

#### POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES

Special Meeting Thursday, November 13, 2014

Chairperson Price called the meeting to order at 6:04 P.M. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Klein, Price (Chair), Schmid

Absent: Scharff

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

#### AGENDA ITEMS

1. Review and Discussion of the Inventory of Donated City Owned Properties, Policy and Procedure 1-48 Sale & Transfer of Surplus City Owned Properties, Developing Guidance and Clarification Regarding Unsolicited Offers to Lease or Purchase City Land, and Policy and Procedure 1-11 Leased Use of City Land and Facilities.

Lalo Perez, Chief Financial Officer, stated the item was referred to the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) by the City Council meetings of September 8<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> because of the Santa Clara Civil Grand Jury finding. He asked the Committee for directions on how they preferred to proceed; splitting the items or responding as a whole.

Chair Price stated her preference was to hear the items one by one.

Mr. Perez provided a list of City owned properties and restrictions included within any one donation. The listing was reflective of the 10 properties donated that the current Staff was aware of. In order to gain more detailed information on other donations the Staff would need to request a conveyance which could cost between \$500 and \$750 per property report from the county. He made a correction on property Item Number 6; 915 Scott Avenue, the Staff comments were not related to the specific property and should be omitted.

Under the column "Leased" it should read "Used by or Leased" because some of the properties were being used by City functions. Staff proposed posting the list on the City's website for citizen review; the list would be updated as future donations or change of use occurred.

Council Member Klein asked for another column to identity the donor of property and a footnote on Item Numbers 9 and 10. He did not favor spending additional funds on conveyance reports; the City owned over 100 properties and that would be a large sum with an uncertain gain.

Council Member Schmid suggested a general idea of when a property or land was donated would be nice information. He was concerned with the listed size of the 915 Scott Avenue site; it appeared to be 1.2 million square feet.

Hamid Ghaemmaghami, Manager of Real Property, stated that was not the correct size; although, Staff was unable to verify the correct size at the present time.

Council Member Schmid noted there was a segment on the table of land, he asked if the list was available or would be to the community.

Mr. Ghaemmaghami stated the City had 140 property parcels; consisting of land and buildings. The reason for the list was to show the Committee an up to date listing; the concern of uploading the entire list on the website was for security purposes. The Utilities Department was uneasy revealing certain locations.

Mr. Perez mentioned the intent of the list began with the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission (IBRC) who needed a listing of City properties for determining the infrastructure needs. Having the Committee review the complete list and request suggestions for a clearer understanding prior to uploading the information onto the website would be helpful.

Council Member Schmid understood there was sensitive data on a list such as this. The reason behind the discussion was public land being fenced off from the public. There was a second property in a similar situation in the center of the Baylands. He asked whether the telegraph building was City property.

Mr. Perez asked if that was the ITT property.

Council Member Schmid stated yes.

Mr. Ghaemmaghami stated the ITT property; land, was owned by the City with an easement granted to ITT.

Mr. Perez stated the condition of the easement was the facility would continue to be used for radar purposes. Staff had been in contact with the holder of the easement to inquire whether or not they were ready to release or sell back the easement. As of yet, the party was not ready to move forward with the release or sale of the easement and they maintain the conditional use remains the same.

Council Member Schmid had heard informally that that site had not been in use for many years. It was important from a park perspective to have the easement eradicated although the site was important for the history of Palo Alto. His question was whether the site would be on the list as a City owned property.

Mr. Ghaemmaghami stated yes, it was City owned property and would be on the list.

Mr. Perez mentioned the completed list would contain the properties owned or leased by the City and the conditions or restrictions attached to said properties.

Chair Price asked why there was a need for a Comprehensive Plan column on the listing of property.

Mr. Perez stated Staff would review the item and see whether it was a necessity.

Chair Price understood the Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) was a standard manner in which to identify properties but she asked whether there was a need for a parcel map link for the public.

Mr. Perez said that question was brought up amongst Staff and the discussion of a Google Map that showed the property. The idea behind the parcel map was if the community desired to check with the county that would have the necessary information.

Council Member Klein suggested doing away with the column of "Acquired By" because it was an inventory of City donated lands which meant they were acquired by gift. There were a lot of columns and he desired to reduce the unnecessary ones.

Chair Price clarified Staff was requesting the Committee to review and accept the listing.

Mr. Perez agreed and noted the Committee had provided ample recommendations which would allow Staff to continue to improve the list prior to uploading to the website.

Chair Price asked if Staff required a separate Motion per item.

Mr. Perez left the decision to the Committee.

James Keene, City Manager, stated Motioning individual items appeared simple enough without being time consuming.

**MOTION**: Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Klein that the Policy & Services Committee accept the attached Inventory of Donated City Owned Properties, which will be posted on the City's website as directed by Council.

#### **MOTION PASSED**: 3-0 Scharff absent

Mr. Perez explained Staff was interested in any suggested revisions in the procedure of the sale/transfer of City owned real property which was located in Policy and Procedures 1-48/ASD. Mr. Ghaemmaghami and his staff performed periodic reviews of the City owned properties to determine the need. There were incidents where a department would approach the Real Estate division to inform them they no longer had a need for their specific facility. He provided the example of the Middlefield Well Sites; the Utilities department and the Water Fund no longer had a need for the wells located on the site. They have removed the property from their inventory of use and returned it to the General Fund. The next step would be for Staff to determine whether the property was surplus. If so, there was a process of competitive bid for Council approval. The other options were the City received an unsolicited offer to lease/purchase the property. The second option did happen frequently but most recently Staff was approached with regard to the Los Altos Treatment Plant. Typically those types of discussions would begin with the Real Property area, if the probability warranted discussion the City Manager and City Attorney would be approached and the final step would be Council for further review.

Council Member Klein believed Items 2: Review and Consider Potential Revision to Policy and Procedures 1-48/ASD (Procedure for Sale/Transfer of Surplus City Owned Real Property), and

3: Consider recommending an amendment to Policy and Procedure 1-48 to specifically address unsolicited offers to lease or purchase City owned properties, and 4: Review policy and Procedure 1-11/ASD (Leased Use of City Land/Facilities) and consider whether amendments are needed; were similar enough and should be linked together for discussion and change.

Mr. Perez noted Staff had not made significant recommendations because it was not common to receive unsolicited offers.

Mr. Ghaemmaghami stated the last surplus property the City sold was in 2006; 2460 High Street at \$450,000. In the past 20 years there had been no more than three properties sold.

Council Member Schmid asked if that location was the electric station.

Mr. Perez believed it was a pump or well site.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, mentioned when the Grand Jury addressed the preliminary work the Staff did with the Council to consider an unsolicited offer on the 7.7 acres of Foothills Park, they reviewed City Policy 1-48 and did not see a specific type of circumstance described in the policy. She acknowledged it may happen from time to time when a circumstance may arise that was not spelled out in a specific policy. A policy was a general statement looking forward; but when you have professional staff they were relied upon to use their judgment when particular or specific circumstances arise that was not Staffs' view that more detail was needed, but rather it was Council's wish to focus on that specific question in response to the Grand Jury's struggle.

Chair Price asked Staff how they wished for the Committee to reply, making a short statement or not.

Mr. Keene stated he had a recommendation. Typically, Staff would be approached in some fashion for an unsolicited sale; at that point the matter could end with Staff's determination. The question he asked himself was whether or not Council wanted to be apprised of an inquiry even if it was not substantiated. In the case of an unsolicited offer that Staff felt required Council's attention, such as the 7.7 acres, Staff scheduled a Closed Session with the Council for discussion for exploration. He asked whether the Committee believed the Council would prefer to have preliminary Open Session process to identify in a little more detail what was occurring with an unsolicited offer. He believed it would be a worthwhile policy to put into place with the flexibility to schedule a Closed Session or a public discussion.

The discussion within Staff had been whether more information was hurtful to the City; in the 7.7 acre situation there was a significant amount of misinformation in the public which was not released by the City.

Council Member Klein favored an additional sentence or two in the policy effectively stating, "An unsolicited offer would be considered the same as a recommendation from a Department Head to the Real Estate Manager as to the consideration of what should happen to the said property". He did not feel every offer should automatically go to Council. The Real Estate Manager and the City Manager should be able to decide the significance of a property offer.

Council Member Schmid felt Policy 1-48 was outdated and should be reviewed and updated. The policy stated there should be an open and competitive bid process, yet the procedures were to notify the departments for discussion, notify other public agencies, then if there was an unsolicited bid the process was to place an ad in the paper, and send flyers. He felt there should be a more efficient process of notification.

Council Member Klein clarified if a citizen approached the City to purchase property and the City Manager stated no; the matter would be closed. If the City Manager agreed; his thought was to add a sentence clarifying the beginning of the process.

Ms. Stump clarified if the City Manager agreed to sell or lease a property the procedures for that process would begin in Section D: Should the decision be to declare the property surplus and sell it by bid. At that point the material would be packaged and submitted to the Council for review and decision.

Council Member Schmid clarified when the City Manager agreed to sell or lease a property it would become an item on the City Council Agenda.

Ms. Stump stated yes.

Council Member Schmid asked if the listing of property was available for the public prior to the 7.7 acre matter.

Mr. Perez stated the information may have been available through a staff report or on the website indirectly at one point but not currently.

Mr. Keene clarified if there came a time in the process of selling or leasing a City owned property there would be public notice and transparency.

Ms. Stump acknowledged the City website did not have a database of properties readily available as was available today. That type of modern information came about because of the Grand Jury process. Once the 7.7 acre matter was researched Staff found it had been brought to Council a number of times in the 1980's and 1990's. Current Staff and leadership had not reviewed or received data.

Council Member Schmid stated his concern was when the current Council received the information it was under the guise of a Closed Session where they operated under the rules of inability to publicly state what occurred during the discussion. At that point the options for the public to become involved were severely limited.

Mr. Keene understood Council Member Schmid's concern but reiterated in the event the Closed Session produced a decision to sell or lease the property the open process would have begun as stated in Section D. With the existing process and policy the City could not have disposed of the property without public input, process, and involvement.

Council Member Klein noted Exhibit A; the listing of City owned property was by no means a list of properties that were for sale or available for lease. The listing was a historic document that simply recorded the property owned by the City. He expressed the current process was very public and the addition of the sentences discussed earlier improved the procedures.

Mr. Perez stated once a property was declared surplus all of the steps thereafter would have been followed and were in Open Session.

Ms. Stump mentioned if there was a Motion at the Closed Session on the 7.7 acres, at the most it would have been to place the item on the Open Session City Council agenda to begin the process.

Council Member Schmid proposed to have the process as outlined when it reached Section D to not say to go to the Consent Calendar or place an ad in the real estate section.

Council Member Klein stated if there were other ways to publicize the availability of a property he was open to suggestions and change to policy verbiage.

Mr. Ghaemmaghami agreed to update the policy to incorporate the City website and add language that property could be advertised on other websites.

Council Member Schmid agreed.

Mr. Keene recommended adding an all-encompassing small "d" to Section D clarifying the utilization of the City's availability of outreach ranges.

Council Member Klein agreed and suggested reference to electronic media.

Herb Borock read a section from the Grand Jury report. The issue was the current Council and Staff reviewed and understood the consequences but he suggested for future members and Staff there be language added; pursuant to Government Code Section 54220, Policy 1-48/ASD and in addition, add another sentence that no discussion of the potential sale of City owned property shall be held in a Closed Session unless the property had been declared surplus.

Ms. Stump clarified the Grand Jury did not find there was a violation of the Brown Act. The Surplus Property Act was a state requirement that the City had stated it would comply with. It was important to note whether it was a mandatory process for a Charter City was something courts had not found and maybe a future Council would choose to dispose of property in a public way that did not comply with the state law requirements.

Council Member Schmid mentioned Section C, Item 1 read: Formally declare the real property surplus and instruct the Real Estate Division to dispose of the property using open bid procedures.

Ms. Stump agreed the process had to be done in Open Session although it did not have to be done before a Closed Session.

Council Member Klein believed the current policy and procedures were accurate and would cover the majority of property transactions the City might have.

**MOTION**: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Chair Price that the Policy & Services Committee direct Staff to bring to the Council the section of the procedure modified in 2 respects; 1) to cover an unsolicited offer and only go to Council if the City Manager recommends and 2) to update the procedures to include electronic media and exposure to the public.

Mr. Keene suggested placing the Motion changes under Section D, Item 3 subsection d as: utilize modes of advertisement including electronic media.

Council Member Klein agreed.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to place the Motion changes under Section D, Item 3 subsection d as: utilize modes of advertisement including electronic media.

Council Member Schmid asked if Section A, Items 1 and 2 could be performed without public knowledge.

Ms. Stump clarified up to that point it could be. Once Staff completed Section A, Items 1 and 2, the next step was to go before Council where the Council could decide the property was or was not be declared surplus.

Council Member Schmid stated if the property was public there should be an opportunity for the public to be engaged.

Ms. Stump disagreed in that the Staff packaged the materials and brought it before Council in an Open Session for the Council to decide whether to dispose of the property or not, therefore the public could be involved.

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED**: 2-1-0 Schmid no, Scharff absent

Council Member Klein asked Council Member Schmid to clarify his no vote.

Council Member Schmid shared his concern with the way the policy read with respect to Sections A, B, and C which implied clearly that the public would be involved through the Council Open Session. The issue with the 7.7 acres was it was deeply involved in a Council discussion without public knowledge or input.

Council Member Klein asked what Council Member Schmid was suggesting.

Council Member Schmid asked Staff to review Sections A, B, and C under the terms of an open and competitive bid process. He asked for language to ensure there would be a public process.

Mr. Keene was trying to differentiate this specific process against any other multi-stage City procedure that Staff handled up to a point prior to Council involvement. He understood the 7.7 acre matter was not dealt with in a normal fashion although it was handled within the policy and procedures. He noted there was action from a prior Committee meeting going before Council relating to the question "what will automatically be placed on a City Council agenda; a vote in public to go into a Closed Session."

He believed that process, if enacted, would allow Council to make the determination on what would be in Closed or Open Session.

Council Member Schmid stated that was a future step not in the current policy.

Mr. Keene understood the Committee suggested that step would be for the future; however, that future step would be added to the current policy and therefore would allow Council to approve or determine any scheduling of a Closed Session.

Chair Price agreed.

Council Member Klein explained the split vote on that item from Committee came about because that situation was already present. Any Council Member could move a Closed Session item into an Open Session by Motion.

Chair Price asked in a situation where we have a parcel of land and we want to swap it with a public or private entity; was there language in an existing policy or procedures to allow Staff to pursue that.

Mr. Perez stated the property in question would need to be declared surplus because it would not be used for its intended purpose.

Ms. Stump agreed with Mr. Perez; the title of the process being discussed was Sale or Transfer.

Mr. Perez clarified the last Section 1-11/ASD the City could lease a property for a term of up to 50 years under the current Charter, and by Ordinance the Council has delegated to the City Manager the authority to lease any City owned property for up to 3 years. The City Manager also has the authority to rent or lease property at the Cubberley Community center for up to 5 years. In review of other cities similar policy's Staff was not proposing any changes to the current policy.

Chair Price asked if the current policy did not state a designated amount simply a designated year.

Mr. Perez stated yes. The majority of the property leased was to non-profit so the amount would be insignificant.

Council Member Klein asked if Staff was planning on requesting title reports for City owned property at a cost of \$500 to \$750 each.

Mr. Perez clarified that suggestion was intended for the first part of the discussion and Staff was directed against the suggestion by the Committee.

**MOTION**: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Chair Price that the Policy & Services Committee recommend no changes to Policy and Procedure 1-11/ASD (Leased Use of City Land/Facilities).

Council Member Schmid asked for clarification on 1-11/ASD under Procedures Section A, Paragraph 2. He asked for clarification on Section B, Item 5, the last sentence. Both sections refer to park lands open to public, although there were large gates and no trespassing signs on the parkland area because there may be a lease involved. There seemed to be a disconnect.

Ms. Stump asked for clarification on what property.

Council Member Schmid was speaking to the lease on the Acterra site of 7.7 acres.

Ms. Stump explained the property was not safe for open public use at the present time. There was an open culvert on the property and the Parks and Recreation Department was currently looking into developing the property for open and active public use. She clarified the property was currently dedicated park land.

Council Member Klein believed the City had fuel stored on the property.

Mr. Perez noted there was fuel stored on the boarder of the property. He stated he and his Staff had visited the property and vouched it was not safe for public access. There would be a Capital Improvement Project coming to the Council once it was determined what was necessary to complete safety issues.

Mr. Keene noted the general intent of the land was to get it to public accessibility and Staff relied on the Policy and Procedures language to make the changes.

Ms. Stump mentioned there were areas within City dedicated parkland where there were areas fenced off from public access because the City Manager or the City Council had made a policy decision for a limited area and limited purpose because it served the larger public purpose such as working materials were prepared, equipment or fuel storage.

**MOTION PASSED**: 3-0 Scharff absent

Mr. Perez asked how the Committee wished for Staff to proceed with the items moving forward to Council since there was not a consistent vote.

Chair Price recommended Items 2: Review and consider potential revision to policy and procedures 1-48/ASD (procedure for Sale/Transfer of surplus City owned real property) and 3: Consider recommending an amendment to Policy and Procedure 1-48 to specifically address unsolicited offers to lease or purchase City owned properties, would move forward to the Council as Action Items and Item 1: Review and accept the inventory of donated City owned properties, which will be posted on the City's website and 4: Review Policy 1-11/ASD (Leased use of City Land/Facilities) and consider whether amendments were needed, would be Consent Items.

2. Review and Recommendation to Council for Approval of the Draft Legislative Program Manual and Draft Semi-Annual Legislative Strategic Initiatives.

Richard Hackmann, Management Analyst, stated Staff was returning with an update on the material from the October 14, 2014 Policy & Services Committee (Committee) meeting. During the prior meeting the Committee members had made recommended changes to the Draft Legislative Program Manual and Draft Semi-Annual Legislative Strategic Initiatives document. Staff had reached out to the Executive Leadership Team members to update the Draft Semi-Annual Legislative Strategic Initiatives document and presented was a more detailed version of initiatives. Staff was requesting input and approval on both documents from the Committee members and a recommendation to Council.

James Keene, City Manager, recommended Committee members review Draft Spring 2015 Semi-Annual Legislative Strategic Initiatives document and noted it was reflective of the collective thoughts of the Executive Leadership Team's thoughts on important policy perspectives to be considered by Council. Staff wanted to explore legislative action although understood there could not be an overabundance of bills from one city. The recommendation desired from the Committee to Council would be for one or two important items that mattered the most to accomplish for the community.

Chair Price asked if Staff was requesting the discussion of sorting out the initiates begin at the Committee level. She noted the list presented was unweighted and not organized by category.

Mr. Keene suggested the Committee determine whether they wished to begin the process of selecting their priorities prior to recommending to Council. The legislative season was quickly approaching and usually due date was set in the third week in January.

Herb Borock suggested when the list went before the Council who recommended the item should be noted; whether by Staff or the Committee. He believed the listing order should be 1) City priority, 2) Committee proposed, and 3) Staff recommendation.

Council Member Klein recommended combining Items 3: Protect and increase local government discretion, balancing that with City values. Ensure that legislative or Constitutional reforms align with the City's values and maintain and/or enhance local discretion; and 4: Ensure that legislation, policies and budgets retain or increase, but generally did not decrease, the amount of local discretion held by the City and protect local decision making. Oppose legislation, policies and budgets that reduce the authority and/or ability of local government to determine how best to effectively operate local programs, services and activities. The City retains the right to exceed State goals, standards or targets. His suggestion was to drop Item 3 and note it was covered in Item 4. He also recommended striking through the first and last sentences in Item 4: Ensure that legislation, policies and budgets retain or increase, but generally did not decrease, the amount of local discretion held by the City and protect local decision making. Oppose legislation, policies and budgets that reduce the authority and/or ability of local government to determine how best to effectively operate local programs, services and activities. The City retains the right to exceed State goals, standards or targets.

Mr. Keene clarified the recommendation was to strike the first sentence beginning with 'Ensure that Legislative' and strike the last sentence beginning with 'The City retains'.

Portion omitted due to audio difficulties.

Council Member Schmid asked where the reference was for the asterisk under the "process" section of Legislative Advocacy.

Mr. Hackmann clarified there was no reference, the asterisk was Staff note. The asterisk could be removed and the note left for informational purposes.

Council Member Schmid recommended removal of the asterisk for clarity of information.

**MOTION**: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid that the Policy and Services Committee accept the draft Legislative Program Manual with the following changes; 1) combine points 3 and 4 with a strike through of the first and last sentence in number 4 and 2) remove the asterisk under Legislative Advocacy after the last item in the Process section.

#### MOTION PASSED: 3-0 Scharff absent

Council Member Schmid stated there were 18 items to select from and he suggested the Committee vote to prioritize the list prior to Council review. His recommendation was for each Committee Member to vote for their top six priorities to narrow the list.

Council Member Klein agreed to reduce the list as suggested.

Mr. Keene stated there would be two stages to the process. The first would be the removal of any items simply not agreeable to the Committee and the second would be how to prioritize the remaining items. The probability of Palo Alto writing a letter of support for a legislative item on the list proposed by someone else would keep the City involved without placing all of the items under their legislative request.

Council Member Schmid felt maintaining all of the items on the list was beneficial because each of them came from a need or desire of Staff. He believed the legislative analyst would inform the Council or Staff when an item on the list but not prioritized was upcoming.

Mr. Keene noted the Committee had the ability to inject an item to the list once it was reviewed.

Chair Price asked if there was a history of the number of priorities allotted each Council Member.

Council Member Klein stated yes, it was three with the ability to add more with a rationale.

Council Member Schmid listed his top 6 priorities; 1) Advocate for Proposition 13 reform as it relates to ownership transfers of commercial properties, 2) As the issue unfolds, track closely any proposed changes to expanding the sales tax base (such as leisure services) and the possible correlated reductions in the sales tax rate, 3) Advocate for policies that promote the long-term stability of CalPERS, 4) Advocate for conservation pricing for refuse,

5) Obtain grant funding for public safety, affordable housing, recycled water, and homelessness issues and/or infrastructure, and 6) Oppose the California High Speed Rail project.

Council Member Klein listed his top 6 priorities; 1) Advocate for Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) housing mandate reform via a revised formula for housing allocations, 2) Advocate for policies that promote the long-term stability of CalPERS, 3) Seek funding that would provide improvements to the Palo Alto Airport, 4) Advocate for Proposition 13 reform as it relates to ownership transfers of commercial properties, 5) Oppose the California High Speed Rail project, and 6) Advocate for environmental initiatives that promote the use of alternative energy sources.

Chair Price listed her top 6 priorities; 1) Obtain grant funding for public safety, affordable housing, recycled water, and homelessness issues and/or infrastructure, 2) Advocate for Proposition 13 reform as it relates to ownership transfers of commercial properties, 3) Advocate for environmental initiatives that promote the use of alternative energy sources, 4) Advocate for policies that promote the long-term stability of CalPERS, 5) As the issue unfolds, track closely any proposed changes to expanding the sales tax base (such as leisure services) and the possible correlated reductions in the sales tax rate, and 6) Advocate for "net neutrality" and related policy areas that ensure that all legal internet activity is treated equally both in theory and practically.

Mr. Keene calculated the score for each of the six priorities and clarified the results in the following order: 1) Advocate for Proposition 13 reform as it relates to ownership transfers of commercial properties, 2) Advocate for policies that promote the long-term stability of CalPERS, 3) Obtain grant funding for public safety, affordable housing, recycled water, and homelessness issues and/or infrastructure, 4) As the issue unfolds, track closely any proposed changes to expanding the sales tax base (such as leisure services) and the possible correlated reductions in the sales tax rate, 5) Advocate for ABAG housing mandate reform via a revised formula for housing allocations, and 6) Advocate for environmental initiatives that promote the use of alternative energy sources.

Chair Price agreed to the order captured.

No Action Taken

#### FUTURE MEETINGS AND AGENDAS

December 9<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014.

Khashayar "Cash" Alaee, Senior Management Analyst, presented the Policy & Services Committee (Committee) members with the list of upcoming meeting topics.

Chair Price stated the items listed for the 16<sup>th</sup> of December did not appear to be substantial enough.

Mr. Alaee stated he could check with Staff on the possibility of moving the airport item up to that date.

Chair Price believed the airport item was important but she was interested in core City issues.

Mr. Alaee noted the Stanford Funds were possible to be moved but he needed to have a discussion with the City Manager; the City Auditor had requested more time on their items. He suggested moving the items from the  $9^{th}$  of December onto the  $16^{th}$  of December and shifting items from the  $16^{th}$  therefore eliminating one meeting. He noted after speaking with Staff members the more significant items needed more work and could not be presented prior to 2015.

Council Member Schmid said the 9<sup>th</sup> as it was with the five items appeared to be a long night. He suggested moving one of the items to the 16<sup>th</sup> and keeping both meetings.

Chair Price suggested moving the Amendment of the Municipal Percent for Art Policy from the  $9^{th}$  to the  $16^{th}$ .

Mr. Alaee agreed to move the item and suggested adding the airport.

Chair Price understood Staff requested more time before returning with the Project Safety Net but she asked for an update.

Mr. Keene agreed to speak to Staff but felt an information update report could be possible.

Council Member Klein did not feel the Percent for Art item was difficult or long. He believed the Health and Safety issue would be significant.

Chair Price agreed to move forward with the next steps on Project Safety Net.

Council Member Klein stated he was uncertain what the discussion would be surrounding the airport.

Chair Price clarified the title for the airport items appeared to be misleading. She felt the title should be rewritten for a better understanding of what needed to be done.

Mr. Keene noted the issue was with the San Francisco airport routing and noise level along with the seat on the Round Table in San Mateo County.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting was adjourned at 8:09 P.M.