



# POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE WORKING MINUTES

Regular Meeting  
February 12, 2013

Chairperson Kniss called the meeting to order at 7:07 P.M. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Klein, Kniss (Chair), Price

Absent: Holman

Chair Kniss suggested moving Agenda Item Number 1 to last and Agenda Item Number 3 to first.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Price to move Agenda Item Number 3- Discussion and Review of the Legislative Action Program Manual and the 2013 Federal and State Legislative Priorities forward to be heard first, followed by Agenda Item Number 2- Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of December 31, 2012 and Revised Workplan, and hear Agenda Item Number 1- Referral from City Council to Establish a Definition of Council Liaison Role for Boards and Commissions and Community Groups that Council Members are designated to in Section 2.4 in the City Council Protocol last.

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

## AGENDA ITEMS

3. Discussion and Review of the Legislative Action Program Manual and the 2013 Federal and State Legislative Priorities.

Chair Kniss reported she, the Mayor, and Sheila Tucker had discussed the report from Van Scoyoc Associates. She requested Mr. Young and Mr. Palmer provide highlights from their report.

# WORKING MINUTES

Steve Palmer, Van Scoyoc Associates, provided an overview of the federal legislative process. There was slightly more political comity in Washington after the Taxpayer Relief Act passed. Federal legislators working together was a positive sign. The new group of legislators was not as conservative as the prior group. Many positions in the Cabinet were being replaced. The President and Republicans indicated they wanted immigration reform, gun control, and budget reform. The sequence of events around those issues would frame either constructive legislation or gridlock for the following two years. Most people in Washington felt sequestration would occur on March 1, 2013. If sequestration occurred, there would be a dramatic cutback in overall spending. He felt a showdown on spending would occur on the appropriations bill at the end of March, which could result in a government shutdown.

Chair Kniss asked about the effect on cities.

Mr. Palmer explained the effect would be a great deal of uncertainty about whether funding would flow from the federal government. In addition, furloughed employees would slow the funding stream. At the end of May 2013, the debt limit issue would return. These major fiscal issues would determine whether or not this Congress worked together.

Council Member Klein expected sequestration to occur on March 1, 2013 and inquired how sequestration would affect the atmosphere in Washington.

Chair Kniss requested an explanation of sequestration.

Mr. Palmer reported sequestration was a mechanism by which Congress and the President required \$1.2 trillion be saved through either spending cuts or new revenue, or \$109 billion each year for ten years be removed from federal spending. Prior sequestration measures had been rescinded. Sequestration would be significantly harmful to people working in the federal government.

Council Member Klein asked why different amounts were being stated in sequestration discussions.

Mr. Palmer could not answer that. He guessed the amounts were larger than necessary to allow for negotiations.

Council Member Price inquired whether sequestration would result in appropriated funds being held rather than distributed.

# WORKING MINUTES

Mr. Palmer stated appropriated funds would not be held. Congress had appropriated funds through March 27, 2013, but had yet to act on funding beyond March 27. Because the Office of Management and Budget had been holding funds, budget cuts would come from existing funding and future funding.

Council Member Price indicated the uncertainty resulted from not knowing where budget cuts would occur.

Mr. Palmer agreed. The process of sequestration required more budget cuts on December 31, 2013. Additional uncertainty resulted from not knowing if the President and Congress would allow a second round of budget cuts or negotiate a deal. The \$109 billion per year budget cuts would shrink over time because of interest savings. \$4 billion would be cut from the budget in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 and \$8 billion more in FY 2014. Substantial cuts would occur no matter what.

James Keene, City Manager, inquired about the amount of the federal budget for FY 2013.

Mr. Palmer believed it was more than \$1 trillion.

Thane Young, Van Scoyoc Associates, suggested the budget amount was \$1.2 trillion.

Chair Kniss recalled sequestration concerned a division between military and human services, and inquired whether that division would continue.

Mr. Palmer explained half of sequestration cuts would come from defense and half from non-defense domestic programs.

Chair Kniss indicated the non-defense programs would affect human services and cities and counties. Sequestration would have a chilling effect. She asked Mr. Palmer and Mr. Young to discuss the services they provided to the City.

Mr. Young reported they notified the City of federal grant opportunities, monitored High Speed Rail (HSR), and dealt with flood control improvements on San Francisquito Creek. They were active in a provision of the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program which would have required all residents to continue paying flood insurance after the flood

# WORKING MINUTES

protection system was complete. They were able to defeat that provision in both the House and the Senate.

Council Member Klein felt that was a significant achievement.

Mr. Young noted the City was heavily engaged on that issue.

Council Member Klein inquired about the groups supporting the provision.

Mr. Young indicated supporters were the insurance community and people concerned that the Flood Insurance Program encouraged development in flood plain areas. It was a difficult issue, because national organizations did not have specific policies.

Chair Kniss inquired whether Van Scoyoc Associates represented other cities on the flood insurance provision.

Mr. Young responded yes.

Mr. Palmer added they had worked on the transportation bill to preserve funding for bike and pedestrian projects, but were not as successful because funding was decreased by approximately one half.

Chair Kniss felt there was time to alter that funding because the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) was for two years.

Mr. Palmer stated they could work with the City to try to restore funding through coalitions with others. In addition, they worked on the Post Office acquisition; however, that was placed on hold as the City developed background information.

Chair Kniss noted the Post Office was a concern for the City and a historical landmark.

Council Member Klein asked what would happen with the United States Postal Service (USPS) with respect to the cut backs.

Mr. Young explained the USPS was not a federal agency; it operated on its own.

# WORKING MINUTES

Chair Kniss requested an explanation of the USPS's relationship to the federal government.

Mr. Young knew the USPS was not a federal agency, but was unsure how it operated. The USPS was insolvent, yet it did not want to sell or modernize assets.

Chair Kniss inquired whether the USPS received federal funding.

Mr. Young believed it did.

Mr. Palmer explained the USPS reduced services in order to acquire federal funding.

Mr. Keene reported market forces and funding actuarial costs of pension plans and benefits were major problems for the USPS.

Council Member Klein stated the USPS could reduce services, because it was no longer borrowing from the federal government.

Chair Kniss noted Council priorities of the creek, flood insurance, and HSR. Without earmarks, the City was relegated to applying for grants. She hoped Van Scoyoc Associates would bring more grant opportunities to the City.

Mr. Palmer explained earmarked funds would still be distributed through discretionary grants. Federal agencies did solicit grant proposals, and they spent a fair amount of time working with different departments and agencies to understand what they were looking for. The agencies who characterized their projects as fulfilling the Administration's goals were more likely to receive grants. They attempted to help by targeting those grant opportunities.

Mr. Young wanted to take the unique strengths of Palo Alto to the federal agencies and look for opportunities to match federal objectives with Palo Alto's capabilities. Agencies would also direct-fund projects not listed for solicitation when they knew a community could meet its objectives.

Chair Kniss inquired whether Council Members should meet with agencies to establish personal relationships.

# WORKING MINUTES

Mr. Young stated Council Members' presence indicated the community commitment. That was important.

Council Member Price believed Mr. Young and Mr. Palmer were generally discussing capital projects and asked if their advising and guidance related to capital projects.

Mr. Young indicated they advised on every kind of service, not just capital improvement projects. When grant programs allocated funds based on a formula, there was little they could do to impact the formula-driven programs.

Council Member Price felt Palo Alto's demographics worked for and against the Council depending on the projects. Palo Alto was not a direct service agency.

Council Member Klein suggested Council Members visit agencies while attending the National League of Cities meeting in March 2013.

Chair Kniss expressed concern about meeting with agencies during that visit because so many cities were present in Washington and time was limited.

Mr. Young explained it was difficult to obtain meetings with legislators during the National League of Cities conference. They would concentrate their efforts on meeting with federal agencies.

Council Member Klein was far more interested in meeting with agencies than ceremonial visits to Congressmen. He was also interested in meeting with Administration officials with regard to technology.

Chair Kniss noted Congresswoman Eshoo had been on the tech committee for quite some time.

Mr. Palmer clarified she was on the Energy and Commerce Committee which had a broad range of trade, technology and healthcare issues.

Mr. Young stated the new chairman at the Rail Subcommittee had jurisdiction over HSR issues and he was from Northern California. It was important for the City to communicate its interests and concerns about HSR to him. They wanted to take advantage of that opportunity when Council Members were in Washington.

# WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Klein recalled Mayor Espinosa met with him two years ago.

Mr. Palmer explained the rail authorization bill was the only bill the Rail Subcommittee had to act on this year. The chairman would be in a prime position to affect HSR policy.

Sheila Tucker, Assistant to the City Manager, suggested a tighter integration with the Utilities Legislative Program.

Council Member Price inquired whether Van Scoyoc Associates had other recommendations.

Mr. Palmer reported that Palo Alto's location at the center of Silicon Valley and high tech growth in the region gave Palo Alto the opportunity to communicate to the Administration and Congress that this area worked successfully. They could position the City to highlight the economic success. Communicating priorities as they developed and changed was important in finding the best programs for the City. Working together throughout the year would create new opportunities.

Council Member Price stated Palo Alto was not the only city interested in pursuing funding opportunities.

Council Member Klein inquired whether Van Scoyoc had some presence in Sacramento.

Mr. Young reported at one point he did some lobbying at the state level, but did not do so now.

Council Member Klein asked if they any thoughts on expanding their work with state lobbyists.

Mr. Palmer explained they had regular conference calls with City Staff and the HSR state lobbyist to compare notes and suggest complementary strategies. That had worked very well but it might not work as well on other issues. Knowing what the City was doing on the state level helped their work.

Mr. Keene inquired about comprehensive immigration legislation.

Mr. Young stated people in Washington were interested in allowing more highly skilled, highly educated foreigners to stay in the country. There was

# WORKING MINUTES

a great deal of sympathy to change the program to encourage more of that. This was one area where there would be legislation in the current year.

Mr. Palmer indicated Congress supported immigration but the question was how far Congress would reach beyond the issues of border control and amnesty.

Chair Kniss inquired whether they could arrange meetings with agencies.

Mr. Palmer said they would provide an itinerary and schedule meetings.

Chair Kniss inquired whether Van Scoyoc Associates would be interested in participating at meetings through conference calls.

Mr. Young replied yes.

Ms. Tucker noted the other two elements of the Agenda Item were the Legislative Program Action Manual and the State Legislative Priorities. The Manual provided the Guiding Principles for legislative advocacy and management of the program. When issues arose, Staff first determined if they were a priority or fit within the Guiding Principles. Staff made positive steps in organizing advocacy efforts. Topics to track closely were pension reform regulations and interpretations, HSR, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reform, and a potential reduction in the two-thirds requirement for bond measures.

Chair Kniss suggested use of a state lobbyist in the future.

Council Member Price inquired whether Staff had talked with Silicon Valley Leadership Group to understand its position on CEQA reform.

Chair Kniss asked Council Member Price to explain Silicon Valley Leadership Group's position on CEQA reform.

Council Member Price understood they were not taking a strong position on preserving CEQA. They believed CEQA had been misused in many communities and the original intent of CEQA was being eroded.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, reported there were two camps on CEQA reform; one for limited changes and the other for significant changes. It was difficult to track legislation because no drafts had been issued and all conversations of high level leadership occurred in private. Staff was monitoring CEQA and would report as soon as draft legislation was provided.



# WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Klein did not believe the City had any common ground with Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

Council Member Price believed it would be good to know the opposing position in order to strengthen Palo Alto's position.

Council Member Klein felt the situation would be a nightmare if the Governor gave HSR a blanket exemption from CEQA. This issue was ripe for unintended consequences.

**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to recommend the City Council approve: 1) the Legislative Program Action Manual; 2) the 2013 Federal Legislative priorities and review of 2012 activities; and 3) the 2013 State Legislative priorities and review of 2012 activities.

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

2. Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of December 31, 2012 and Revised Workplan.

James Pelletier, City Auditor, provided a quarterly update for the Office of the City of Auditor. The Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report was finished; however, as of December 31, 2012, it was in process. In addition, the Contract Administration Audit, the Utilities Reserve Audit, and the Human Resources Employee Benefits Audit were now complete. Staff would continue to review sales and use tax allocations to ensure the City captured all sales tax due. The City Auditor's Office recovered approximately \$65,000 in total sales tax. As of December 31, 2012, the Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Hotline received three calls. One was an inquiry and Staff answered it. Working with the Human Resources Department, he determined the remaining two calls to be unsubstantiated.

Council Member Klein asked for clarification of "unsubstantiated, referred for further action."

Mr. Pelletier explained he found the specific allegation of the call to be unsubstantiated; however, the Human Resources Department saw an opportunity to clarify some policies and took action. He was working on a call in the current quarter. With respect to the work plan, he proposed increasing the number of hours allotted to audits.

# WORKING MINUTES

Chair Kniss inquired whether a monetary amount was applied to the audits.

Mr. Pelletier answered no. Performance audits reviewed the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.

Chair Kniss asked if audits analyzed the use of funds.

Mr. Pelletier reported that was dependent on the audit. Finding potential savings opportunities or additional revenue opportunities was not always the goal of an audit. The goal of an audit was to review the underlying controls within the process to ensure the City adequately mitigated any risks associated with that process. By mitigating risks, the chance of the City losing money or being inefficient was reduced. The focus was on fixing the process more than identifying dollars.

Council Member Price inquired whether Mr. Pelletier anticipated performing the Development Permit Process Audit in Fiscal Year (FY) 2014.

Mr. Pelletier explained items marked as "not started" would be started in the current quarter. Other audits planned for the current year would be part of the following year's plan.

Council Member Price clarified that audits marked FY 2014 would be considered the following year.

Mr. Pelletier replied yes.

James Keene, City Manager, reported the Development Permit Process Audit appeared on a former auditor's proposed work plan about the same time the blueprint process began. He recommended this particular audit be deferred and reconsidered when the process was closer to completion.

Chair Kniss agreed to defer the audit.

Council Member Klein also agreed.

Mr. Pelletier suggested possibly performing the Development Permit Process Audit once the project was complete. At that point, he could revise the number of hours needed to perform the audit. The audits performed thus far required more time than he initially anticipated.

# WORKING MINUTES

Chair Kniss inquired whether Staff needed a Motion to defer the Development Permit Process.

Mr. Pelletier indicated the Committee could instruct him to identify a different audit to include in the plan.

Council Member Klein instructed the City Auditor to do so.

Mr. Pelletier suggested the Committee choose an audit to replace the Development Permit Process Audit or allow him to choose one.

Chair Kniss felt it appropriate for Mr. Pelletier to choose the replacement audit.

Council Member Price noted the work plan could be discussed again at the mid-year Council discussion or sooner if needed.

Council Member Klein inquired whether the City had a mechanism to collect sales tax from online retailers.

Mr. Pelletier reported Staff worked with an outside vendor in that area. The vendor monitored online retailers and would continue to monitor them.

Council Member Klein recalled another sales tax issue regarding the dispute between United Airlines and San Francisco International Airport, and asked if another company was avoiding paying sales tax.

Mr. Pelletier was not familiar with that case, but would follow up.

Council Member Price requested Council Member Klein expound on the dispute.

Council Member Klein explained United Airlines treated jet fuel purchases as being made in a jurisdiction other than San Francisco to take advantage of tax forgiveness. San Francisco disputed United Airlines' ability to do that.

Mr. Pelletier reported that was similar to the tactics being used by some online retailers. Staff would monitor the situation.

Council Member Klein guessed a high proportion of Palo Alto citizens were buying goods from online retailers.

# WORKING MINUTES

Mr. Pelletier reported another factor was the share of funds Palo Alto received from county taxes. If the county did not receive their fair share, then Palo Alto would not receive their fair share.

Council Member Klein suggested Staff pay close attention to that.

Mr. Pelletier indicated the City's vendor was following the issue.

Council Member Price inquired whether the vendor was working with other cities to share insights on the issue.

Mr. Pelletier responded yes. The vendor had clients throughout the state and provided good insights.

Council Member Klein suggested placing an item on the Council Agenda with regard to lobbying successes and efforts.

Mr. Keene agreed.

Sheila Tucker, Assistant to the City Manager, noted the Staff Report would be on the Consent Calendar.

Council Member Klein did not believe anyone would see the Staff Report on the Consent Calendar.

Ms. Tucker reported Staff discussed adding a page to the City Manager's web page for legislative information. In addition, Van Scoyoc Associates would return for a Council meeting soon.

Mr. Keene inquired whether the City Manager and the Mayor retained the ability to remove an item from the Consent Calendar and place it on the Agenda as an Action Item.

Council Member Klein replied yes.

**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to recommend City Council acceptance of the Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of December 31, 2012 and Revised Workplan, to include deferring the Development Center Process for one year.

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

# WORKING MINUTES

1. Referral from City Council to Establish a Definition of Council Liaison Role for Boards and Commissions and Community Groups that Council Members are designated to in Section 2.4 in the City Council Protocols.

Chair Kniss believed the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) was asked to redefine the role of Council liaison. The Council made a total of 35 assignments. She suggested dividing the assignments into categories of City Boards and Commissions, State and County organizations, and community-based organizations (CBO).

Council Member Price indicated liaison relationships in all categories were important, but liaison attendance at meetings in the first two categories should be more frequent than attendance at CBO meetings. Each Council Member determined how often he/she attended meetings. Each Council Member had a different method for reporting meeting attendance. She suggested including language regarding information items that should be shared with the Council.

Chair Kniss stated the most important item was Council Members refraining from speaking for the full Council on matters for which the full Council had not taken a policy position. Council Members should not appear to provide guidance on an issue if the Council had not discussed it.

Council Member Klein recalled that perceived problems were Council Members advocating at Boards and Commissions and expected attendance at meetings. There should be only two categories of governmental organizations and CBOs. If a Council Member advocated a particular position at a Board or Commission meeting, then he/she were violating procedures.

James Keene, City Manager, noted several places indicated Council Members should not advocate positions in the liaison role.

Council Member Klein suggested a new section discuss expected behavior at CBO meetings. Council Members should not be expected to attend 100 percent of CBO meetings. County, City, and State organizations were not liaison positions. In some governmental organizations, the Council Member voted the City's position; while in other governmental agencies the Council Member voted his/her own position.

Council Member Price reported another city distinguished appointments and liaisons from CBOs.

Chair Kniss felt there should be three categories, because County and State

# WORKING MINUTES

appointments were frequently in contention.

Council Member Price added some positions were appointed or elected by the body itself.

Council Member Klein disagreed and inquired about the three categories.

Chair Kniss explained in the first category the liaison was not expected to participate in discussions. In the CBO category, the liaison might participate in discussions. In the County and State category, the liaison would participate in discussions, vote, and assume a leadership role.

Council Member Klein did not view the State and County category as a liaison position.

Chair Kniss agreed.

Council Member Price suggested calling that category appointed or elected.

Council Member Klein noted Council Members could be appointed, elected, or compete for various County and State organizations.

Chair Kniss inquired whether Council Member Klein wanted to remove those positions from liaison.

Council Member Klein answered yes.

Chair Kniss asked if he preferred to call them appointments.

Council Member Price stated the path to those organizations may be different but they did not belong in the same category.

Council Member Klein suggested including a new section discussing how Council Members served as liaisons to non-profit organizations.

Chair Kniss agreed. Reaffirming Section 2.4 was the other important aspect.

Mr. Keene reported the title of Subsection C should end with "not to Individual Council Members." Subsection A was confusing regarding comments made at a Board or Commission meeting.

Council Member Klein would put that last.

Council Member Price agreed the language was confusing. Council Members

# WORKING MINUTES

should clearly state they were speaking as individuals.

Mr. Keene indicated the liaison was present to represent the Council and not himself/herself. The wording was unclear.

Council Member Price inquired if that should be Subsection G.

Council Member Klein said the current Subsection G was fine.

Chair Kniss felt Council Members could attend meetings quarterly or negotiate as to when the Board or Commission wanted the liaison present. It was difficult to attend all meetings, especially with the number of assignments.

Council Member Klein suggested relaxing the wording of Subsection G. Appointments should not exceed two years.

Council Member Price agreed strongly. Others should have the opportunity to learn about that topic area.

Chair Kniss believed limiting terms prevented a Council Member from becoming enmeshed with the group such that she advocated without realizing it. She inquired whether limiting terms should be a Committee recommendation.

Council Member Klein responded yes.

Council Member Price inquired whether the term limit would apply to Boards, Commission, and state and regional organizations.

Chair Kniss could not speak to state and regional organizations because some state and regional organizations had different term requirements.

Council Member Klein felt a two-year term limit for state and county organizations would not allow a Council Member to achieve a leadership role.

Council Member Price asked if Council Member Klein felt there was merit in remaining more than 2 years in order to develop expertise.

Council Member Klein replied yes

Chair Kniss inquired whether the Committee should provide language for the changes discussed.

# WORKING MINUTES

Sheila Tucker, Assistant to the City Manager, indicated general intent was sufficient.

Chair Kniss suggested attendance should be either quarterly or at the discretion of the Council Member.

Council Member Klein agreed. A liaison to a CBO was freer to speak as liaison, because so many CBO activities did not affect the City.

Mr. Keene stated liaisons should feel fewer restrictions to speak as liaison to a CBO.

Council Member Klein clarified a liaison should be careful in speaking at a CBO meeting on a City issue.

Chair Kniss noted some CBOs received City funding.

Council Member Klein indicated the City should have liaisons to CBOs receiving City funds.

Chair Kniss felt liaisons should attend more meetings if the CBO received City funding; however, she did not wish to include that in the Section.

Mr. Keene reiterated that assignments would be separated into categories as the Committee defined those categories; and that Section 2.4 would speak to Categories 1 and 2, and with more discretion in attendance and more freedom for speaking in Category 3 (CBOs).

Ms. Tucker added the two-year limit for appointments.

Chair Kniss stated there should be some discussion about the two-year term limit.

Council Member Klein indicated a term limit should only pertain to CBOs.

Council Member Price inquired whether the two-year issue would apply to City Boards and Commissions and CBOs.

Council Member Klein answered yes.

Council Member Price clarified term limits would not apply to state and county organizations.

Mr. Keene reiterated the Subsection G language should indicate more



# WORKING MINUTES

regular attendance in the first two categories than would be expected for CBOs, and allow for judgment decisions. Maintaining an active liaison relationship set the expectation that Council Members would attend meetings.

Council Member Klein felt the language should suggest maintaining an active relationship without attending every meeting.

Mr. Keene offered meeting attendance was important, but time conflicts or other demands could impact liaison attendance at every meeting.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Price to recommend the City Council prepare a draft of revised 2.4 in accordance with discussions.

**MOTION PASSED/FAILED:** 3-0 Holman absent

## Future Meetings and Agendas

Chair Kniss announced the next meeting was scheduled for March 19, 2013 at 7:00 P.M., and requested input regarding Agenda Items.

Sheila Tucker, Assistant to the City Manager, reported one item for discussion in March was Core Values and Guiding Principles. Staff would recommend deferring the Board and Commission recruitment discussion to April.

Chair Kniss felt smoking in parks was a priority.

Mr. Keene noted the Finance Committee and the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) had scheduled meetings on March 19<sup>th</sup> and Staff would move between the two meetings.

Council Member Price inquired about the process and goal for discussion of Core Values and Guiding Principles.

Mr. Keene suggested the Committee complete pre-work for the full Council discussion.

Council Member Price was unsure of the process.

# WORKING MINUTES

Ms. Tucker indicated Staff could obtain Council input on Core Values or Guiding Principles and bring that information to the Committee for discussion of the process to be used at the Retreat in March 2013.

Mr. Keene reported the Committee could set a structure of requesting input from the Council at the Retreat.

Council Member Klein believed the Committee's task was to provide a draft of Core Values.

Mr. Keene felt Core Values should be enduring.

Council Member Klein expected the Core Values should be short, similar to a mission statement.

Council Member Price inquired about the process for developing Core Values.

Mr. Keene stated Staff could provide some information and the Committee could accept or reject it or prepare its own draft for recommendation to the Council.

Council Member Klein suggested including on the March 19, 2013 Agenda the Council's schedule for the year.

Council Member Price requested an update of the test bed discussion with regard to economic development and utilities.

Mr. Keene indicated Staff could report on that.

Council Member Price asked if there was much activity in either category.

Mr. Keene did not believe there had been activity in the general economic development category. Utilities had a business objective to search out innovative operations or enterprises.

Council Member Price requested that be addressed at a future meeting.

Ms. Tucker explained the Committee decided to begin meetings at 6:00 P.M. unless there was an item of significant public interest. The Code stated 7:00 P.M. She requested input as to a beginning time for Committee meetings.

Chair Kniss inquired about the ending time for meetings beginning at 6:00 P.M.

# WORKING MINUTES

Mr. Keene suggested an ending time was dependent upon the Committee's time management.

Ms. Tucker added the number of items on the Agenda was a factor.

Mr. Keene recalled meetings beginning at 6:00 P.M. usually ended between 9:00 P.M. and 10:00 P.M. Meetings beginning at 7:00 P.M. usually ended by 10:00 P.M.

Chair Kniss requested preferences.

Council Member Klein preferred 7:00 P.M.

Council Member Price did not have a preference.

Chair Kniss suggested beginning at 7:00 P.M., in order to limit the meeting to three hours.

Ms. Tucker suggested moving the meeting next to the Council Chambers because the smoking ordinance would have significant public interest.

Council Member Price requested the test bed issue be placed on the agenda.

Ms. Tucker indicated Staff would put it on the agenda or provide an update.

Mr. Keene suggested an informational report.

Council Member Klein inquired when the sleeping in cars issue would be on an agenda.

Chair Kniss stated that could be presented in April

Council Member Klein felt the topic would require most of one meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 9:17 PM.