Alto to have.

Chair Burt stated the intent of the City Manager was to complete a certain level of scrutiny prior to committing City Funds. It seemed as though the study needed to move forward. He posed adding a change to the proposed first action; contingent upon Staff review of the value of the study and their concurrence it was a fruitful expenditure.

Council Member Wolbach asked if the verbiage was a proposed Motion or a discussion.

Chair Burt felt it would be more efficient to break out the different aspects into individual Motions for a clearer understanding.

Council Member Berman supported Staff performing further analysis to determine the scope of the study and returning to Council with a concrete estimate of the cost. He was concerned if other communities assisted with the funding of the study they were going to anticipate input thereby changing the focus from Palo Alto and possibly increasing the costs.

Council Member DuBois supported the study.

MOTION: Chair Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Berman that the Policy & Services Committee recommend to the City Council that the City fund the Technical Study in an amount up to the estimated \$30,000, and that would be contingent upon Staff's review of the cost and value of the study.

Council Member Wolbach asked if there needed to be language in the Motion identifying or defining the specifics of the study.

Mr. Keene felt the type of study was inherent in the inclusion of the value analysis.

Chair Burt asked the Sky Posse to describe the study they were requesting.

MINUTES

Mr. Harriot stated the study was to look at the impact of the air noise over Palo Alto; analyzing the data which had comprehensive radar traces. The title of the study should be: The Analysis of the Impact of Air Noise Over the Palo Alto Area.

Mr. Slike stated it was important the question Palo Alto wanted the experts to answer was defined. Such as how air routes could be designed to reduce the noise level over Palo Alto without adversely impacting other cities.

Chair Burt understood the concept was to use the data analysis to make a recommendation. He asked for clarification in that the Sky Posse was recommending data analysis be approved to the end result of attempting to reduce air noise over Palo Alto by redesigning air traffic without a disruptive impact over another city. He asked how the amount of \$30,000 was determined.

Ms. Landesman stated the group spoke to a consulting firm. She noted there were ranges of possibilities for the study; the amount was determined by the information received.

Chair Burt asked if the \$30,000 encompassed the data analysis and the data interpretation leading into the recommendation.

Ms. Landesman stated yes.

Chair Burt believed if the financial request encompassed both actions the wording needed to be clear.

Mr. Landesman noted the point of the study was to come up with a more scientific route plan to convince the FAA to make changes to the elevation.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add data analysis of aircraft noise over Palo Alto and recommendations for alternatives to reduce the noise based on said data analysis.

MOTION AS AMEDED PASSED: 4-0

Chair Burt suggested actions to be taken around the consortium of cities, state of affairs of the federal advocacy role, whether or not a Council Member be recommended as a Council representative as a non-voting member to the Airport Board Advisory Committee, and whether the City Council should have a liaison to the Sky Posse.

MINUTES

Council Member DuBois asked if Chair Burt was expressing a specific level of advocacy for the FAA and SFO.

Chair Burt stated the topic was around what advocacy should be taken.

Council Member Berman said those were the discussion topics.

Chair Burt stated the topics he listed were the remaining topics he had for discussion and possible action.

Council Member Wolbach supported the recommendations and asked to add Staff level communication with neighborhoods and residents.

Chair Burt asked if the tri-cities meetings with Menlo Park and East Palo Alto had been reactivated.

Mr. Keene had reached out to the north facing cities to reinitiate the meetings and reached out to the south facing cities; Los Altos and Mountain View to try to engage them. There was a suggestion to include Sunnyvale given Moffett Field was within their city limits.

Chair Burt explained in the past there had been periodic meetings between the Mayors and City Managers of Palo Alto, Menlo Park and East Palo Alto outside of the airport noise issue. He believed that was a just forum to begin the discussion regarding aircraft noise.

Council Member DuBois stated he attended one of the Sky Posse meetings and there was representation from Woodside and Portola Valley citizenry. He felt they could be a viable partner.

Chair Burt suggested if at the next Menlo Park, East Palo Alto tri-cities meeting it could be asked if the other cities would be willing to invite Woodside and Portola Valley. He asked if the goal was to seek collaboration with surrounding cities; if so how to go about it. The interest could be initiated through the tri-cities meetings, from there Staff would know whether there was interest in creating a consortium.

Council Member Berman agreed and felt the responses received by the surrounding communities would assist in the understanding as a whole on how the air noise was being perceived. He asked if the complaints received could be broken down by city and if so could the complainants be contacted. If the complainants could be requested to contact their local government agencies that might add to the overall voice.

MINUTES

Council Member Wolbach believed finding a path to have outreach to the City Managers of the aforementioned cities for support would be a positive notion.

Mr. Keene agreed with the Chair in that the tri-cities forum was a beneficial area to begin the discussions. Palo Alto had ongoing relationships with most of the surrounding cities. He could reach out to the City Managers of other cities although he believed the Mayor/City Manager aspect held a better weight.

Chair Burt acknowledged Atherton had not been included and believed they should be.

MOTION: Chair Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to direct Staff to utilize the different tri-cities meetings as a vehicle to engage and measure the interest of surrounding cities in the flight path/noise issue and to reach out to several adjacent cities as a compliment.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Chair Burt stated the next action he wished to take up was regarding the advocacy role, specifically federal advocacy. The question was whether or not the Committee wished to provide direction to the full Council or to Staff dependent on the concurrence of the full Council to ramp up the advocacy in this area.

Council Member Berman recalled there was a discussion coming up regarding advocacy matters.

Mr. Keene stated yes, it was tentatively going before the Council in March.

Chair Burt asked when the National League of Cities (NLC) was in Washington D.C.

Mr. Keene stated the conference ranged from March 7 - 11. He mentioned the majority of the meeting was around the legislative lobbying.

Chair Burt asked if the NLC conference preceded the legislative advocacy discussion on the Council agenda.

Mr. Keene was certain the NLC meeting would precede the Council meeting. He agreed to work on scheduling meetings with the legislative people during the D.C. trip.

MINUTES

Chair Burt asked if there should be an item placed on the Council agenda in order to officially authorize the City Manager to add the airport noise item to the legislative action item agenda.

Mr. Keene stated no, the Mayor, Council Members and any Staff attending the NLC would automatically be meeting with lobbyists, and certainly attempting to meet with the Senators would be a key piece to the discussion.

Chair Burt asked if it would be appropriate to recommend that the legislative advocacy agenda include a great emphasis on the FAA issues and having Staff recommend points that had been endorsed by the Sky Posse.

Council Member Wolbach asked about working directly with the local legislative offices.

Chair Burt noted dealings with the local political offices were not out of the realm of possibility.

Council Member DuBois asked if there had been contact or considered contact with John Martin, the Director of SFO.

Mr. Swanson agreed to reach out to arrange a meeting with the Director of SFO.

Ms. Landesman noted the Sky Posse had written to Anna Eshoo's office and requested assistance. She felt engagement through the City to Congresswoman Eshoo's office would be better received.

Chair Burt believed a more effective approach was a combination of citizen organizations and Staff with elected representatives.

Council Member Berman noted from working in the office of Congresswoman Eshoo he knew hearing from residents was important and it did hold weight.

MOTION: Chair Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Berman that the Policy & Services Committee recommend to the City Council that the issue of aircraft noise become an elevated priority and request advocacy at various appropriate levels.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Chair Burt recommended the Mayor appoint a Council Member liaison to be a non-voting member of the Round Table and a liaison to the Sky Posse.

MINUTES

Council Member DuBois asked for more information on the Community Airport Round Table and whether they had pull with the FAA routes.

Chair Burt said Staff may have comparative value of participating on the Round Table even as a non-voting member.

Mr. Swanson stated there would be some benefit of a Council Member being at the meetings. The non-voting member would be able to bring the information back to the full Council.

Council Member DuBois asked what power the Round Table had for either the voting or non-voting members.

Mr. Swanson did not believe the group held any actual authority.

Mr. Keene said other than being able to speak or make suggestions he was uncertain how the agendas were created.

Mr. Swanson believed a request could be made to the Chair of the Round Table for any matter to be brought forward. He referred to Bert Ganoung for clarification.

Chair Burt added that being a non-voting member did put Palo Alto out at the table and provided an opportunity to see who shared the concerns and who voting members of the Round Table were.

Mr. Ganoung admitted the Round Table was a good voice and was a nationally recognized body. With the recent construct of the North and South County subcommittees he believed a concerted voice would be received well and be accepted.

Ms. Landesman stated being at the Round Table, one received information and being that SFO was the only airport out of four that had such a group it was beneficial.

MOTION: Chair Burt moved, seconded by Council Member DuBois that the Policy & Services Committee recommend that the City Council authorize the Mayor to appoint a Council Member representative as Liaison to the Sky Posse and as a non-voting representative to the Airport Round Table.

Council Member Berman asked if the Sky Posse had a set schedule with agendas.

MINUTES

Mr. Carl stated the group was fairly informal but they met monthly.

Chair Burt did not want to imply the Council Liaison would be obligated to make every meeting.

Mr. Slike stated the majority of the work was filtered through e-mail.

Council Member Berman noted the Liaison may not wish to be added to the list serve.

Mr. Keene stated his understanding was Mr. Alae and Staff had been meeting with the Sky Posse. He believed the most likely option would be for a Staff member to invite the Liaison to the meeting when the subject matter was relevant.

Chair Burt did not believe the Liaison would have the bandwidth to meet with the full committee but there would be representatives and outputs.

Mr. Keene felt it would be better to coordinate the meetings between the Liaison and the Sky Posse so that there was no conflict when the full Council met.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

MOTION: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member Berman that the Policy & Services Committee recommend that the City Council direct the City Manager to continue to work with residents.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Chair Burt thanked the Sky Posse for their engagement and the constructive way they had been working with the City.

Mr. Harriot stated the City Staff had been very responsive.

Future Meetings and Agendas

March 10, 2015

- City Auditors Report
- Palo Alto Green Building Ordinance

Chair Burt mentioned there were a number of items being referred to the Committee that had not yet been folded into the current list of upcoming matters for discussion.

MINUTES

Mr. Alae stated that was correct.

Chair Burt wanted Staff to look forward as to when there was likely to be an issue where two meetings would be necessary in a single month.

Mr. Keene reviewed the upcoming schedule of items and felt there needed to be a prioritization of the list.

Council Member DuBois recalled discussions at the Council Retreat around protocols for running meetings.

Chair Burt stated early in the year there was to be an agenda item to review the Council's Policy, Procedures & Protocols.

Mr. Keene felt at the Retreat the Council was speaking of the Council Meetings of the Whole for certain meeting discussions.

Chair Burt believed there was an annual discussion at Council to review the Policy, Procedures & Protocols.

Mr. Keene stated historically the Council discussed that at the Retreat; although, this year it was set for a more detailed discussion outside of the Retreat.

Chair Burt understood the City Manager was suggesting having the Policy, Procedures & Protocols discussion after the first Committee of the Whole meeting.

Mr. Keene stated that was correct.

Chair Burt asked when the next Committee of the Whole was to occur.

Mr. Keene stated there were two Committee of the Whole meetings scheduled prior to the next Committee meeting on March 10th.

Council Member Berman noted the tentative schedule for February 26 was cancelled but February 17 was scheduled.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 9:43 P.M.