



## **POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE**

---

Regular Meeting  
March 8, 2011

### I. Roll Call

Chairperson Price called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burt, Holman, Price (chair)

Absent: Klein

### II. Oral Communications

None

### III. Agenda Items

#### 1. Review and Recommendation on Economic Development Strategic Plan

Manager of Economic Development Thomas Fehrenbach said he was unveiling the draft of the Economic Development Plan. He said Staff's goal with the Economic Development Plan was to be proactive in attracting new businesses while retaining and growing existing businesses. Innovation was a key component as Palo Alto was a city that attracted many start up technology businesses. He said there was a nexus between the innovation that has made Palo Alto a global center, the array of resources available, and the tax generating businesses in the City. He discussed the formation of new partnerships with the community and across departments within the organization. He listed four major categories of deliverables: Communication/Outreach/Information Flow, Development Center Experience, Community Partnerships, and the Bottom Line. He said the bottom-line was that they needed to focus on the items they had influence on. They will report the outcomes to the City Council.

Mr. Keene said the Economic Development Plan fit into the City Finances category of the Council Priorities. He said that this was a starting point to find the focus for Economic Development. Staff was hoping to receive comments from the Committee. Staff was concerned about generating a revenue stream that would help the City. There was also value in business vitality beyond sales tax revenue with quality of life.

Council Member Holman spoke regarding the role development will have in this plan. She said there were impacts to many future programs. She referred to the Ten Myths of Successful Downtowns which state that a community can differentiate itself through diverse and unique retail. She stated that Staff's description of downtown Palo Alto sounded flat. She spoke regarding a proliferation of restaurants on University Avenue and the trend toward it on California Avenue. She wanted the focus to shift toward a local, independent business structure. Businesses should be recognized more by Council. She questioned the economic benefit of companies that Staff refers to as keeping the character and charm of Palo Alto.

Mr. Keene said that economic development may not be the right term for this concept. He said it was more in reference to quality of life perhaps than a hierarchy of business types.

Mr. Fehrenbach said there were induced benefits to these types of businesses even though they do not generate a high level of sales tax revenue. He said that a major business attractor was innovation which was difficult to put a quantitative value on.

Council Member Holman reiterated that they may not be focused on the right topic to the right degree. She wanted to understand how they would achieve balance between the types of businesses. She discussed the land-use component of the plan. She wanted to know some examples of land-use and transportation with regards to thoughtful progression.

Mr. Fehrenbach said one example would be making sure the economic development perspective was brought to the table when discussing items such as land-use changes. The City should advocate for the taxable base. Sustainability and Economic Development do not need to be mutually excludable. He clarified that the Developmental Processes were about the Development Center changes.

Council Member Holman asked if they would get another chance to

improve the ground floor development around the City.

Mr. Keene said the plan was still conceptual and intended only to recognize that economic development should integrate with the Comprehensive Plan and the Land-Use and Zoning plans; they should all be aligned. The nature of retail changes on a regular basis and the plans and zoning processes should be aligned to what is in the best interests for the City.

Council Member Burt said that it should potentially not be called the Economic Development Plan. It was worth spending time to determine the best title. He suggested the City review attempts to describe the qualitative factors that go into the direction they want to nurture for businesses. For example the City valued innovation, revenue generation, and diversity of business. There could be some alignment between the values of the community and those of the business. For example Palo Alto would not likely want to be known as the "home to big tobacco". He stated the policy should not be prescriptive or intended to prohibit businesses. Palo Alto had one of the highest retail revenues per-capita in the region. The "big box" Palo Alto stores, in Stanford and stores such as Apple downtown may not serve the day-to-day needs of the community as well as they serve the revenue generating need. He said they should articulate the intention to fuse economic and sustainability goals. He suggested Staff use a stronger mission statement, than "Palo Alto's Economic Development Team is dedicated to sustaining Palo Alto's economic growth and stability by understanding the needs and issues facing business, and partnering with the community and within the organization to proactively engage in solutions." He suggested they use the following verbiage from page three of the Staff Report: "Working together, we will better leverage our resources to keep Palo Alto as a center for innovation, while maintaining a strong, vibrant, and attractive economy. We will continue to make our City one of the most desirable places to live and work not only in the Bay Area, but in the entire country." He discussed the mix of restaurants to retail stating that 20 years ago an influx of restaurants saved downtown. He suggested they need to evaluate the balance of restaurants per block. He commented on the sequence of the guiding principles listed in the Staff Report. The Comprehensive Plan was referenced in the addendum and should be used as an overriding policy. He said the purpose of the economic development went beyond driving revenue and needed to be addressed more prevalently in the Staff Report. He referred to the role business centers played in the Comprehensive Plan. He discussed the need for a business directory in order to help provide data for the plan to proceed.

Chair Price said that she was concerned that there were no foundational documents to grow from. She discussed having a vision for the guiding principles, community character, and revenue generation. The plan should be implemented in phases. Periodic progress updates from Staff would be very important. She suggested performing arts activities bring people to neighboring communities and could provide the same benefits to Palo Alto. She suggested that a benchmarking process should be introduced to provide a checkpoint for determining successes or challenges. She suggested Staff should explore how the City could benefit from internet purchasing. She discussed exploring methods to improve business-to-business transactions through City policy. She asked if there would be periodic informational reports to the Council.

Mr. Fehrenbach said there would be reports at least yearly. He suggested there would be many opportunities to update the Council on successes and potential issues.

Chair Price asked what Staff Members comprised the Economic Development Team.

Mr. Fehrenbach said it was him and Steven Emslie worked closely with him. He felt that Staff across the departments thought regularly about economic development and were involved in the process.

Mr. Keene said there were also other people that held roles in the process, but it was small team.

Chair Price discussed the issue of a test bed concept mentioned in the Mayors State of the City Address, and Public-Private Partnerships. There were economic components to all of concepts and they could be included in the Economic Development Plan. She suggested using learning's from other City's.

Council Member Holman agreed with Council Member Burt's comments regarding the order of the Guiding Principles. The Mission Statement should be the language indicated by Council Member Burt as well. The Executive Summary was a bit disconnected as it did not include a purpose. She discussed item 2a on page 10 of the Staff Report stating that Staff listed three tactical marketing collateral pieces for CPA Ed. She suggested that Staff should not call out such a specific number so early in the process. She discussed the last promotion for Palo Alto businesses released by the City stating that it was not effective. She discussed the

entities the City was planning on partnering with. She wanted to know how Staff was planning on working with the businesses that create the flavor of Palo Alto. She asked how to reach businesses that were not part of formal organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Fehrenbach said that business in Downtown and on California Avenue are all members of their organizations by default. For Downtown Staff was considering a Block Captain model to encourage communication and foster engagement. He acknowledged there was much work to do. He said there were opportunities to work with interns and partners to help the program process.

Council Member Holman asked about Destination Palo Alto.

Mr. Fehrenbach said the Tourism Business Improvement District has been formed and Destination Palo Alto blended into it. It was a relationship that the City needed to foster to leverage resources.

Council Member Holman asked if Mr. Fehrenbach had the ability to reach out to everyone.

Mr. Fehrenbach said that was why the document before the Committee was so important to him it helped him formalize his objectives and understand Council direction.

Mr. Keene said there was the intent of the capacity and yet there was the reality of the span.

Chair Price said knowing the current situation was a key piece as well.

Council Member Holman spoke about signage issues throughout the City; illegal sandwich boards were everywhere and degraded the shopping experience. Code Enforcement needed to address the situation. She suggested the City should allow blade signs in front of businesses. She said too much of one type of retail, such as restaurants, displaces a good mix of businesses and disrupts parking. She stated that she was not opposed to development but encouraged a balanced approach to encourage local businesses to thrive.

Council Member Burt suggested caution regarding reviewing other Cities practices as that was not an effective method of discovering innovation. He said the Executive Summary should be rewritten. It should be a summary of the content of the body not an overriding statement. He

said this was a great foundation, something that had never been completed before.

Mr. Keene asked the Committee to forward any edits to Staff. He suggested Staff and Council remember the assets they had, and the healthy design of the City.

Chair Price asked Staff what the next steps would be.

Mr. Fehrenbach said he would like to go to the Finance Committee next, perhaps the Utilities Advisory Commission (UAC) after that as there were economic impact to Utilities.

Chair Price said her preference would be to give Staff time to organize the data.

Council Member Burt said the UAC would not be the best forum as they were very focused on their core responsibility.

Chair Price suggested the Committee work with Staff to find a date to report progress to the Committee.

Council Member Holman said she wasn't sure if Staff should go to the Finance Committee without bringing the changes suggested tonight back to the Policy & Services Committee.

## 2. Final Council Procedures and Protocols

Council Member Holman said that she was directed to work with Staff on some language and that was not completed. She distributed copies of a draft for the Committee, Staff, and the Public.

Donna Grider City Clerk reviewed the items that were before the Committee. One item before was the structure of Study Sessions which the Interim City Attorney would review later. Submittal of materials directly to Council was also agendaized. The City Attorney reviewed the item and determined it would not need to be included in the Procedures and Protocols because it is covered under Late Submittal of Correspondence which states that items delivered to Council Members homes should be brought to the attention of the City Clerk. The City Attorney had drafted some language covering the Policy and Services Committee Role, Purpose, and Work Planning which would also be covered later in the evening. Staff had included in the report a copy of

the applicable Municipal Code sections as requested by the Committee.

Don Larkin Interim City Attorney spoke regarding Study Sessions. He said the intent was to create some flexibility in the way Study Sessions were conducted. Currently the rules were constraining and did not allow full public or project applicant participation. Implementing some Council flexibility for conducting Study Sessions was discussed. Staff attempted to provide some alternate rules that would not dictate so stringently how the Study Sessions would be held. The proposed language reiterated that Council would not utilize formal procedures during a Study Session. Instead of describing exactly how that would work the proposed language stated that some Study Sessions may be held in a town hall format, or a brown bag format with questions and answers. Staff did not want to prescribe a specific format as it may not be appropriate for every Study Session. He spoke on the roles and responsibilities of the Committee, saying he would prefer to answer questions rather than present ideas. He spoke regarding ex-parte communications stating that it wasn't in the report, but he recommended adding a definition of what type of projects would be covered. He suggested the definition could be "A plan, formal or conceptual, to go forward with a particular project or development."

Council Member Holman said that she submitted draft language to Staff regarding how to manage the different types of Study Sessions. She said the Staff Report was open ended and did not provide guidance. She said Council had understood that they were not allowed to provide direction in a Study Session. The Staff Report stated that they could offer general guidance, which seemed the same as giving direction. She suggested the following verbiage in the Procedures Handbook, section B General Requirements, sub-section 3, after item c on pages II-11 and II-12:

d) Public Participation. The general rules of decorum apply in Study Sessions. The public will be given an opportunity to comment on all Study Session items. ~~and comment may be consolidated with oral communications.~~

~~d) e) No Final Action.~~ Staff may be directed to bring matters back for Council consideration and/or action at future meetings, but no ~~final~~ action can be taken. Input-Comments provided by the Council members at a Study Session or during a preliminary review process is only general guidance; it should not be relied upon as direction, as the Council cannot take action at such meetings.

1) Follow up meetings regarding development projects.

As indicated above, no action can be taken at Study Sessions or preliminary reviews. If Council wishes to provide guidance or direction to an applicant at a follow up meeting, it should generally address policy issues such as land use and appropriateness of location and avoid giving direction in project specifics such as number of units, square footage, density, etc so not to prescribe a project prior to environmental analysis and Board and Commission review. General guidance should not be relied upon as a final decision nor shall it be binding on future hearings of the Council or any board or Commission.

Council Member Holman stated that the intent with the verbiage change was to provide access to the process and improve the process without circumventing environmental reports or other criteria.

Chair Price asked about the timing of the issue. She said that by the time Council participated in a Study Session, the project typically had already been through other Committees.

Mr. Larkin said that on a Planned Community (PC) application or a development agreement Council had the opportunity to have a Study Session before or after the project went to the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) or the Architectural Review Board (ARB). The reason for a Study Session beforehand was to give the developer general guidance in the beginning of a project.

Council Member Holman said that at the last meeting they discussed scheduling an action item immediately after the Study Session. She said they were trying to avoid giving guidance at a Study Session as there could not be a motion.

Mr. Larkin said it would be more appropriate to make sure the applicant and public were clear about the purpose of the Study Session. Council could not take a final action without the environmental reports.

Council Member Burt said this section was supposed to be about presentation. He asked if there was a purpose statement anywhere in the book regarding Study Sessions.

Mr. Keene read a statement from the Protocols and Procedures that referred to Study Sessions being a means for Council to receive information regarding a project.



Fred Balin spoke regarding submittal of materials directly to Council. He said it needed to be clarified and included in its own section so it could also relate to the submittal of materials to Staff. He said the Committee had already approved language regarding the late submittal of materials to Staff. He said that the submittals would impact the Staff Reports and that is what was being referenced. The discussion this evening referred to the same types of materials going directly to Council that had to deal with policy change or planning submission changes. All changes should go through Staff and be submitted to the Planning Director. It should remain in Protocols, not Procedures. He said the language should be changed to "If a Council Member receives correspondence or other info related to planning materials he or she will notify the Planning Director and the City Clerk."

Tom Jordon discussed late submittals of materials. He said an important piece of the language was "Staff Determines" and Staff could not determine anything that was not before them. If materials go straight to Council Staff had no way to act on it. Complete end runs around the regular channels were not wanted and should be put back into the regular channel of information.

Council Member Burt discussed late submittal of materials for discussion of protocols. It was not good practice. He addressed Council Member Holman's language stating there was no purpose statement for Study Sessions. Council Member Holman's language discussed that Study Sessions should not be relied upon for direction, action or guidance, with those three terms being interchanged throughout the proposed language. He stated that they were different concepts that should not be confused. Direction and action were close, but guidance was different. There had been times in the past where action and direction were perceived to be given in Study Sessions.

Chair Price suggested that given the late information provided by Council Member Holman, the Committee defer the Study Session discussion to another date.

Mr. Keene suggested the Committee could come back with a Study Session purpose statement draft as well. He added that Study Sessions were used for a range of issues beyond development issues.

Ms. Grider said there was a definition in the Procedures about Study Sessions. She read from the Procedures handbook on page II-1, section

II-A: "Study Sessions are meetings during which the Council receives information about City business in an informal setting. The informal Study Session setting is intended to encourage in-depth presentations by City staff, and detailed questioning and brainstorming by Council. The Council may discuss the material freely without following formal rules of parliamentary procedure. Staff may be directed to bring matters back for Council consideration at future meetings, but no action can be taken. During regular Study Sessions, public comments are typically received together with oral communications at the end of the session or at another appropriate time at the discretion of the chair. During special Study Sessions, public comments will be heard at the end of any Council discussion, but oral communications will be consolidated with the oral communications section of the regular meeting, if one follows the Study Session. The Decorum rules still apply to the behavior of the Council and public."

Council Member Burt asked if the verbiage suggested by Council Member Holman was meant to be inclusive of the language the City Clerk read.

Ms. Grider said perhaps they should refer to the language she read from page II-1 in Council Member Holman's verbiage suggestion which would be inserted in a different section.

Mr. Larkin said neither section defined a purpose to Study Sessions. He said that Staff would return with recommendations for a purpose statement.

Mr. Keene said Study Sessions were either Staff and Council or Staff, Council, and a third party.

Mr. Larkin said the vast majority of applicants were the City.

Council Member Holman said the language she was suggesting focused on Study Sessions for development as the other types of Study Sessions did not typically have the same issues. She also stated the Committee could discuss changes that would address public comment.

Council Member Burt asked for confirmation that Council Member Holman's verbiage was intended only for development projects.

Council Member Holman said that sections c, d, and e were for any type of Study Session, section e-1 was development project specific (Procedures Handbook, section B General Requirements, sub-section 3,

item c, d, and e on pages II-11 and II-12).

c) Town hall-style or round table style meetings for development projects

Staff or other city-sponsored informational presentations for non-development Study Sessions.

Council question and answer

d) Public Participation. The general rules of decorum apply in Study Sessions. The public will be given an opportunity to comment on all Study Session items. ~~and comment may be consolidated with oral communications.~~

~~d) e) No Final Action.~~ Staff may be directed to bring matters back for Council consideration and/or action at future meetings, but no ~~final-action~~ can be taken. Input-Comments provided by the Council members at a Study Session or during a preliminary review ~~process~~ is only general guidance; it should not be relied upon as direction, as the Council cannot take action at such meetings.

1) Follow up meetings regarding development projects. As indicated above, no action can be taken at Study Sessions or preliminary reviews. If Council wishes to provide guidance or direction to an applicant at a follow up meeting, it should generally address policy issues such as land use and appropriateness of location and avoid giving direction in project specifics such as number of units, square footage, density, etc so not to prescribe a project prior to environmental analysis and Board and Commission review. General guidance should not be relied upon as a final decision nor shall it be binding on future hearings of the Council or any board or Commission.

Council Member Burt said that under c the first bullet is for development projects.

Council Member Holman agreed.

Council Member Burt said the intent was important.

Council Member Holman said she would email the verbiage to Staff.

Council Member Price suggested Staff return for further discussion of Study Sessions at the next Policy and Services meeting, currently scheduled for April 12, 2011.

Mr. Larkin said he did not have an issue adding late submittal language back in. Staff intentionally crafted the language to be general. He thought it was redundant because several questions had come in regarding the language. Information needed to be submitted to Staff with the appropriate amount of time for review and report preparation. At the minimum state rules regarding information delivery to Council needed to be followed.

Mr. Keene suggested the following verbiage change in the Procedures Handbook; section B General Requirements, item c on page II-3:

"If any correspondence or other information is submitted after this deadline to Council Members or Staff, and Staff determines additional review is needed Staff will reschedule the item for a future Council meeting. "If Council receives materials related to planning applications they will notify the City Clerk and the City Manager as soon as possible.""

Chair Price said that verbiage seemed reasonable, but it was not just the City Clerk that needed to be notified.

Mr. Keene said it was not appropriate for the Planning Director to be notified. Materials should be submitted to the City Managers Office and be routed from there.

Mr. Larkin agreed.

Council Member Holman agreed with the City Managers verbiage, but suggested the sentence before it (Procedures Handbook; section B General Requirements, item c on page II-3) should include the words "to Staff" so that it reads:

"In order to allow for adequate Staff review and analysis, and to ensure public access to information, all plans, correspondence, and other documents supporting or commenting on planning applications being heard by the City Council must be submitted to Staff not later than noon five working days prior to the release of the Council

Agenda Packet.

Council Member Burt asked if a parenthetical last sentence in the City Managers suggestion should have the section above it bolded. If so the last sentence should read "if a Council Member" not "if Council". He stated that for purposes of clarity the statement should indicate if the material is received outside of normal channels.

"If any correspondence or other information is submitted after this deadline to Council Members or Staff, and Staff determines additional review is needed Staff will reschedule the item for a future Council meeting. "If a Council Member receives materials related to planning applications they will notify the City Clerk and the City Manager as soon as possible.""

Mr. Larkin agreed and said that Staff would refine the language but it should state "Except from Staff". He stated that there was enough direction to create a motion.

Council Member Holman asked about if a Council Member receives an email from a non-applicant that does not affect a planning item. She wanted to know if Council still had to submit the material to Staff.

Mr. Keene said the conversation was referring to late submittals related to planning applications.

Council Member Burt said adding "related to planning applications" would provide good clarity.

Council Member Holman said these questions had been raised in the past.

Mr. Larkin said "related to" was overly broad and suggested "correspondence or other information material that influences the project itself".

Council Member Burt said the only way a project may be modified was by the applicant. He asked if the verbiage was addressing applicant changes.

Mr. Larkin said it was also a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) issue.

Council Member Burt said items by an applicant would be different than

material submitted by a member of the public. This would put the Council Member in a position of subjectively determining what is "material" and what is not "material".

Mr. Larkin said Council should share everything with Staff.

Council Member Burt said that meant Council would submit everything that was not submitted to them through normal channels. He asked if that just meant anything in writing, and what Council should do with an oral communication.

Mr. Larkin said "normal channels" would need definition. He agreed that it was subjective.

**MOTION:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to request that the City Council approve changes to the verbiage in the Procedures Handbook; section B General Requirements, item c on page II-3, as follows, and to request that Staff return to the Policy and Services Committee with further discussion on what constitutes correspondence related to planning applications:

"If any correspondence or other information is submitted after this deadline to Council Members or Staff, and Staff determines additional review is needed Staff will reschedule the item for a future Council meeting. "If a Council Member receives materials outside of normal channels they will notify the City Clerk and the City Manager as soon as possible." "

**AMENDMENT TO MOTION:** change the verbiage "outside of normal channels" to state "other than Staff"

Council Member Burt accepted the intent of Council Member Holman's amendment and asked Staff to refine the language.

Council Member Holman asked if her suggested change to the Procedures Handbook; section B General Requirements, item c on page II-3), adding the words "to Staff" was also part of the motion:

"In order to allow for adequate Staff review and analysis, and to ensure public access to information, all plans, correspondence, and other documents supporting or commenting on planning applications being heard by the City Council must be submitted to Staff not later than noon five working days prior to the release of the Council

Agenda Packet.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0, Klein absent

Council Member Price discussed the Policy and Services Committee Role, Purpose and Work Planning.

Council Member Burt asked about the need to revise the Municipal Code to accommodate the proposed language indicating the Committee would be able to self-initiate matters.

Mr. Larkin said it would be a Municipal Code revision.

Council Member Burt asked about concurrently updating the other Municipal Code elements for the Finance Committee and the PTC.

Rob Braulik Assistant Director of Administrative Services said the Committee had requested the Municipal Code language to assist them in drafting the Policy and Services language, not to change the other committees roles.

Council Member Burt stated that he recalled a discussion at the last Policy and Services Committee meeting regarding if they were able to bring items to the full Council, the Finance Committee should have the same authority.

Mr. Larkin said that they were similarly restricted.

Council Member Price thought the goal was to allow them to have the opportunity to make recommendations to Council and that option should be afforded to both committees.

Mr. Larkin said that change would be reciprocal in the Finance Committee.

Council Member Holman asked for clarification between the Role, Purpose, and Work Planning, and the Purpose Statement. She wanted to know where the Purpose Statement was placed and why it was bolded on the Staff Report.

Ms. Grider said it was bolded in an effort to clarify that it had been discussed, but not yet approved, at a previous Policy and Services Committee meeting.

Council Member Holman clarified that meant it was not placed within the Procedures or Policies books yet.

Ms. Grider said the language was in draft form and had not yet been approved.

Council Member Holman asked for clarity on the issue with ensuring good public policy and best practices.

Mr. Braulik said the issue had to do with policy should be set at the Committee level versus the Staff level.

Mr. Keene said there was a conversation about committee roles versus Staff roles. He suggested removing the word "regularly" and the words "and best practices" from the proposed Purpose Statement, as follows:

Purpose Statement: The purpose of the Policy & Services Committee is to ~~regularly~~ review and identify important community issues and City policies and practices with a focus on ensuring good public policy ~~and best practices~~. A particular focus of the Committee is to ensure that the City organization is responsive, effective and aligned with community values and City Council priorities.

Council Member Holman asked where the Purpose Statement would be incorporated with the Role and Responsibilities.

Mr. Larkin said it would be with the existing responsibilities as a defined purpose.

Council Member Burt suggested the verbiage on page seven of the Protocols Handbook, under the section titled Policy & Services Committee – Role, Purpose, & Work Planning, acted as a purpose statement. He suggested adding the first line of the verbiage suggested by the City Manager to that existing statement. He further suggested adding the word "empowerment", so the statement would read as follows:

"...consider and make recommendations on matters referred to it by the council relating to parliamentary and administrative procedures and policy matters pertaining to intergovernmental relations, personnel policies, planning and zoning, traffic and parking, public work, and community and human services.



(§2.04.220) The Committee is empowered to review and identify important community issues and City policies and practices with a focus on ensuring good public policy."

Mr. Keene said the existing language was antiquated and limited.

Council Member Holman suggested adding "to ensure good public policy" to the proposed Purpose Statement, and deleting the remainder of the statement. She also suggested adding "The Committee shall", "to Council", and "such as those" to the existing verbiage page seven of the Protocols Handbook, under the section titled Policy & Services Committee – Role, Purpose, & Work Planning while deleting "referred to it by the Council".

Purpose Statement: The purpose of the Policy & Services Committee is to review and identify important community issues and City policies and practices to ensure good public policy. ~~with a focus on ensuring good public policy. A particular focus of the Committee is to ensure that the City organization is responsive, effective and aligned with community values and City Council priorities.~~

The Committee shall consider and make recommendations to Council on matters referred to it by the council relating to parliamentary and administrative procedures and policy matters such as those pertaining to intergovernmental relations, personnel policies, planning and zoning, traffic and parking, public work, and community and human services. (§2.04.220) The Committee is empowered to review and identify important community issues and City policies and practices with a focus on ensuring good public policy.

Council Member Burt suggested removing the words "referred to it by the council" and adding "relating to parliamentary, administrative procedures and policy matters" instead.

The Committee shall consider and make recommendations to Council ~~on matters referred to it by the council~~ relating to parliamentary, ~~and~~ administrative procedures and policy matters such as those pertaining to intergovernmental relations, personnel policies, planning and zoning, traffic and parking, public work, and community and human services. (§2.04.220) The Committee is

empowered to review and identify important community issues and City policies and practices with a focus on ensuring good public policy.

Mr. Larkin said that Staff would bring revised language back to the Committee.

**MOTION:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to revise verbiage on page seven of the Protocols Handbook, under the section titled Policy & Services Committee – Role, Purpose, & Work Planning as follows:

The purpose of the Policy & Services Committee is to review and identify important community issues and City policies and practices to ensure good public policy.

The Committee shall consider and make recommendations to Council on matters relating to parliamentary and administrative procedures, and policy matters.

Mr. Larkin said Staff would revise the language as needed.

**Motion passed:** 3-0, Klein absent

3. Discussion on the Project Safety Net Community Task Force and recommendation to request that Council appoint a Council Liaison to the Palo Alto Youth Council.

Community Services Division Manager Rob De Geus spoke about Project Safety Net (PSN). He said that the PSN task force was formed 18 months ago. The reported to Council in July 2010 with the PSN Report which included 22 strategies designed to support the emotional health of teens. The report then went before the Policy & Services Committee to filter the items that had City policy implications. Five items were identified which included approval of the Palo Alto Suicide Prevention Policy and adoption of a resolution supporting the Santa Clara Suicide Prevention Policy, and adoption of the 41 Developmental Assets framework. Both of those items were approved. Items that were still open were ongoing Staff support, commitment to youth outreach and elevating the youth voice, and commitment to the reduction of lethal means to self harm. He briefly reviewed the lack of structure among the many organizations involved in the promotion of youth well being.

Management Specialist Greg Hermann said that both the City and School District have passed joint policies. He said that hundreds of Gatekeepers have been trained in the community. One strong outcome was the new relationships among organizations within the community. He cited the Council Priority regarding Community Collaboration.

Mr. De Geus spoke about the amazing job Palo Alto did with youth outreach. He spoke about an event that took place recently called Ignite. He said they believed in finding and encouraging a spark in kids. He said it would be helpful if the Council assigned a Youth Council Liaison.

Mr. Hermann said the City had influence over items such as a commitment to reduction of lethal means to self harm. He said there was no evidence supporting the span of a project such as this. The Police Department will submit \$70,000 from their budget to continue the program. The most difficult item was on-going Staff support. He reviewed what Staff was working on. He said a multi year strategic plan was needed. A wealth of effort was taking place, but more communication with the community needed to take place. There needed to be resources in place to support those efforts.

Mr. De Geus spoke regarding the support the Santa Clara County Mental Health Department was providing. He said the Developmental Assets was a key development. A youth survey will be released shortly that will drive a variety of programs. Peer-to-Peer counseling programs were being established. He spoke about utilizing social network media to connect the network of partners. He said they were creating a recreation program taking place at the high school gymnasiums. He discussed the strain the program has had on Staff as they continued to balance larger workloads.

Ray Bacchetti said that direct financial support should be made for PSN. To allow Suicide Prevention and the 41 Developmental Assets to flourish there must be a Staff in place. He said there was a move to create a foundation around PSN, but they were told it was not a good candidate. PSN would be an investment over time. PSN was a promise to the City's kids that they can have a good start in life.

Leif Erickson Executive Director Youth Service a participant in PSN spoke regarding the urgency of the situation, they were still in the midst of a public health contagion. He encouraged sustainability but not at the expense of the collaborative model. The message should be that this is a shared responsibility. PSN will strengthen the community. Underlining

the depth and quality of the work product was important. The collaborators signed a Memorandum of Understanding that indicated funding should be funded for support among the partners not for Staff.

Terry Godfrey expressed her appreciation for the City's role in the project. The City was able to see long term, unlike many other organizations.

Victor Ojakian discussed the series of actions suggested by Staff that the Committee could help reinforce. He discussed the public benefit of some of the projects happening in the City. He said the PSN could use a fiscal agent. He reiterated that there were no good solutions to end a cluster such as the one Palo Alto was in. He spoke with another community suffering the same issue, but they struggled to engage a cross section of their community. Palo Alto was fortunate to not have that issue, they had all the pieces.

City Manager James Keene spoke regarding PSN. He said they have had incredible success forming PSN. He did feel they were at a critical crossroads to sustain the program; the current model was not sustainable. Some measure needed to be in place to stabilize the collaborative aspect of the program. He said that as the City nears completion of the Stanford Development Agreement, there was \$4 million identified for health services. He advocated \$2 million of that going to PSN. Putting \$70,000 into the budget for Track Watch was just one part.

Council Member Burt asked about activated sectors that Staff referred to in their presentation. He requested a more common descriptor. He asked if the funding referred to for Track Watch was meant to be additional funding.

Mr. Keene it was meant to be additional. When the Council balances all the pieces of the budget with a \$2 million deficit it could be competitive. It is an additional cost to the on-going services.

Council Member Burt agreed. Track Watch was being administered through the Police budget but it wasn't using their direct Staff. He was concerned about Police Department cuts in recent years. Track Watch should not take revenue other Police functions. He spoke regarding the communications plan with the community partners. He said there were many outstanding community members who were communications professions and would be good resources.

Mr. De Geus agreed and suggested the Mid Peninsula Media Center would be a good resource. He felt it was important to form a robust communications committee

Council Member Burt said peer-to-peer counseling had been a program in the middle schools previously. He wanted to know if the project cost would be managed by the School District.

Mr. De Geus said the School District was taking the lead and had committed \$25,000. Additional funding may be needed. There may be opportunities through the Teen Center as well.

Council Member Burt discussed the School District's policy of site autonomy. He asked if this program would be across campuses.

Mr. De Geus said he wasn't sure they made that commitment yet. The High Schools were supportive of the project.

Council Member Burt said the City's implementation responsibilities made it appropriate to have the discussion about whether or not these were systematic or ad hoc programs. He asked if the School District had shown an interest in collaborating on the Stanford Challenge Success.

Mr. De Geus said that they already had a relationship with the program. There were opportunities for a deeper collaboration. Staff had tried to bring everyone together and put forward thoughtful recommendations, although it was difficult to influence such a large organization.

Council Member Burt asked about resources that may be available soon. PSN was a partnership not only among the community organization, but also the School District and the City. He asked if the School district had indicated willingness to partner in the funding and support staff.

Mr. De Geus said Staff had not specifically discussed funding with the School District. They had discussed ownership of the program and the implementation of the programs.

Council Member Holman said she was interested in pursuing the School Districts commitment to funding the program. If the City took on the complete funding then that would always be expected, and may not be sustainable. The Track Watch funding should be added as funding that is needed.

Mr. De Geus asked how the discussion about the role of the District and the City should be started.

Council Member Holman said that there was a Colleagues Memo discussed at the previous nights City Council Meeting. A liaison committee would have discussions involving traditional responsibilities and future responsibilities. This funding should be a piece of that.

Mr. De Geus suggested a meeting between the School District Superintendent, the City Manager, and Council to discuss the issue.

Mr. Keene said the need was for a sustainable annual budget and sufficient funding.

Council Member Holman suggested volunteer opportunities for students to connect them with the City and with local businesses.

Mr. De Geus said that was an existing component. The City alone hires 200-250 teens each summer that help run our programs.

Council Member Holman asked about teen initiated community projects which were a way for teens to develop self-worth and give back to the community.

Mr. De Geus said the youth were very engaged. There were various leadership groups led by the teens. He said they were having a one-day youth forum in March.

Council Member Holman said the Youth Councils were great, but she wanted to know if there were other youth recognition that the City could provide.

Recreation Program Supervisor Minka Van Der Zwaag said the Human Relations Committee had been discussing youth recognition as well.

**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved seconded by Council Member Burt for the Policy & Services Committee to recommend the City Council and/or the Finance Committee approve a designation of \$2 million as part of the health or community benefit aspect designated for Project Safety Net/youth well being through the development agreement currently being negotiated with Stanford University Hospital.

Council Member Burt asked if the timing would be correct to commit for

allocation dollars.

Mr. Keene said this would be a recommendation to the Finance Committee or the Council as the Development Agreement is being negotiated consideration should be made that the Policy & Services Committee had made this recommendation. He said the timing of the funding was fairly immediate in the Development Agreement, if approved.

Council Member Burt suggested the motion be reworded as follows: a recommendation to the Council and Finance Committee that \$2 million of the public health program funding from the Stanford hospital Development Agreement be earmarked for PSN.

Council Member Price said it was PSN/youth well being.

Mr. De Geus recommended using the Council Priority which was Community Collaboration for Youth Well Being.

Council Member Price said she wanted to make it clear that the recommendation was for the money to go to youth well being and project safety net.

Council Member Burt said it would be earmarked for funding programs to fulfill community collaboration for youth well being and specifically the ongoing support of project safety net. He stated his recommendation for the motion verbiage: Recommendation to the Finance Committee and City Council that \$2 million of the pending Development Agreement with Stanford Hospital public benefits, health benefit element, be earmarked for fulfillment of Community Collaboration for Youth Well Being initiatives, specifically on-going support for Project Safety Net.

Council Member Price said the modification was acceptable.

Council Member Holman asked what the \$2 million would be used for.

Council Member Burt suggested stating the \$2 million would be set aside for the City's commitment to the ongoing funding for PSN.

Council Member Price said it should stop there.

Mr. Keene said that \$2 million would not be enough to sustain the initiative but could provide a viable start.

Council Member Price said that in no way does this Motion state that the expectation for other partners to participate has been eliminated or reduced. She said this was a beginning.

Council Member Burt asked the City Manager to confirm that the Development Agreement funds had not been allocated to specific budget items already.

Mr. Keene confirmed that the funds had not been allocated.

Council Member Holman asked Council Member Burt to restate the part of the Motion after "set aside"

Council Member Burt said "toward the City's contribution toward Project Safety Net". He said the implication would be this was for the City's share without attempting to define the other partner's shares.

Council Member Holman said she did not want to send a message that \$2 million was the right amount without having had those discussions. She also wanted to know if there was something else that needed that money.

Council Member Burt asked what dollar amount was in the Development Agreement for the health benefit.

Mr. Keene said it was \$4 million in the health programs category.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER TO REVISE THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:**

Council Member Price moved seconded by Council Member Burt for the Policy & Services Committee to recommend to the Finance Committee and City Council that \$2 million of the pending Development Agreement with Stanford Hospital public benefits, health benefit element, be earmarked for fulfillment of Community Collaboration for Youth Well Being initiatives, specifically on-going support for Project Safety Net.

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED:** 3-0, Klein absent

Mr. Keene said the governance structure for an on-going format and a financial vehicle for dispersing funds would still be needed for Project Safety Net.



**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to recommend the City Council appoint a Council Liaison to the Youth Council.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0, Klein absent

**MOTION:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Price to include the cost of Track Watch, at \$70,000, into the process of searching for partners.

Mr. Keene reiterated that the project needed to continue and opportunities for partnerships needed to be explored.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0

4. Approval of the City Council Priorities for 2011

Rob Braulik, Assistant Director of Administrative Services, recalled the City Council Priorities set at the Council Retreat in January 2011. He discussed a spreadsheet that detailed the Priorities. With the approval of the Policy and Services Committee, Staff would bring the Priorities to the full Council on March 21, 2011. All Priorities were scheduled for completion, or to be reported on, by December 2011. He said that Staff had very brief descriptions about how they would accomplish the Priorities on the spreadsheet.

James Keene, City Manager, stated that the Priorities would be an informational item to the full Council. If Council wanted additional actions the item could be agendaized. He suggested a quarterly report should be delivered to the full Council beginning with the second quarter. He also suggested Staff would follow up on the Year in Review report that Mayor Burt launched the previous year.

Chair Price commended Staff for delivering a spreadsheet that complied with previous Policy and Services Committee requests. She asked if Staff could include scheduling information.

Mr. Braulik said many of the items were already being worked on. He said that Staff was planning on providing quarterly reports with scheduling updates.

Mr. Keene said the reports would have variances in the level of detail. Some projects were easier to chart than others. The quarterly reports

would keep Staff on track. The Council's role was oversight and policy guidance. There would be more detailed information at the Staff level.

Council Member Holman asked Staff to clarify "x's" and check marks on the spreadsheet.

Mr. Braulik said the "x's" were City Financial Goals. Check marks were where those priorities crossed over into other areas of the organization. He said the Policy and Services Committee had requested that Staff illustrate items that cross into multiple areas, and the "x's" and check marks were Staff's attempt to comply.

**NO ACTION REQUIRED**

IV. Future Meetings and Agendas

April 12, 2011 - Stanford Project

May 10, 2011 - Binding Arbitration Models and Options

May 10, 2011 - Staffing Flexibility Changes for Changing Environments

V. Adjournment

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 11:09 p.m.