



POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

Special Meeting
April 20, 2011

Roll Call

Chairperson Price called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burt, Klein, Holman, Price (Chair)

Absent:

Oral Communications

None

Agenda Items

1. Follow Up Issues re: Council Protocols and Procedures.

Don Larkin, Assistant City Attorney, reviewed the changes made to the Protocols and Procedures books at the last Policy & Services Committee including some of the language changes in the policy statements.

Council Member Klein asked if all developmental projects were quasi-judicial.

Mr. Larkin stated zone changes were generally considered legislative and Planned Community (PC) zoning was different but overall was legislatively treated as quasi-judicial for disclosure purposes. He noted it was not Staff's intent to expand the definition to include other types of projects. The idea was that, within that group of quasi-judicial, this is what they were talking about in development projects.

Council Member Klein suggested adjusting the wording to reflect a quasi judicial development project.

Council Member Holman stated she would agree to change the wording to accommodate quasi-judicial and PC development projects.

Council Member Klein noted other wording required revisions to increase clarity regarding whether suggestions were formal or conceptual. This remained difficult to determine.

Mr. Larkin stated this was the reason for the wording, "a particular project," in order to eliminate this confusion.

Council Member Klein stated it remained unclear how the statement provided guidance to a Council Member.

Mr. Larkin stated Staff struggled to clarify this. He requested guidance from the Finance Committee on how to aid Council Members in determining the difference between property owners trying to figure out what to do with a specific property or somebody looking for feedback on a specific project.

Council Member Klein asked for the conclusion of where this ultimately would lead.

Mr. Larkin stated if discussions led to Council Members developing an opinion on how to develop a project based on off-the-record conversations, it had to be reported.

Council Member Holman stated they had not heard the right definition; however, an applicant requesting input from Council prior to the application process circumvented the entire purpose of the proposed policy.

Council Member Burt reviewed hypothetical instances illustrating where to draw the line in order to find some clarity on the issue.

Mr. Larkin stated he struggled with the issue because he did not want to make policy determinations for the Council or make recommendations on what the policy should be. The intent in the language was to find something conceptual a Council Member could respond to.

Council Member Burt asked if Council Member Holman could clarify what she meant by "or conceptual."

Council Member Holman noted she had trouble with this wording as well. She

said she hoped to prevent the circumventing of their procedures by an applicant, who might come to Council for input or opinions on a project that is formed prior to filing out an application.

Council Member Burt stated this language was still fuzzy and he did not want to see language in the procedures that was ambiguous.

Mr. Fred Balin spoke regarding the five-day window of the release of The Staff Report. He referred to materials in the minutes and Motions made regarding materials received outside the normal channels. He hoped the wording regarding the late release of materials could be resolved, in order to keep these materials in, as an important aspect to preventing more circumvention.

Mr. Tom Jordon strongly recommended that wording should be drafted by the Committee rather than by Staff. He suggested the two people discussing it should come up with language that would work and then move it forward. He made further comments on the quasi-judicial discussions. He stated that PC projects were in fact quasi-judicial projects. He stated they were land use planning projects and were required to have a master plan.

Council Member Holman suggested defining "project" as "for purposes of this section, for a quasi-judicial or PC development project subject to these rules is a formulated plan to go forward with a particular project or development." She said the proposed verbiage indicated there were specific details having to do with a project being discussed.

MOTION: Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Klein, that the Policy and Services Committee recommend the City Council adopt the following language in the Staff Report, page 3, Definition of Project:

"For purposes of this Section IV, a Quasi-Judicial or Planned Community Development Project subject to these rules is a formulated plan, ~~whether formal or conceptual~~ to go forward with a particular project or development."

And, the following language on page 1 of the Staff report, Study Sessions:

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~~ discussions by ~~City staff~~, and detailed questioning and brainstorming by Council on issues of significant interest, including

~~City policy matters, zoning applications, and major public works projects.~~ 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 Council consideration meetings, but as no action can be taken at a study session. ~~During regular study sessions, public comments are typically~~ Public comments on study session items may be received together with oral communications ~~at the end of the~~ immediately following the session or may be heard during discussion of the item as determined by the Mayor. ~~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 Holman stated the language, as amended as she proposed, would provide some assurance to colleagues that they were referring to a formulated plan.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to amend the Staff recommended language for Study Sessions on the Staff Report, page 2(b) No Formal Rules:

a) No Formal Rules. Study sessions are intended to be conducive to in-depth factual 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, and the Mayor shall have discretion to determine the appropriate process for conducting the study session, including when public comment and oral communications will be heard. Examples of potential formats for conducting a study session include, but are not limited to:

- ~~• Town hall style or round table style meetings (these may be particularly appropriate for applicant and community dialogue with the Council related to specific development projects)~~
- ~~• Staff or other city-sponsored informational presentations~~
- ~~• Council question and answer.~~

Council Member Holman asked how future Councils would understand study session formats without these examples.

Council Member Klein stated the Mayor had the discretion to determine an appropriate process for conducting a study session.

Council Member Klein questioned the suggested verbiage on page 3, paragraph 1 of the Staff Report regarding follow up meetings. He asked for clarification regarding the intent of the additional language.

Council Member Holman stated action could not be taken at study sessions. So the reason for the followup Council meeting was in order for the Council to take action and give direction.

Council Member Klein stated action and direction were not the same thing.

Council Member Holman said study sessions addressed policy issues such as land use and appropriateness of location, but project specifics would not be addressed.

Council Member Klein stated there were several meeting types, and the meeting they were discussing above was not covered in those meeting types. If something is agendized it is because some form of action is being taken

Council Member Holman stated the purpose was to take action or not, because the Council may or may not agree to take an action. However, they were not to get into any specific details of the project.

Council Member Klein asked again, if the item was agendized why Council were not being asked to take action.

Council Member Holman stated there had been meetings where projects that went to council prior to having formal review. In the past, there had been study sessions on these projects where very finite specifics have been indicated which tie the hands of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) and the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC).

Council Member Klein understood this scenario, but stated that the paragraph they were discussing did not speak to this.

Council Member Holman stated they were talking about a formal City Council meeting where action can be taken to give guidance to an applicant.

Council Member Klein stated if the Council had agendized an item inappropriately

then somebody needed to bring that up, but if it were properly agendized then they were to do what was appropriate under that item.

Council Member Holman stated what they were trying to do was identify what was appropriate given the early stage of review.

Mr. Larkin stated the language would come into play with a PC application or in a City-sponsored project, such as the library project.

City Manager, James Keene, stated one problem with study sessions was the Council Members can say things that the ARB or Staff may construe as needing to be incorporated formally in some way, but these are not real actions by the Council. As a prelude to the Council's ultimate decisions, they are referring to intermediate type meetings. He agreed with Council Member Klein that this would be a regular Council meeting and this would be an agendized item requiring Council action. They could try to prescribe some limits to their actions.

Council Member Holman stated the limits would be policy issues and not the project specifics, which is why it was stated that the guidance should address policy issues.

Mr. Larkin stated the PC zone is the only place where it does not fall within the guidelines of the existing zoning ordinance.

Council Member Holman stated this had been an issue for years. She spoke regarding the policy direction coming prior to environmental review. The language was retained to ensure the direction was not binding.

Council Member Burt asked who this direction was intended for.

Council Member Holman stated the direction was intended for both the applicant and Staff.

Council Member Burt noted if it was a PC they do not give the applicant direction, but they give them guidance.

Council Member Holman gave her observations and experiences of what occurs at study sessions.

Council Member Burt asked if her explanations and observations were moving outside of what they were discussing at the moment which was PCs.

Council Member Holman stated she was discussing PCs and City projects and whether to go forward on any given project, and does the Committee want Staff to spend time in their exploration of these projects. With a followup action at a Council meeting they can give clear direction whether or not to move forward.

Council Member Price agreed with Council Member Klein's comments. She encouraged flexible language regarding study sessions emphasizing that they were a "safe environment."

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to delete the following from the Staff Recommendations, first paragraph, page three of the Staff Report:

~~(1) Follow up meetings regarding development projects. Council may direct staff to bring study session matters back for Council consideration at a future meeting, prior to formal review of the project. If Council wishes to provide guidance or direction to an applicant at a follow up meeting, such guidance should address policy issues, including such as land use and appropriateness of location, but should not address project specifics (such as number of units, square footage, density, etc.) prior to environmental analysis and Board and Commission review. Any guidance provided by the Council prior to formal review 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 noted there were times when study sessions were rushed at the end. He stated the feedback loop and individual Council Member comments are sometimes lost. He suggested they consider either longer study sessions to prevent this or a followup session to catch up these comments.

AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT: Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member XXXX, to retain the first sentence of the first paragraph on page three of the Staff Report to read as follows:

~~(1) Follow up meetings regarding development projects. Council may direct staff to bring study session matters back for Council consideration at a future meeting, prior to formal review of the project. If Council wishes to provide guidance or direction to an applicant at a follow up meeting, such guidance should address policy issues, including such as land use and appropriateness of location, but should not address project specifics (such as number of units, square footage, density, etc.) prior to environmental analysis and Board and Commission review.~~

~~Commission review. Any guidance provided by the Council prior to formal review 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.~~

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND

Council Member Holman provided a further example of an issue that resulted in poor Study Session policies with the 800 High Street project.

Council Member Klein added that the present rules needed to be enforced rather than adding layers to the process.

AMENDMENT PASSED: 3-1 Holman no

Council Member Burt asked if they were voting on everything else, at what point did they consider the changes that Mr. Fred Balin brought forth.

Council Member Holman suggested that this be done separately, or it could be added as an amendment.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 4-0

Mr. Larkin spoke regarding the outside normal channels language. He stated Staff was comfortable with the language in the minutes and the changes within can be incorporated into the motion.

Council Member Price asked if he was speaking to the minutes they had in front of them.

Mr. Larkin confirmed.

Council Member Burt clarified that the minutes reflected, "If a Council Member receives materials other than through City staff they would notify the City Clerk and City Manager as soon as possible." If so, in order to eliminate any ambiguity, he wished to place this as a Motion.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman that the Policy and Services Committee recommend to the City Council the following language be included in the Procedures Handbook:

“If a Council Member receives materials other than through City Staff they would notify the City Clerk and City Manager as soon as possible.”

Council Member Klein stated applicants and members of the public had to be treated the same, so he questioned what they would do with regard to an email/s received from citizens over a weekend prior to a Monday meeting.

Mr. Larkin stated this was not intended to include phone calls, but anything added to the administrative record should be given to the City Clerk as soon as possible.

Council Member Price asked if he was suggesting that all the emails the Council receives should be forwarded to the City Clerk.

Mr. Larkin stated he was not suggesting anything, but this was a policy previously discussed at the last meeting. If it was a policy matter being discussed at the meeting the email should be forwarded to the clerk.

Council Member Burt asked if this could be pointed out in the meetings.

Mr. Larkin did not have them. He knew the issue had come up but did not know if it was resolved.

Council Member Holman went from memory and not the minutes, but she believed it was clarified because they had talked about it in the context of materials that would come forward that substantially affected a project. It was not specifically to include email comments that you get from someone in support of a project or in non-support of a project. It was for literal focus on substantive information that would change or influence a project.

Council Member Klein stated he was still troubled by this and the Council Members frequently get citizen emails that do not limit themselves to opinions of yes or no on a project and then provide lots of information.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to defer this discussion for future Policy and Services Committee meeting.

Council Member Holman suggested this return to Council rather than coming back to Policy & Services.

Council Member Burt preferred closure on the matter.

Council Member Klein did not expect this to be on the agenda, but did not believe it was a trivial matter since it puts an unnecessary burden on the Council.

Council Member Holman suggested, when this item returns at the next meeting that it returns as a full redline version so they have the context.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 4-0

2. Review of the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project Draft Development Agreement.

Council Member Klein recused himself from this item.

Steven Emslie, Director of Planning, corrected an error in the Staff Report reflecting the May 11th Planning Commission recommendation versus the City Council recommendation.

Mike Petersen, Vice President of Special Projects, stated he represented both Stanford Hospital and Clinics and Lucile Packard's Children's Hospital. He gave an overview of their activities since mid January. He gave information on the GO Pass program. He continued with a slide presentation on funding structures. He stressed they were adamant about getting to go through all the steps necessary to get the permits to make sure that the contractors and subcontractors provide the necessary information and procedures to get the Construction Use Tax revenue flowing to the City.

Council Member Burt asked for clarification on several PowerPoint slides regarding community benefits. He asked if those were a combination of what Stanford Hospital described as benefits and what the City described partially as benefits and partially as mitigation. He stated they had agreed to disagree over how to categorize them. They agreed they were the right measures and beneficial to addressing the issues. He stated it was important not to describe them as community benefits.

Mr. Keene stated that was they case, and they could also see that this was not a disagreement.

Council Member Burt noted that this was a full agreement with meaningful substantial measures, that were addressing the issues of the project, and that everyone was in agreement with. He also discussed the change in the cost of

the GO Pass was not because the City asked for an expansion of the program. The cost of the program increased because of CalTrain increases.

Mr. Emslie confirmed this was correct.

Council Member Holman spoke to page 68 in the Staff Report, and the monitoring of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs, and shuttle service downtown.

Mr. Keene noted she was speaking to the language in the Draft Development Agreement.

Council Member Holman stated there was talk of linkages to downtown, but everything stopped at the train station.

Mr. Emslie stated the numbers lead to a focus on getting people from train to job centers at the hospitals. Most of downtown was walkable, whereas the hospital was not as walkable.

Council Member Holman noted the number of increased patient visitor trips annually was in the six figures. She asked why it did not make sense to get them from the medical center to downtown to support the retail sector.

Mr. Emslie stated there were traffic engineers who had some of those numbers, but generally it came up that there was a tremendous amount of patient use of the transit system. Due to the nature of that type of trip, they would be using their automobile for the most part, in need of hospitalization or other clinic practices and may use less transit.

Council Member Holman stated she had been referring to page 2 of 12 of the Staff Report for her previously noted projections.

Mr. Emslie stated transit was a way to reduce traffic and was dependent on patients using vehicles if they did want to access services for the most part. The traffic engineers felt they were more likely to engender vehicle trips rather than shuttle trips to and from the hospital.

Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney, stated in terms of using the shuttle service to mitigate the traffic from a CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) -perspective, they focused on the patient trips because those represented the peak hour trips. They also focused on employee trips. The agreement also involved an expanded TDM program. It was expected, at some point, that

expanded service to downtown could be added.

Council Member Holman asked what the leverage was at that point.

Ms. Silver noted certain criteria Stanford Hospital needed to meet in terms of trip reductions. If the existing program is not effective in reaching those triggers than Stanford Hospital and the City would collectively look at other options.

Council Member Holman, noted on page 68 of the packet in monitoring the TDM programs it was stated that the hospitals cannot guarantee the results of these programs. However, the hospital must monitor the success of the programs from the date of their initial project approvals until 2025. On other occasions they have looked at consideration for the 51 years, 30 years or so. If traffic and air quality are such huge issues, she asked why they stopped at 2025.

Mr. Emslie stated that 2025 was the built-out year where they will know if they are meeting their TDM targets of 35 percent.

Council Member Holman stated a building can have the same uses for many years, but if things changed over the years it may generate more traffic. She asked about the likelihood of extending that canvassing program.

Mr. Emslie stated he would need to take an additional look at this.

Ms. Silver stated the monitoring program continued for the life of a project.

Council Member Holman stressed the importance of effective management.

Council Member Price clarified the TDM process and the above comment about the mitigation monitoring plan, which was part of a super process, was something much more detailed in that they would anticipate where in the mitigation monitoring plan there were more specifics.

Ms. Silver agreed this was the case.

Council Member Price stated she appreciated the work on the assurance of construction use tax revenue done by Stanford Hospital, Lucile Packard and the City Manager in addressing these concerns.

Bill Phillips, of Stanford Hospital, stated the practice was straightforward and was incorporated in a Board of Equalization item regulation, which allowed contractors with contracts of \$5 million or more to take out on-site licenses that

direct most of those use tax items under their control to the City. What the hospital would do is provide in the contractor's paperwork that they meet those requirements. They must obtain the on-site sales licenses that would allow the reporting of their use tax revenues and the allocation of those to the local body, which in this case would be the City of Palo Alto.

Council Member Price stated she was confused about how this was enforced.

Mr. Phillips stated they would expect this to be reported and they would expect the City to hold license numbers and monitor the information as well. He noted they would share the information on their end as well.

Council Member Price appreciated the expansion and discussion of the TDM programs, although there were still a lot of unknowns. She asked if it was appropriate to assume that if there were new or more effective practices employed elsewhere that this would be something examined in the course of this development agreement.

Mr. Emslie stated they had the ability to make corrections and redirect the dollar amounts to under effective measures.

Council Member Price stated there was reference in the original draft to monies being allocated to AC transit. She asked if any of this language or discussion included exploration of allocating money to VTA transit as well.

Mr. Emslie stated they had the flexibility to look at this.

Council Member Burt asked about the GO Pass and the percentage of usage.

Mr. Emslie stated the numbers were getting better and higher, at 22 percent, recently.

Mr. Phillips said his understanding was that it was just over 20 percent.

Council Member Burt stated this usage would be interesting to watch on both the campus and hospital, since the hospital was closer to the station.

Council Member Price spoke to transportation and interchange improvements in terms of engineering and traffic engineering including Opticom Systems. She asked if the Opticom System was a generic technique or improvement.

Mr. Emslie stated it was a generic system. Emergency vehicles use it to override

the traffic signals.

Council Member Holman, pointed to the language about the GO Pass on page 23 of 51, and the top of page 24. "If the cost of obtaining GO Passes exceeds the GO Pass amount, the hospital has the option to elect either to purchase the GO passes at the then applicable price or to terminate the obligation to provide the GO Passes or a substantially similar program." She noted this was where the flexibility comes in that was mentioned prior. She asked how confident Staff was over this language.

Ms. Silver stated this issue was looked into, and from a CEQA perspective, they did need to mitigate the intersections that showed a level of significance. The language was inserted for that reason. They have looked at some alternatives for expanded shuttle programs and that there will be an overall improvement of intersections surrounding the project, so they are confident in limiting the language to these particular intersections.

Council Member Holman noted she was going a bit wider than that. She stated it was not a development agreement. There would be impacts, maybe not at the same intersections or in the same areas. As far as mitigation measures, yes, that was understood. She felt a broader application may help them to actually address the environmental impacts and care quality impacts in the development agreement versus a specific mitigation measure.

Ms. Silver noted this made sense, although they were still required, at a minimum, to mitigate the impacts that were identified in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) before the Development Agreement can proceed.

Norman Beamer noted he had spoken prior regarding the issues including the upstream retention basis as part of the Community Benefit Agreement.

Robert Moss noted this was the biggest project thus far in the City. He noted traffic needed to be addressed. He hoped for careful, cost effective planning process for this project including catastrophic event planning.

Council Member Price discussed cataclysmic events and acts of God. She stated a Development Agreement was based on the assumption that there were assurances and some predictability as to outcomes.

Ms. Silver stated what Ms. Price was referring to was a *force majeure*, which typically referred to catastrophic events such as earthquakes, strikes and wars. Under the Development Agreement, if such an event occurs it operates to

suspend both parties' obligations. She stated Mr. Moss was referring to what happens if there are other events that are unforeseen such as the applicant is just not able to fulfill their obligations due to poor planning or some other unforeseen occurrence, and that is just a standard land use type of enforcement issue. She noted this can happen, and if applicants are not meeting the obligations under the entitlement permits then typical enforcement action takes place.

Council Member Burt asked if, for whatever reason, the cost of concrete or steel triples (for example) and the cost of the project increased well above projections, this in no way would diminish their obligation for these mitigations and Development Agreements to the City.

Ms. Silver stated this was correct.

Council Member Holman stated that the extension of the El Camino Lease was critical and El Camino Park was counted towards the Parkland requirements.

Mr. Emslie stated the criteria they used to decide what would be pulled forward had a direct relationship to the project, such things as community wellness, healthcare, community enhancements, strong sustainable landmarks and the like.

Council Member Holman stated the location of this park benefited those who were visiting the medical center, as an example of ways the project could give back to the community. She also discussed redundant power sources.

Mr. Keene stated there had been discussions on redundant power sources.

Council Member Holman did not think the redundant power discussions were unrelated to this project. She asked what leverage they had here on this issue.

Council Member Burt stated they had not yet advanced to the point where they could effectively apply some of the characteristics of a potential agreement yet. He stated all the indications he had were that there were very serious discussions about this, but they were not in a position yet to bring something to the table.

Art Kramer stated the major concern with Stanford Hospital was Slack.

Council Member Burt spoke to the laundry list of items that the press had mischaracterized as a set of requirements. This was clearly not the case. Everyone had agreed this was a framework for discussions. He said they have

narrowed things down to a comprehensive agreement and have before them tonight what appears to address what Council had identified as the major outstanding issues. He then spoke to the cost neutrality issues, which the press has often misunderstood. In front of them now, he stated they had fundamentally a strong set of agreements.

Mr. Emslie stated the Committee had received their packets at least a half a dozen times and it had been modified many times as well.

Council Member Price stated she agreed with many of Council Member Burt's comments. She said the cost neutrality issue was critical to the debate. She was comfortable with the comments and proposals being brought forward.

Council Member Holman expressed everyone's work on the materials. She agreed perfection would not be achieved on the materials. She reiterated the importance of inclusion of items that cost Stanford Hospital little or no money such as the inclusion of the park area previously mentioned. She also agreed the second dedicated source of power was important. She pointed out some constricted language regarding the intersection funding on page 24, regarding the CalTrain GO Passes. She asked about costs on Table 1 regarding page 3 of 12 on the Staff Report, page 22 in the packet, the ADE analysis numbers. She stated these do reflect similar costs for Public Works and Administrative Service numbers.

Mr. Emslie stated they are comfortable with the numbers and they included the direct costs, as well as overhead and administrative costs, which were the main differences between the two.

Council Member Holman also hoped for better connectivity to downtown. She spoke again to the on-site use tax license issue. 1:35:51

Lalo Perez Director of Administrative Services,

Council Member Burt

Council Member Holman

Council Member Burt forward comments to council not recommend adoption as a whole

Mr. Keene borrowing from finance committee report in a different place than in finance. Recommend: page four of 12 committee endorse package of special

attention 1,2,3 add resolution of fiscal issue with terms . . . adding 4th bullet to restatement of dedication of 2 million to psn.

Council Member Holman no mitigations

Council Member Burt asked if feir was a concern

Mr. Keene said yes.

Council Member Burt no recommendation on feir absent #2 inclusive

Mr. Emslie

Mr. Keene

Council Member Burt dev agreement allows them did not agree shouldn't make recommendation

Council Member Price psn make sure they make it happen

Mr. Keene

Council Member Burt gives city latitude points on pages 4 & 12

Mr. Keene yes

Pat moved p&s recommend to council our support for the summary sttaetments surrounding this project embodied on 4 & 12 staff report 1-3 addition that #1 include recommendation of support for the cost neutrality proposal 4/20/11 by sumc and that #2 assure that the health care housing and community improvement funding give descretion to the city to allow expenditure of funds to psn. Seconded by Price

Mr. Keene

Council Member Price

Council Member Holman is different than understanding of what cm needed she thought cm needed recommending dev agreement. Motion is awknolege three mpoints and additions recommending policy applications to council.

Mr. Keene was recommending

Council Member Burt **is appropriate the motion include language that the committee support dev agreement in principle with in the inclusion of numbered items stated in original motion.**

Council Member Holman

Council Member Burt
Council Member Holman

Council Member Burt

Council Member Price

Council Member Holman

Council Member Price

MOTION PASSED: 2-1, Holman no

MOTION: Council Member XX moved, seconded by XX, that the Policy and Services Committee XXXX.

MOTION PASSED 4-0.

II. Future Meetings and Agendas

May 10, 2011: Anti Smoking ordinance,

III. Adjournment

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

COFFEE POT