

Special Meeting
March 15, 2005

Chairperson Freeman called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Beecham, Cordell, Freeman, Kleinberg (arrived at 7:05 p.m.)

Absent: None

1. Oral Communications

None.

2. Approval of Criteria that would identify which Capital Improvement Projects require policy direction from the City Council before they are included in the Adopted Capital Improvement Budget

Assistant Director Public Works Mike Sartor recalled that in November 2004, Council Members Freeman and Ojakian put forth a Colleague's memo requesting staff put together a set of criteria that could be used to determine whether or not a project required Council policy direction prior to moving forward. His task was to lead the effort and work with the Utilities Department and members of the Transportation and Public Works Department. The Capital

Improvement Project (CIP) consisted of planned projects that spanned over five years. The Utilities CIP was based on a five to ten year replacement plan and consisted primarily of replacement of existing infrastructure such as water mains, gas mains, and sewer lines. The Infrastructure Management Plan (IMP) had a series of projects that were identified in a 1996 Adamson Study of city facilities and adopted by the City Council in 2001 as its CityWorks Program. The CityWorks program had ten or more year's worth of projects that were planned in the budget cycle. The staff report (CMR:165:05) listed criteria to be used to determine when a CIP project needed to be brought forward for policy direction. The criteria was presented to the Finance Committee and approved by a 4-0 vote. Council Member Morton had suggested staff indicate "real" property when talking about acquisition or disposition of property. Council Member Mossar had suggested removing the reference to libraries and storm drains in one of the criterias. If the Council accepted the criteria, they would be included in the CIP document in future years, so there was no need to list specific projects. If the Council accepted the criteria, staff would include them in the capital improvement budget each year. There would be an indicator in the actual CIP description pages in the case a project might lead to future policy direction in the future.

Council Member Cordell said one of the criteria required the diversion of staffing and asked whether a qualifier was needed.

Mr. Sartor suggested stating "substantial diversion."

Council Member Cordell questioned the criteria that indicated, "project may require voter approval."

Mr. Sartor said voter approval was needed, for example, if the Council did a feasibility study for the storm drain program.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg referred to the criteria that stated, "Project would require an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or other master plans" and asked whether there needed to be a determination of compliance or compatibility if it were not certain that an amendment was needed.

Mr. Sartor said if the project definition were at the point where staff had to go back and look at a plan, the project would go back to the Council for review.

Council Member Freeman said part of the request in the Colleagues' Memo was that during the budget process, the Council needed to know that potentially, down the road, there might be some money that the Council needed to think about in the future.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg asked whether language could be added to say, "The project would require a determination of compliance or compatibility and or an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or other master plans." Issues of compatibility had been raised in past situations. The wording, "significant changes" in the criteria, "Project involves a significant change in service levels requiring additional staffing or other resources" was questioned.

Mr. Sartor said a significant change would be the addition of a new building or budgeting \$25,000 per month to maintain a system.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said someone told her the storm drain initiative included another staff person, which was believed to be significant and should be highlighted. The wording was too vague.

Mr. Sartor said the alternative was to say the "Project involves a change in service levels."

Council Member Cordell said the language stated, "involves a significant change in service levels requiring additional staffing." Additional staffing was what was considered.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg asked whether there was ever a project that did not require additional staffing to complete the project.

Mr. Sartor said the IMP program was fully staffed. As the IMP program was managed, the \$10 million per year worth of work was fully staffed. If a new police building or a \$17 million storm drain program were added, those were unanticipated projects.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg clarified the Council was talking about an unanticipated new project not already included in a previously approved CIP.

Mr. Sartor said that was correct.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said she did not want to see staff return with every little project.

Mr. Sartor said he believed the criteria were targeted at a major new facility or program that the community wanted to see that was not included in the existing planning.

Council Member Beecham said the Council periodically retuned staff if needed.

Assistant to the City Manager Chris Mogensen said the wording was subjective on purpose, because it depended on economic factors such as staffing. One full time employee (FTE) might be significant at the current time but not in five years. Quantifying was difficult.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said the significance of the project was focused on rather than number of employees.

Council Member Freeman said the criteria were for flagging. Some projects were approved by the prior Council but came to a point that required additional staffing.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg clarified the criteria were for policy direction.

Council Member Freeman noted the staff report (CMR:165:05) indicated "recommended criteria to be used to determine when a CIP project needs to be brought forward for policy direction." The Colleagues Memo, authored by Council Member Ojikian and herself, was focused on the CIP budget document being very clear for people who were on the Finance Committee and Council to understand there were some projects that potentially required additional staffing in the future.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said the Colleague's Memo talked about things that had to do with policy direction or approval and were policy decisions that might or might not be determined by a budget matter.

Council Member Freeman said the criteria all had to do with CIPs.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said part of the concern raised was about the Environmental Services Center (ESC) and proposals for the Baylands were that little iterative steps were taken along the way that were not budget decisions but were decisions that added up to a policy direction without ever having to face the fact that policy had not been made until it became a big project.

Council Member Freeman said the ESC was part of the precipitous for the Colleague's Memo because the ESC was in the budget for several years. The different phases came up. The project was not identified as new because it was not new. The Council had not made all the policy decisions, and there was nothing to flag the project. There were several items in the budget the prior year where the Council questioned whether policy was done.

Mr. Sartor said the ESC project was bled through a number of the criteria.

Council Member Beecham clarified the criteria, "Project involves a significant change in service levels requiring additional staffing or other resources" referred to changes when a project was implemented, such as the Library requiring additional operating staffing.

Mr. Sartor said that was correct.

Council Member Beecham said the alternative to the criteria; "Project may require voter and/or property owner approval" was a mitigated negative declaration.

Mr. Sartor said that was correct. Many projects had a categorical exemption or a mitigated negative declaration.

Council Member Beecham clarified the staff report (CMR:165:05), which mentioned, "agendize such projects during the upcoming fiscal year," meant the first year after the project was listed in the CIP.

Mr. Sartor said that was correct. Projects were budgeted as a planning tool, but staff would not move forward unless there was policy direction.

Council Member Freeman said the prior year; Assistant City Manager Emily Harrison worked with the Finance Committee to streamline the budget in order to not have a lot of things in the budget that the Committee was not able to get to.

Mr. Sartor said staff did a major effort the prior year on the CityWorks team to eliminate planned projects and propose projects that could actually be accomplished.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said projects that included changes to the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) or Master Plan or a change in land use should not go back from the budget Finance Committee hearings on the Consent Calendar. The projects needed to be specifically flagged and discussed where policy was being made.

Mr. Sartor said the projects would be brought back to the full Council.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said she was happy for the Finance Committee to vet the issues but hoped that did not prevent the Council and the public from discussing the policy decisions.

Council Member Beecham said he assumed such projects would be agendized for the entire Council.

Mr. Sartor said that was correct.

Council Member Cordell asked what happened with the comments made that evening.

Council Member Freeman said a motion would be made that would go back to the Council.

Council Member Cordell asked whether the changes were in conflict in any way.

Council Member Beecham said no.

Council Member Freeman clarified the criteria would be clearly identified in the proposed budget.

Mr. Sartor said the criteria would be considered in the front of the CIP, and any project that had the potential of coming up in the future would be flagged.

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Cordell, that the Policy and Services Committee approve project screening criteria to be used to identify proposed Capital Improvement Projects that require Council policy direction before they are included in the Capital Improvement Budget each fiscal year. **In addition, modify the following language: 1) project would require a significant diversion of staffing and/or City funds due to outside funding opportunities (e.g. grants); and 2) project would require a determination of**

compliance or compatibility and/or an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or change in land use.

MOTION PASSED 4-0.

Mr. Sartor said staff would most likely consolidate both the Finance and Policy and Services Committees' recommendations into one staff report to bring back to the full Council.

Council Member Freeman clarified the item would return on the consent calendar.

Mr. Sartor said that was correct.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said she wanted the Finance Committee to be aware of the additional language.

3. Criteria and Process for Recognizing Individuals on a "Wall of Honor" display.

Senior Executive Assistant to the City Manager Chris Mogensen said one-year prior the Council made a decision and formed a policy to recognize individuals in parks naming. There was discussion about alternative ways to recognize members of the community.

Manager Open Space Division Greg Betts said there were not many opportunities for recognition of significant contributions to the community through naming of fields, parks, or facilities. The Council's direction the prior year was to find a way of recognizing people in the community who had

enriched the community creatively through the arts, supported programs through contributions, and supported the business community through innovation or new concepts. The League of California Cities was contacted to see whether cities had methods of recognizing individuals. One of the nicest programs was in the City of Foster City where there was beautiful display in the City Council lobby, and the public was encouraged to suggest people who were due recognition. Guidelines were drafted from bits and pieces from different cities, but there were questions that had not been answered such as how many people should be recognized. Different commissions as part of the selection committee were suggested which incorporated different aspects of ways that people contributed to society. When proposals were brought forward for the naming of a facility, there would be documentation that staff essentially created a resume or outline that helped present the information to the Council for consideration and for the history of the recognition. The Palo Alto Historical Association (PAHA) was very involved in the naming of facilities. The tradition in Palo Alto tended to be that facilities were named after people who made significant historical contributions. The proposed change was that the selection committee was broader. Staff looked for a location for the display. One of the most fitting places was in the Council Chambers lobby hallway. Alternatives, such as Centennial Way, were looked at; however, some members of the PAHA did not feel that location was not actually in the Government seat or a place that was on par with the recognition of former Council Members and Mayors. Criteria to be used in selecting person included: (1) Ten (10) or more years of significant community service contributions; (2) Sustained the quality of life or had a positive impact on the lives of Palo Alto citizens; (3) Created opportunities for the community through new facilities or programs; (4) Was a Palo Alto resident during the time the nominee provided community service; (5) The individual has not been previously honored by other actions of the City,

such as facilities named in their honor or other memorial; and (6) Candidate may be living or deceased.

Council Member Cordell asked whether a person had to meet all six criteria or a portion.

Mr. Betts said the intent was that the individual met all of the criteria.

Council Member Cordell questioned the wording "Sustained the quality of life or had a positive impact on the lives of Palo Alto citizens." Sustaining the quality of life had a positive impact on people's lives.

Council Member Beecham suggested one of the phrases might refer to a one-time event versus continuous.

Council Member Freeman suggested adding the words "sustained or improved" the quality of life.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said naming anything after people who were alive was not a good idea. The criteria, although well thought out, were vague and subjective. Mr. Betts did a great job. The research, care, and thought that went into the recommendation for recognizing individuals were outstanding. There was no way to get around the subjective, emotional, dramatic misunderstandings that were part and parcel of an effort to do something good and nice when people were alive and might misunderstand and feel slighted.

Mr. Betts stated nothing was said the prior year about whether there was a Wall of Honor that was specifically for a person who was living or deceased. The

cities of Mountain View and Menlo Park had specific rulings for their parks and facilities that the person had to be deceased for five years.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said state parks had a similar rule.

Mr. Betts said some people suggested that in order to recognize people while they can enjoy the merits of their work, it was nice to honor them.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) was a companion governmental agency, which broke ranks with virtually all the other school districts in the state by not nominating teachers of the year. The PAUSD chose not to single out one teacher because all the others were special, and there were differences of style and contribution.

Council Member Beecham said his concerns related to the capacity of the wall and how much recognition was done annually. The proposed recognitions were for individuals rather than organizations. There were groups of people who made significant contributions to the City.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said Tall Tree recognized organizations in addition to individuals.

Council Member Freeman said not every person would be honored. People who did great things in the City should be honored. The application required ten years of significant community service contributions. The contributions needed to be documented and referenced. "Significant community service contributions" needed to be clearer. Working on campaigns was a civic duty that might be considered. A representative of the PAUSD on the selection committee was suggested. The Palo Alto Neighborhoods Association president

was also suggested. A concern was that many people did not go to City Hall. Bricks in Heritage Park were suggested as a place for recognition.

Mr. Mogensen said Mr. Betts did research on the brick option.

Mr. Betts said normally bricks were used for fundraisers or a walkway were cast and done with a minimum quantify of 50 bricks at a time. An alternative included sandblasting a piece of slate or brick, and the expense was greater than the concept of a standardized plaque. An alternative might be using a bronze plaque, which cost from \$200 to \$1200, depending on size. Many parks had decomposed granite walkways, which worked like sandpaper on brick or slate. The PAHA had a difficult time choosing names for what was finally called Heritage Park. The vision was that benches in the park gave honor to historical figures. The PAHA had a strong sense of ownership on the future recognitions in the park.

Council Member Freeman said Heritage Park was public. Bricks could circle a tree rather than be on a path. There were issues with bronze plates on the ground because they can be slippery.

Council Member Beecham said he was less enthused about the project and probably would not support it.

Council Member Cordell asked whether there was a limit on the amount of people who would be nominated in one year.

Mr. Betts said the limit was not discussed.

Council Member Cordell suggested there be a limit each year.

Mr. Betts said the City of Foster City honored one individual per year.

Council Member Cordell said her concern was that there might be more upset in the community about who was recognized.

Council Member Freeman said she would err on the side that citizens received recognition for the amount of work they due. The Tall Tree awards were given to two individuals and an organization. Honoring the same amount was suggested.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg expressed opposition to the Wall of Honor because not everyone would be recognized. Many people who were not well known to Council Members and Commission Members but who did small acts of public service. Honoring a few people who were well known became a popularity contest. Cost of such an honor needed to be taken into consideration.

Council Member Cordell clarified the Wall of Honor was a new idea.

Mr. Betts said yes.

Council Member Cordell asked whether there were other ways that the City honored people other than parks and facilities.

Vice Mayor Kleinberg said there was volunteer appreciation.

Mr. Betts said there was a resolution process to honor people. The Wall of Fame could include resolutions.

Council Member Cordell expressed concern about the City engaging in the business of honoring people.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Kleinberg moved, seconded by Council Member Beecham, that the Policy and Services Committee not recommend to the Council adoption of a policy for the recognition of individuals on a “Wall of Honor” display.

MOTION PASSED 3-1, Freeman no.

4. Discussion for Future Meeting Schedules and Agendas

Senior Executive Assistant to the City Manager Chris Mogensen said the next meeting of the Policy and Services Committee was scheduled for April 12, 2005.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

NOTE: Sense minutes (synopsis) are prepared in accordance with Palo Alto Municipal Code Sections 2.04.180(a) and (b). The City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are made solely for the purpose of facilitating the preparation of the minutes of the meetings. City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are recycled 90 days from the date of the meeting. The tapes are available for members of the public to listen to during regular office hours.