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The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:10 p.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Present: Barton Beecham, Cordell, Drekmeier, Kishimoto, Klein, Kleinberg, Mossar

Absent: Morton

STUDY SESSION

1. City of Palo Alto’s Environmental Stewardship

Staff’s presentation on Environmental Stewardship in the City of Palo Alto - Accomplishments and Challenges Ahead focused on four technical areas:

- Reclaimed Water
- Waste Reduction
- Energy
- Greenhouse Gas

The presentation highlighted selected accomplishments in environmental stewardship with a presentation of Staff’s current focus on activities and progress as well as directions, goals and next steps.

- Reclaimed Water - Phil Bobel discussed advanced source control, meeting all irrigation requirements, multiple uses, the Service Area Master Plan and EIR as well as the Bay Area Wide Master Plan. All of those activities had been completed. The future focus of the program targeted on obtaining Federal funds, reducing salinity, addressing trace contaminants, achieving public acceptance, requiring recycled water use, and obtaining Hetch-Hetchy Allocation “credits” from San Francisco.

- Waste Reduction - Wendy Hediger noted despite having a program for over 20 years, the City had only a 62 percent Diversion Rate in 2004. She also discussed moving from waste reduction to zero waste, concentrating on increased waste prevention, reuse, recycling and composting activities throughout the City, continued efforts toward extended producer responsibility, continued efforts toward Green Design and Clean Production, and encouraging environmentally preferable purchasing throughout the City.

- Energy - Tom Auzenne noted Palo Alto Green was the number one program in the United States by participation rate with 14 percent of customers being enrolled and representing three percent of electricity use. The utilities focused on efficiency (a reduction in the City’s load by
four percent since 1999, $13 million invested, reduced electricity use by 38 million kilowatt hours (kWh) per year, reduced peak demand by 6.7 Mega Watts (MW), reduced gas consumption by 1.4 million therms per year, and clean supply where Palo Alto’s supply was far cleaner than either the California or United States power mix. The goals of the energy program were to: preserve local control of efficiency programs, develop “Zero Resource Waste” by flattening projected load growth, and entering into a “Low-Carb energy diet” by evaluating reductions in overall greenhouse gas content in the future resource mix.

- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and global warming - Karl Van Orsdol noted the City had a very modest impact of emissions, and that transportation, not energy, was the largest contributor to California (and global) GHG emissions. He noted that individuals could directly impact emissions. For example, one gallon of gasoline contributed 20 pounds of carbon dioxide (CO2), or that one kWh of electricity required to run a 100-watt light bulb for 10 hours produced 1.2 pounds of CO2. Palo Alto’s energy efficiency and solar programs had reduced Citywide CO2 emissions by over 30,000 tons per year since 1999. Additionally, the City was involved with key businesses in the Sustainable Silicon Valley program to reduce emissions Countywide. In regard to future directions, staff noted the steps involved in completing the GHG Registry process (2006), developing the Citywide Climate Action Plan (2007), and educating residents and businesses regarding greenhouse gas actions. Possible new considerations included evaluating programs to make the City climate neutral, and taking a look at promoting emissions reductions through market mechanisms by buying green tags or emission credits. Staff noted the leadership of the Green Ribbon Task Force (GRTF) would catalyze community involvement and participation in GHG reduction.

- In summary, Emily Harrison noted that each of the programs needed a high level of “community ownership” to fully engage business and residents in maximizing the impact of existing environmental programs and future initiatives to effectively reduce our environmental footprint.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 7:18 p.m.
The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 7:20 p.m.

Present: Barton, Beecham, Cordell, Drekmeier, Klein, Kishimoto, Kleinberg, Morton (arrived at 8:20 p.m.), Mossar

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Enid Pearson spoke regarding the Quimby Act and assurance that property development included parks and open spaces.

Michael Mora, Loma Verde, spoke regarding traffic control.

Kirsten Flynn, 471 Matadero Avenue, spoke regarding strengthening construction and demolition waste management.

Leif Erickson, Youth and Children Services (YCS), 4000 Middlefield Road D-3, spoke regarding an invitation to “Play at the Bay” YCS Family Service Day on Earth Day.

Judith Lo Vuolo-Bhushan, 3838 Mumford Place, spoke regarding garbage disposals.

Stan Christensen, 1650 College Avenue, spoke regarding sustainable development and land use policies in Palo Alto.

Susan Rosenberg, 1425 Stanford Avenue, spoke regarding the Canopy event on April 30, 2006, and distributed a copy of a recent Pacific Horticulture magazine featuring “The Front Gardens of Palo Alto.”

Arthur Keller, 3881 Corina Way, spoke regarding the Quimby Act and inclusion of Mitchell Park Community Center with the Mitchell Park Library redevelopment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Mossar, to approve Item Nos. 1 - 2 on the Consent Calendar.

1. From the UAC: Long-Term Electric Acquisition Plan (LEAP) Update and Revised 2006 LEAP Implementation Tasks with a Request for Approval to Redirect Local Generation Feasibility Study Efforts Toward Small-Scale Distributed Generation and Power Generation Ownership Alternatives Outside of Palo Alto
2. Approval of a Contract with O’Grady Paving Inc. in the Amount of $307,779 for Roadway and Traffic Signal Improvements at Gunn High School/Arastradero Road as Part of the Charleston-Arastradero Corridor Improvements - Capital Improvement Program Project PL-05002

MOTION PASSED 8-0, Morton absent.

REPORTS OF OFFICIALS

3. Recommendation for Council to Refer San Francisquito Creek Interim Flood Control Improvements to the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority

Arthur Keller, 3881 Corina Way, expressed support for taking interim measures, but the Council needed to be cautious about the recent study by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) which stated a high liquefaction risk may lead to the failure of the levees adjacent to the San Francisquito Creek.

Norman Beamer, 1005 University Avenue, President Crescent Park Neighborhood Association, said the Association supported the basic theme of the staff report (CMR:194:06). Both Palo Alto and East Palo Alto were most adversely affected by flooding from the Creek.

Art Kraemer, 1116 Forest Avenue, favored Section 104 and 215 of Public Law 99-662, which provided a mechanism for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to provide credit to a local sponsor for implementing interim flood control improvements in advance of the authorization and implementation of the full project. Therefore, earlier replacement of the Chaucer Street Bridge and improvement of the Highway 101 Bridge would comply with both sections.

Bob Moss, 4010 Orme Street, said repairing the Creek in the short term would not result in corrective action, but would mitigate the impact of flooding.

Crystal Gamage, 1568 Channing, urged the Council to adopt staff’s recommendations.

John Guislin, 225 Middlefield Road, said while he favored the Cost Sharing Agreement between the Corps and San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (SFCJPA), the six-year timeline for the feasibility study was too long for residents to risk an annual flood along the Creek. He supported interim actions.
Mary Schaefer, 742 DeSoto Drive, expressed her support for interim flood control measures.

Council Member Klein asked Dr. Schaaf for background information on his familiarity with the Creek and his involvement with Palo Alto.

Dr. Jim Schaaf, Consulting Civil Engineer, said his recent involvement with the City was as a consultant for the legal team defending the City of Palo Alto in the lawsuit that occurred after the 1998 flood. As part of that work, his staff investigated the locations where water was observed coming from the Creek. A model of the Creek was later developed that showed the areas where flooding occurred and how much flooding took place.

Council Member Klein understood Dr. Schaaf’s work and model had been turned over to the JPA.

Dr. Schaaf said yes. It had also been given to the Corps.

Council Member Klein asked for a summary of his conclusions from the February 1998 flood.

Dr. Schaaf said flooding occurred upstream on the Pope/Chaucer Street Bridge and in approximately 20 locations downstream between the Bridge and Highway 101. If the Middlefield and Pope/Chaucer Bridges were removed, the flooding would simply move downstream. Flooding on the East Palo Alto/Menlo Park side was a little greater while the Palo Alto side remained the same. Residents who lived near the Creek upstream from the Pope/Chaucer Bridge were unaffected because the water did not spill over. It spilled downstream.

Council Member Klein asked what steps could be taken in the interim to prevent the flooding that occurred in 1998.

Dr. Schaaf said the flow rate of the 1998 flood was above 7,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). It was not feasible to provide a 7,200 cfs capacity without tearing down the bridges and raising the banks with walls. Once the water surface elevation was raised, the walls would need continued building upstream.

Council Member Klein asked what if the goal changed.

Dr. Schaaf said if the Pope/Chaucer Street Bridge was removed, another 1,000 cfs would be sent downstream. In that instance, mitigation measures would be built to prevent flooding at the Pope/Chaucer Bridge. However, flooding would occur downstream the way it did in 1998.
Council Member Klein asked whether there were interim measures to prevent flooding if the level was changed to 6,000 cfs.

Dr. Schaaf said he did not believe the channel required deepening, but it would require raising the banks.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Kishimoto moved, seconded by Council Member Mossar, to approve staffs’ recommendation to:

1. Authorize the Mayor to send a letter to the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (SFCJPA) Executive Director requesting that the JPA identify and review options for interim flood control improvements along San Francisquito Creek.

2. Direct staff to submit a letter to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) during the San Francisquito Creek feasibility study public scoping comment period requesting the Corps address the options for interim flood control improvements as part of the feasibility study.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto said the Council needed to consider contingencies in the wake of not having Federal funds to depend upon. She asked at what point would the Council need to take action if the feasibility study funding was in place.

Greg Zlotnick, Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD), said President Bush did not provide monies for the proposed project in his budget. Congresswoman Anna Eshoo would continue to work on putting money back for the JPA.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto referred to a continuing resolution.

Mr. Zlotnick said with a continuing resolution the government would continue to use last year’s numbers until a new budget was adopted.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto asked for last year’s numbers.

Mr. Zlotnick said the County received $225,000 from the Corps in 2005 for the project. For 2006, the amount would remain the same along with the addition of the local cost share. The JPA would discuss possible options in the event there was a shortfall in funding. Annually, the Corps determined how much they needed to remain at full capability to move the project forward, which equated to approximately $900,000 for fiscal year 2007.
Vice Mayor Kishimoto asked how the interim project/phases would be built into the 100 year project. She also inquired whether it was incorporated into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Mr. Zlotnick said the draft letters from the staff report (CMR:194:06) asked to look at the ability to phase construction once an alternate was implemented. This project would likely consist of various components, which would provide interim improvements.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto asked whether the SCVWD had experience in using Section 104.

Mr. Zlotnick said yes in terms of being credited for moving projects more quickly. *Section 104 of Public Law 99-662* only applied once a project had been selected and it was moving towards the construction phase. Part of the cost share of a project fell on the locals who were 100 percent responsible for the land and property involved, which often put them over 50 percent of the total cost of the project.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto inquired about the timeline the JPA provided the Corps.

Mr. Zlotnick said he was hopeful the project would take three to five years as opposed to six. The SCVWD had done some work that contributed to the Corps process and would cut down on the time to complete the project.

Council Member Mossar made note of the memo at places regarding the bridge over San Francisquito Creek at Highway 101.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND THE SECONDER** to request staff to work cooperatively with the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (SFCJPA), the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA), and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), to achieve the goal of flood control improvements at Highway 101/San Francisquito Creek Bridge.

Council Member Drekmeier said he believed the biggest threat along the Creek was in East Palo Alto where the water level reached the top of the levees. He said a bypass channel that followed the original path of the Creek and emptied into the yacht harbor area would most likely address the problem.

Council Member Mossar indicated she had not proposed a particular project but requested that the discussions should take place. The goal was to take two projects and get the benefit of both projects by working cooperatively.
Vice Mayor Kishimoto clarified whether that was in order to advance the flood management needs in the lower region of San Francisquito Creek.

Council Member Mossar said yes.

Council Member Klein asked whether the JPA had a Plan B in the event President Bush’s position to eliminate funding for the project was sustained on a permanent basis.

Mr. Zlotnick said there was no Plan ‘B’; Federal elections occurred that could change appropriations in future years.

Council Member Klein asked for a specific timeline for the item to return.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto said it would have to occur after October 2006.

Mr. Zlotnick said staff would provide the Council with reports on JPA discussions.

Council Member Mossar said the JPA would receive official notification on October 1, 2006, with a meeting scheduled for later in October.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND THE SECONDER** that the item would return to Council in November 2006 for an update.

Council Member Cordell said her concern was to stop the flooding, and questioned the City’s legal liability if they failed to do so. If the Council approved the interim measure, would it be sufficient in limiting the City’s liability should there be flooding in the short-term.

City Attorney Gary Baum said yes as long as the City and the JPA had acted diligently and reasonably based on what the experts had indicated.

Mayor Kleinberg asked what could the Council expect the Corps to do with a request to address the options for interim flood control improvements, and would that extend the feasibility study.

Cynthia D’Agosta, Executive Director SFCJPA, said interim measures were not normally studied in a feasibility process. She did not anticipate the Corps would respond to the City having a separate study take place that was quicker than getting through the feasibility study, although it was fully acceptable to ask the Corps to look at phasing or solutions in the downstream or upstream.
Mayor Kleinberg asked why the Council had asked the Corps in a letter (Attachment F) to do something it would not do.

Director of Public Works Glenn Roberts said staff had attempted to ensure the local interests were represented in the best way possible. The letter to the Corps (Attachment F of the staff report (CMR:194:06)) was input to the scoping process.

Mayor Kleinberg said she had trouble seeing the significance.

Mr. Roberts believed the project would have multiple components. There would be something for the upstream, the downstream, along the channel, as well as an environmental enhancement. The question would then become which component should have priority. It was at that point the community’s input would be significant for the Corps to consider.

Ms. D’Agosta clarified the Corps would not take a separate study and look at what could be done in the interim. They were engaged with the JPA Management Team on a daily basis in managing the project. As a member of the JPA, it would be important to go on record asking for acceleration of the project as part of the JPA collaborative.

Mayor Kleinberg said staff recommended a letter be sent to the Executive Director of the SFCJPA requesting the JPA identify and review options for interim flood control improvements. She asked what the review process was by which staff’s request would be reviewed by the other partners. She also inquired regarding the type of work the JPA did in support of what the Corps was being asked to do.

Mr. Zlotnick said the other partners were aligned with Palo Alto.

Mayor Kleinberg asked whether the JPA would review interim options for flood control improvements.

Mr. Zlotnick said when staff reviewed the material with the Corps they would be looking to identify potential interim measures.

Mr. Roberts said he wanted the City to go on record asking the JPA and the JPA Management Team to take an equal advocacy role in presenting interim measures to the Corps.

Mayor Kleinberg said it was important that Palo Alto did what it could to express its commitment to ensure something happened. She expressed support for the motion.
Council Member Klein said it was important to keep on the pressure to see that a solution was accomplished in the shortest timeframe possible.

**MOTION PASSED** 9-0.

**COUNCIL MATTERS**

4. Colleagues Memo from Mayor Kleinberg, Vice Mayor Kishimoto and Council Members Drekmeier and Klein regarding Environmental Initiatives

Council Member Drekmeier said Palo Alto had a long tradition of environmental leadership. He liked the idea of using Earth Day annually to celebrate accomplishments and launch new initiatives.

**MOTION:** Council Member Drekmeier moved, seconded by Klein, to direct staff to:

1. Consult with CANOPY and other interested citizens and return to Council in the Spring of 2007 with a draft update to the Street Tree Management Plan.

2. Examine deconstruction and reuse as elements of the zero waste operational plan and/or the Construction and Demolition (C & D) ordinance and return to Council by the Spring of 2007 with recommendations for how reuse of C & D debris could be substantially enhanced, perhaps with doubling the present standard as our goal.

3. Examine the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) memo and the policies and return to Council by Spring 2007 with recommendations for incentives and policies that would lead to construction and remodeling in the private sector meeting some, or all, of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards.

4. Explore the benefits and costs of: a) installing additional and more user-friendly recycling containers on the streets in our business districts; b) a related public awareness campaign; and c) how the costs might be borne through public and/or private means, and report back to Council by the Spring of 2007.

5. Study the feasibility of developing a more extensive and inviting program, comparable to that for residential areas, for the recycling and composting of plant materials generated in our business and commercial districts, and report to the Council the results of such study by the Spring of 2007.

Council Member Klein concurred with Council Member Drekmeier. The Council conferred with staff and came up with the five initiatives that could...
be done with little staff time, at a comparatively low cost to the community while still making an impact on the environment.

Arthur Keller, 3881 Corina Way, inquired about setting up a registry of people who wished to declare climate neutrality.

Paul Gardner, 1935 Pulgas Street, East Palo Alto, said he had deconstructed approximately eight buildings in Palo Alto in the last year and found the building materials to be in very good condition. He encouraged the Council to find a way to prevent salvageable materials from going into the landfill.

Council Member Barton asked whether recycling in commercial districts would be a separate issue or would it be combined with the City’s zero waste. In regard to demolition debris and green building policies, he suggested the Council urge staff to talk to the business community to find out what affects they had on compliance. He inquired how the Colleagues Memo, the previous discussion on environmental stewardship, and the Mayor’s Green Ribbon Task Force (GRTF) synthesized together, and whether it created multiple versions of similar things for staff.

Mayor Kleinberg said staff was asked to look at everything and then come back with recommendations.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto hoped the zero waste plan would return to the Council by the Spring of 2007.

Council Member Morton expressed concern about the recommendation in Item 2. On the one hand, the Council asked staff to look at the feasibility of creating a Resource Recovery Center, while they had previously approved the closure of the recycling center at the landfill. He was in favor of taking another look at the issue.

Council Member Mossar asked staff to address the amount of staff time and costs for impacts on schedules for the proposed initiatives.

Director of Public Works Glenn Roberts said four of the five items contained therein were under the purview of the Public Works Department. He said the initiatives within his department were consistent with ongoing programs and activities, and he did not anticipate any significant increase in staff resources in order to implement them within the recommended timeline.

Assistant City Manager Emily Harrison said the same was true of the Planning and Community Environment Department with the Green Building Standards.
Council Member Mossar said the memo seemed to duplicate what was already ongoing.

Ms. Harrison said staff believed the initiatives were consistent with the direction previously given, but it was a new part of the work plan.

Council Member Mossar questioned if it was something staff was already engaged in why it merited a separate memorandum. She also inquired about the Mayor’s GRTF.

Mayor Kleinberg said she would share information regarding the GRTF once it was formatted.

Council Member Drekmeier said reuse was the most efficient form of recycling. He appreciated the way the initiative evolved the construction and demolition ordinance to focus more on dismantling and reuse of materials.

Council Member Barton noted the amount of paper it took in distributing the Council’s packet. He suggested going to a paperless packet within the following year.

**MOTION PASSED 9-0.**

5. **Colleagues Memo from Mayor Kleinberg, Vice Mayor Kishimoto and Council Member Klein regarding Santa Clara County Land Conservation Initiative**

   Resolution 8596 entitled “Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Support for the Santa Clara County Land Conservation Initiative”

Council Member Drekmeier said he would not participate in this item because he is employed by People for Land and Nature (PLAN), the sponsor of the Initiative.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Kishimoto moved, seconded by Klein, for the City Council to approve a resolution in support of the Santa Clara County Land Conservation Initiative.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto said the initiative presented long term consequences. It would affect unincorporated Santa Clara County, but had no affect on land designated for housing. Supporting the initiative was a first step in embracing change, progress, and economic prosperity with efficiency through land use.
SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Mossar moved, seconded by Morton, to continue this agenda item until the next Council meeting because the initiative was not provided with the agenda packet prior to the meeting.

Council Member Mossar said the initiative affected properties in the unincorporated portions of the County owned by individuals, and involved in private property issues. She felt the item was not noticed properly and lack of supporting attachments made it unclear to the public.

Council Member Morton concurred with Council Member Mossar. He believed it was in the public’s best interest to put the matter over a week.

Mayor Kleinberg asked whether the item would be put over an additional week.

Assistant City Manager Emily Harrison said the item would return on the Council Agenda for May 1, 2006.

David Olerich, 2138 Wellesley Street, Co-Chair of Local Government Relations Committee for Silicon Valley Association of Realtors (SVAR), agreed the matter should be put over. It was a premature resolution that would impose a disproportional responsibility on the land owners for planning errors that occurred in the past.

Chris Draper, 19400 Stevens Creek Blvd., Cupertino, Government Affairs Coordinator Silicon Valley Association of Realtors, concurred with the comments of David Olerich. SVAR supported open space that was done in a way that did not harm the property rights of the land owners.

Paul Cardus, 19460 Stevens Creek Blvd., Cupertino, concurred further consideration should be given to the initiative.

Walt Hays, 355 Parkside Drive, said the initiative would only affect the hillsides, the ranch lands and large scale agriculture. Those properties had been that way for many years and the County General Plan (CGP) called for them to remain as such. A property would generally sell for its existing use with no problem. A problem arose when land owners wished to convert their land for a speculative value to convert it to urban use.

Arthur Keller, 3881 Corina Way, concurred with the comments of Walt Hays. He noted a large fraction of the land was covered by the Williamson Act.

Michael Closson, on behalf of Acterra, said the Board of Directors endorsed the initiative.

Herb Borock, P.O. Box 632, expressed support for the motion.
Betsy Allyn, 4186 Wilmar Avenue, said the initiative petition should be placed on the election ballot. It was up to the citizens to determine the outcome, not the Council.

Mary Davey, Los Altos Hills, presented the initiative which was scheduled to appear on the November 2006 ballot. The intent of the initiative was to ensure that the County preservation of open space, hillsides and ranch lands and agriculture remained.

Council Member Morton asked whether the item would return on the Consent Calendar and, if so, could the public still speak to the item.

Ms. Harrison said yes.

Council Member Morton said he would like the public to have more time to familiarize themselves with the initiative. The Williamson Act had been effective in helping people keep their farm land, but its protection only lasted 10 years. He support putting the matter over.

INTEGRATED INTO THE SUBSTITUTE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER that the agenda item return on the Consent Calendar.

Council Member Mossar clarified she had not been asked to endorse the initiative nor had it been explained to her.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto expressed support for voting on the matter that evening.

Mayor Kleinberg failed to see how the matter being placed on the Consent Calendar would add to the public debate. She noted the information was made available by staff prior to the Council meeting.

Council Member Morton said the public would still be able to speak to the item on the Consent Calendar.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED 2-5, Morton, Mossar yes, Drekmeier not participating, Beecham absent.

MOTION PASSED 6-1, Mossar no, Drekmeier not participating, Beecham absent.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES

Council Member Mossar stated her understanding was the Policy & Services Committee (P&S) would review policies and procedures relative to
colleagues’ memos and she recommended the following for discussion: 1) number of signatures required; 2) the timeline and inclusion of materials for the agenda; 3) the type of supporting materials to be included; 3) who is responsible for providing the cost data, staff impacts and impacts on City work priorities; and 4) also, to clarify the process for City Council approval of ballot measures and other voter initiatives.

Ms. Harrison confirmed Council had requested review of Council Protocols at the January Retreat and P&S discussed this item at its first meeting in 2006. Staff requested direction to formally codify the number of signatures required on a Colleagues’ Memo.

Mayor Kleinberg noted the Council unanimously approved a P&S recommendation in July 2002 regarding approval of ballot measures and legislative advocacy processes, and adopted a number of guidelines as the basis of the City’s legislative advocacy program. Since it is current policy, it could be used as a starting point and would be made available to P&S members.

Council Member Mossar recommended that document be included, as well as the Protocols and Procedures so everything may be integrated into one document.

Vice Mayor Kishimoto referred to the excellent report on the Consent Calendar on the Long Term Electric Acquisition Plan (LEAP), which indicates the change in policy direction to more distributive generation and the energy efficiency potential.

**FINAL ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

**ATTEST:**  
City Clerk

**APPROVED:**  
Mayor
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