

Regular Meeting
February 5, 2002

1. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS..... 2

2. Request by International School for Consideration of
Public/Private Partnership to Construct Play Fields..... 2

3. Process re City Positions of Ballot Propositions..... 2

4. Discussion for Future Meeting Schedules and Agendas..... 2

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m..... 3

Chairperson Kleinberg called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Beecham, Freeman, Kleinberg, Mossar

Absent: None.

1. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

2. Request by International School for Consideration of Public/Private Partnership to Construct Play Fields

David Van Adnon, Co-Chairman of the Board of the International School (IS), said the IS had been working for over a year to solve some of the school's problems with the cooperation of City staff. The staff report (CMR:110:02) was thorough and the staff work was appreciated. The IS acquired the Laura Lane site after an exhaustive search when use of the Garland School site was ending. The Laura Lane site worked out well and the IS built a new building for the campus. However, there were two major issues: 1) a traffic and parking problem in the afternoon; and 2) the need for a playing field for the children. The IS sought assistance from the City and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) for a trail that would lead from the Laura Lane campus to the Baylands parking area. The trail would help alleviate the parking and traffic issue during the afternoons. The IS was also working on a public/private partnership to solve the need for a play field. The IS was willing to pay the capital costs and most of the upkeep for the field. In return, the IS would have the use of the field when the school was in session. The public would have use of the fields at all other times.

Stuart Berman, Chairman of the Site Committee for the International School, said the IS was founded in 1979 in Palo Alto and existed at the Garland School campus until the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) required the site for the Terman Middle School campus. The IS was in its second year of operation at the Laura Lane site with 500 students on two campus sites, 350 of which were located at the Laura Lane campus. Of the 350, 148 resided in Palo Alto, representing 98 families. The IS had two major problems with the current site, which it was attempting to alleviate with the proposal before the Policy and Services (P&S) Committee: 1) problems with afternoon traffic congestion; and 2) inadequate playground space for students. The traffic situation at the school was impacting the United States Post Office (USPO). For about 20

minutes a day, USPO customers were unable to access the facility. In the search for an adequate site for the school, the IS sought a five-acre site. However, the Laurel Lane site was only 1.75 acres. The area of greatest impact was the inadequate playground space. The IS proposed reducing the level of automobile traffic generated by the school by reducing the traffic congestion on East Bayshore Road and Laurel Lane. When first opened, the IS had access to the Baylands and a number of parents picked up students by parking at the Baylands and walking to the campus. At that point, there had been no traffic problem. The IS believed the environment would also be improved because currently cars sat idling on East Bayshore Road and Laura Lane for up to 20 minutes, emitting a great deal of toxins into the environment. The IS also offered to construct athletic fields that were needed by both the school and the City, at no cost to the City. The proposal included construction of a water permeable, graded, granite pathway over SCVWD lands to connect with an existing pathway at the Baylands Athletic Center (BAC). Students would be able to continue along the pathway to the cul-de-sac at the BAC parking lot. The IS would construct a small field adjacent to the BAC fields in a site that was currently a dumping area and a smaller field in an unused dirt field. Some concerns were voiced about adherence to the City's Comprehensive Plan. Although he had not had the time to go through the Comprehensive Plan to find more things that supported what the IS was attempting to do, he had found two policies in the Transportation Section. Policy T-14 called for improvement of pedestrian and bicycle access to and between local destinations, including schools, parks and open space. Policy T-17 called for increased cooperation to establish and maintain off-road bicycle and pedestrian paths and trails utilizing creek, utility and railroad right-of-ways.

Assistant City Manager Emily Harrison said a multi-departmental effort by City staff was made to work with the IS on the proposal. A number of concerns were raised regarding the effect of the proposal on the Comprehensive Plan. She read from an email by Lisa Grote about the concerns, which primarily dealt with program and policies 10, 11, and 12 and Programs N-7, N-8 and N-9 having to do with the setback from the San Francisquito Creek. Although the programs were important, they would not preclude improvements or expansions of already disturbed or developed areas. Program N-7 stated that existing development within the 100-foot setback from the top of the bank would be considered legal and non-conforming. Athletic fields could be considered developed and seemed to be so in the Baylands Master Plan (BMP). Program N-7 called for a 100-foot setback where feasible. The redevelopment of areas must be consistent with basic creek habitat objectives and make a significant net improvement in the condition of the creek. Adding the fields would be a perfect opportunity for the IS to fund creek

improvements as part of their proposal for the new fields. Some of the other Comprehensive Plan goals that were cited had to do with coordination with SCVWD. The City would stay in coordination with SCVWD. Cynthia D'Agosta had contacted Council Member Mossar and SCVWD, indicating acceptance of the proposal.

Chairperson Kleinberg clarified Cynthia D'Agosta was with the Joint Powers Authority (JPA).

Council Member Mossar would relay specific comments at a later time.

Ms. Harrison said Ms. Grote had also pointed out that Policies C-22 and C-26 and Program C-23 called for the design and construction of new community facilities that could accommodate flexible functions in a number of groups, maintaining and enhancing existing park facilities, and recommending methods of public and private financing for improved park maintenance, rehabilitation and construction. Staff was comfortable that the IS proposal was compatible with the Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives. The IS proposal also conformed to the BMP. The proposed area was in Zone 2, which was urbanized landscape. The area was part of the BAC. The BMP required an amendment to the current use permit to accommodate the path and the park. A park improvement ordinance would be necessary, as stated in the staff report (CMR:110:02).

Council Member Freeman asked Ms. Harrison to provide copies of Ms. Grote's notes to the P&S Committee.

Ms. Harrison said staff was excited about the possibility of being able to expand the fields inventory, which was a significant problem in the City in terms of over-use of the fields. Staff hoped that the timing of the IS and City usage would be compatible and the fields could be programmed effectively for children and the soccer league. The IS proposal was brought to the P&S Committee rather than first going to the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC), because the proposal was conceptual for the public/private partnership. Staff believed that the policy issue should be decided before being sent through the standard planning process. The proposal was a significant policy issue. Other than the Terman Park area, the City had not previously entered into such an agreement for dedicated parkland.

Council Member Mossar asked what the P&S Committee was supposed to decide.

Ms. Harrison said the staff recommendation was that the P&S Committee approve proceeding with the public/private partnership at

the same time that the proposal would be going through the normal planning process for review.

Council Member Mossar asked what was involved in the "normal planning process," if approved.

Ms. Harrison thought the process involved an environmental review, which would involve the P&TC.

Council Member Freeman thought the staff report (CMR:110:02) had not indicated that process.

Ms. Harrison said the environmental assessment and site and design were required in conjunction with the P&TC.

Council Member Mossar clarified the P&S Committee decision would be passed along to the Council. If the Council agreed with the P&S Committee's decision, the matter was referred to the P&TC.

Ms. Harrison said normally with an option to lease, the lessee was provided with the terms under which a lease could be pursued, one of which was to go through the full planning process, including approvals from any relevant body, such as the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). Once the lessee had met all the requirements, it could return with a lease for the property.

Council Member Mossar asked about the procedure to involve the JPA in the approval process.

Ms. Harrison said the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) required coordination with SCVWD. Although there was no requirement for involvement with the JPA, the JPA would also be involved as part of the environmental review.

Council Member Mossar said she thought the project highlighted a problem in the review process with the advent of the existence of the JPA.

Council Member Freeman asked whether, whatever the P&S Committee decided, the item would go to the full Council.

Ms. Harrison said yes. Depending on how the P&S Committee wanted the item handled, it would either return on the Consent Calendar or for discussion. If the Council approved the proposal, staff would move forward to enter into an option to lease, not a lease with the IS. All the requirements would be spelled out in the option to lease, such as financial requirements and planning approvals.

Council Member Freeman clarified Planning Department approvals meant going through the P&TC.

Ms. Harrison replied yes. If the P&S Committee wanted to see something in the process, it could be added. For example, if the P&S Committee wanted the Parks and Recreation Commission (PARC) to examine the proposal, that direction could be included in the option to lease.

Catherine Shinnars, 3632 Arbutus Avenue, supported the proposed project as a parent of children attending the IS for over nine years and a Palo Alto resident. The proposal would enhance the children's playing space and be a resource for use by all residents in the City. The traffic problem was acute if brief.

Dave Matson, 4062 Campana Drive, opposed the proposed construction of playing fields at the BAC. The PARC made a proposal to build a number of soccer fields at the BAC, which generated opposition from the baseball community who were concerned about the loss of the facility, since it was the only real baseball field in Palo Alto. An isolated decision for the BAC area was inappropriate; all fields should be considered in context with other PARC decisions.

Council Member Beecham asked whether there was a threat to the existing baseball diamonds.

Mr. Matson said no. The area was heavily used by the adult and youth community during the spring, summer and fall months, raising the issue of parking in the area with an additional field.

Council Member Beecham clarified the fields were not threatened but the parking was perhaps a burden.

Mr. Matson said perhaps.

Council Member Beecham asked whether Mr. Matson opposed further development at the BAC area.

Mr. Matson said further development should be considered in a more comprehensive way, rather than piecemeal.

Council Member Mossar asked whether Mr. Matson would be more comfortable waiting to decide what to do with the field space until after the Citywide study was completed.

Mr. Matson thought waiting was more appropriate. If the field were to be reconfigured to accommodate soccer over other sports, it would make more sense to consider all issues together.

Council Member Freeman asked about the meeting that was being held concurrently with the P&S Committee meeting and the group's involvement in the process.

Director of Parks and Golf Paul Dias said a meeting was being held regarding athletic fields in town. The meeting was a spearhead meeting to determine whether more fields could be built in town or whether all the athletic fields could be better utilized. The place at the BAC referred to by Mr. Matson was a dirt area that would come into focus with the study as a place for an additional field. The PARC was advised of the proposal.

Council Member Freeman asked whether the PARC was included in any of the discussions that came up with the current proposal.

Council Member Beecham thought the group that was meeting concurrently with the P&S Committee meeting was just formed and it was their first meeting.

Ms. Harrison said the group was a new one. When Mr. Beck raised his proposal, staff immediately asked itself whether to proceed. One of the reasons for proceeding was that what was proposed by the IS was a private group paying 100 percent to create a new field, which staff thought was worth continuing.

Council Member Freeman asked when the new committee was formed.

Mr. Dias said the new committee was created about six weeks prior.

Ms. Harrison said the IS work was begun 10 months earlier.

Mr. Dias said if the P&S Committee approved forwarding the proposal to the Council and it was approved, it would fall under the purview of the new committee as a new additional site among the rest. If the P&S Committee disapproved the proposal, that message would be brought back to the committee.

Chairperson Kleinberg clarified it was premature to bring the IS proposal to the new committee until a decision was made about whether the Council was interested in approving it.

Mr. Dias replied yes. The new committee was looking at the City as a whole and would spend the next few months considering different areas of the City where athletic fields could be enhanced, changed or added.

Council Member Freeman was concerned from Mr. Matson's perspective that people who were in attendance at the committee meeting could

not attend the P&S Committee meeting because of the timing of the meetings and might have important information to present.

Mr. Dias said the committee had no information. The purpose of the meetings was to examine site maps throughout the City and examine the fields to make a recommendation to either increase field space or not.

Emily Renzel, 1056 Forest Avenue, opposed the project as proposed; however, not all aspects of the proposal were opposed. Procedurally, the P&S Committee was the Council. If a policy decision were made that the proposal was acceptable, it would color staff's responses to the P&TC and PARC. If a true and honest assessment was desired from the various boards and commissions, the boards and commissions should be given the opportunity to review an item prior to a Council committee review. Major decisions had been made in the past before meaningful input was acquired. The proposed site had many trees and native vegetation, so a field would strip vegetation from the area. The proposed trail would require major filling and might create drainage problems with other fields. She questioned the SCVWD's refusal to allow the use of the existing levee with a trail. Whenever there was any natural habitat in existence, it should not be changed or made uniform. The Council should be very mindful that when it spoke, it sent strong signals that would color all the staff work and framing of the issue for boards and commissions.

Herb Borock, Post Office Box 632, supported continuing the item to the next P&S Committee meeting, since it conflicted with both the Finance Committee meeting and the Fields Committee that was established by the PARC. The recommendation for action by the P&S Committee to direct staff to proceed with preparation of an option to lease was contrary to adopted Council policy. Adopted Council policy for use of City-owned property, including parklands, had two alternatives. If there was only one potential user, the proper procedure was an option to lease with a notice of intent. However, when there were many potential users, as was the case in the current circumstance, the procedure was to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP). The City was interested in additional fields. He disagreed with the assertion that the proposal was to solve a traffic problem. As soon as the facility opened, the IS talked about use of the field space, independent of any traffic or parking problem. A staff report for the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in 1999, indicated that the transportation impact analysis prepared for the IS project revealed no significant traffic impacts would result on nearby intersections or in the vicinity of the project. Normal City processes should be followed.

John W. Kelly, United States Postmaster for the City of Palo Alto, 2085 E. Bayshore Road, supported anything the IS could do to resolve the traffic problem. Many of the children and parents were dodging cars, which would be alleviated with the proposal. The safety of the children was an important issue that should be taken into consideration.

Dan Meyers, 1631 Santa Cruz, Menlo Park, parent of an IS student, spoke in support of providing new field space for the students and alleviating the traffic problem. The IS anticipated \$.5 million to build the field, which would be difficult for the City to find at the current time. The path and field projects could be handled separately. The intent of the 100-foot setback was to protect the riparian zone to ensure nothing ran into the creek. In the present proposal, the land was separated from the creek by a levee, so there was little chance of runoff. He understood that the land belonged to the SCVWD and the vegetation was not native. An agreement was made between the IS and SCVWD for an exchange of lands.

John Ruckstuhl, 552 Everett Avenue, Apartment 6, said a problem existed and there was a need to find a prompt solution. United States Postal Service workers and others often took shortcuts through surrounding neighborhoods to avoid the traffic generated by the IS parents. The traffic violations that resulted from excess traffic required attention. The traffic problem should not be bundled together with a field plan, particularly if it was privately funded.

Rex Chiu, 8 Tulip Lane, a parent of an IS student from the other campus, had observed the traffic generated by the Laura Lane campus. Even removing 200 cars from the area would be helpful. If more fields were going to be put in the area, trees would need to be eliminated.

Michelle Furbershaw, 214 Pope Street, Menlo Park, a parent of an IS student, said traffic generated inconvenience and disruption. The safety of the children was of concern and the environment was affected. The use of the path was favored greatly over the traffic congestion. The ability of the City to effectively deal with an emergency or fire was questioned in light of the traffic.

Mei Lin Fung, 1010 Emerson Street, a parent of an IS student, favored the proposal. A playing field was greatly desired. Traffic was also an issue that required attention.

Diana Morin, 1635 El Camino Real, a parent of an IS student, favored the proposal. The IS was not just a private school but one with diversity. The traffic around the school was a major problem

and the path access to the school when it first opened had made a tremendous difference in the traffic.

Denise Dade, Committee for Green Foothills, said there was a need to solve the issues of traffic, parking, and access through the SCVWD land. The path to the field sounded like a good idea. The issues could be separated. Playing fields did not have to be a component in the proposal. The area was currently being used for overflow parking for baseball events. If the area was used as additional playing fields, and there was not currently sufficient parking for the baseball needs, it raised another conflict. Upholding the integrity of the riparian corridor policy that the City had in place was critical. Riparian corridors were an essential component for wildlife. Program N-7 of the Comprehensive Plan addressed setbacks along natural creeks prohibiting the siting of structures, impervious surfaces, outdoor activity areas, and ornamental landscape within 100 feet of the top of the creek bank. A border of native vegetation at least 25 feet along the creek bank was also required. The point was to uphold the integrity of the corridor. If the policy could not even be upheld in public parkland, she queried where it could be upheld in Palo Alto.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked Ms. Dade to point out the public parklands on the map.

Ms. Dade was unsure exactly where the area was located. The SCVWD had an easement through the parklands.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked whether Ms. Dade meant the Baylands.

Ms. Dade said no, dedicated parklands.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked Ms. Dade to repeat her statement about the 25 feet.

Ms. Dade said within the 100-foot setback of the creek bank, not the center of the creek, a border of native riparian vegetation at least 25 feet along the creek bank. She assumed it was along the levee.

Stephanie Munoz, 101 Alma Street, Apartment 701, said if the City determined that public playing fields for children, even though not in the PAUSD, was of value, it should keep in mind that Cubberley High School had a gymnasium adjacent to another private school in Palo Alto. The school was interested in allowing the children to use the gymnasium during rainy days at the noon hour, but were told they had to rent the facility from the City. However, the rent was too expensive. If a building was not in use, the children should be able to use the building without paying for it.

Brent Cottong, 215 Highland Avenue, Burlingame, Landscape Architect for Site Committee, said his firm had been working on creek-related projects for 22 years. Clients included the SCVWD, developments and municipalities. A number of creeks throughout the area, including the San Francisquito Creek, were included in the various projects on which the firm had worked. The levee was manmade but could not be used for plantings. The plan was to raise the levee and make improvements that would impact the areas. In terms of vegetation, recommendations and suggestions were welcome. The trees in the diagram were not being "hidden" but were included on the diagram to indicate improvements. A few trees existed in the area that would need to be removed. City staff and the SCVWD both requested the removal of the Eucalyptus trees, which were dangerous. Indigenous trees would be used to replace removed trees. His firm worked on the new SCVWD's new headquarters in San Jose and installed one of the first bio-swells in the middle of the parking lots. The issues related to wildlife and revegetation were not a problem. The fields would not be lit; rather, downcast lighting was used that was shielded and faced away from the creek. The Comprehensive Plan Project N-7 about natural creeks was key, since San Francisquito was not a natural creek.

Council Member Mossar asked whether Mr. Cottong's company ever built playing fields in an area with tidal influences.

Mr. Cottong said yes.

Council Member Mossar clarified her question was whether the company ever built a playing field in an area where the ground was salty.

Mr. Cottong replied yes; his company had built playing fields in Alameda and Foster City. There were several instances of building fields in areas with tidal influences with fresh water on top of the saline water.

Council Member Mossar asked whether Mr. Cottong was aware that the levees were a potential temporary flood measure that might be redone within a 10-year timeframe.

Mr. Cottong said a lot of dialogue about the different directions had occurred. He would not want to speculate on which direction it was heading. Ten years was optimistic.

Council Member Freeman asked whether Mr. Cottong's team had asked the SCVWD about using the levee as a path.

Mr. Cottong said yes.

Council Member Freeman asked about the result of the query.

Mr. Cottong said the SCVWD did not want the levee used as a path.

Council Member Freeman asked why the SCVWD did not want the levee used as a path.

Mr. Cottong said the SCVWD was concerned about the liability and safety issues related to using the levee as a path.

Council Member Freeman asked whether any part of the path was closer to the edge of the creek than 100 feet.

Mr. Cottong pointed out the high-water line on the map, indicating the path was very close to the 100-foot setback.

Council Member Freeman asked whether the levee would preclude any water from changing the softball field located next to the proposed Field A.

Mr. Cottong said the proposed fields were independent in every way, such as drainage and irrigation, to the existing ball fields.

Mr. Dias said the proposed field was not designated for parking or legal parking. Staff would reinforce the no-parking zone for softball players.

Council Member Mossar asked staff about the prevalent setback along the golf course.

Mr. Berman said the golf course came directly to the foot of the levee.

Council Member Mossar said some of the speakers mentioned something she independently observed when at the site. Field B, the smaller field, was currently very wet. Obviously regrading would be required to convert the site to a playing field and fill would be required.

Mr. Dias said her observation was a reasonable assumption. The area had been over-excavated due to the spoils from the creek cleaning being put in the area for years and then removed. The elevation was probably two feet lower than normal.

Council Member Mossar asked whether the level would have been higher six months prior.

Mr. Dias said the level would have been substantially higher a year ago. The field side of the levee had been used for de-watering purposes. The area was very disturbed.

Council Member Mossar understood that salt water had been a significant issue at the golf course. One would assume it would also be an issue at the fields.

Mr. Dias said that was correct. Staff was recommending that the field be sand-based, which was sports field turf technology, so the salt would not work up into the field.

Council Member Mossar said over time the golf course had to be elevated to deal with the salt-water issue, querying whether over time the field would also have to be elevated.

Mr. Dias replied no. The field would be built at the proper elevation from the beginning.

Council Member Mossar clarified the field would be handled properly in a way that the golf course was not originally handled.

Mr. Dias said yes.

Council Member Mossar said the fields were small yet mention was made of the possibility of women's soccer using the field.

Ms. Harrison said the field would be a practice field and not intended for any regulation size use.

Council Member Mossar asked about recreational uses for the smaller fields.

Mr. Dias said smaller fields could be used for recreational purposes. Many of the City's smaller parks were used such as El Camino Park. The fields were not intended as full-size soccer fields but as an open-space greenbelt area that children could play on. If the public wanted to use it, the field could be used as a practice field for children.

Council Member Mossar said the bicycle path closer to the Bay was slated to be reconstructed by the City after the levee project was completed. She asked whether the path was inland from the levee or on the levee.

Mr. Dias said the path was on the levee, starting at the cul-de-sac. The semi-paved pathway went all the way to the airport.

Council Member Mossar asked whether the City's commitment to rebuild the bicycle path was off the levee or remained on the levee.

Mr. Dias said City staff's assumption was that if the SCVWD planned to raise the levee, they would fix it back in kind to what it was currently. He had not heard that the SCVWD was not going to do that.

Council Member Mossar said the SCVWD was a partner in the JPA and not the controlling agent. She encouraged staff not to defer to the SCVWD as the ultimate authority. She asked about the dedicated parkland.

Mr. Dias said the area on which the IS wanted to build the field was dedicated parkland. There were some adjacent SCVWD properties, but he was unsure about the property line.

Council Member Mossar said she was the City's board member on the San Francisquito Creek JPA and had infinite conversations over the creek, which was a natural creek and was a national treasure for the native steelhead run. She cautioned people to understand it was a very special creek and had the distinction of being one of the only native steelhead runs in the Bay Area. The levee project that was being discussed and acknowledged in the staff report (CMR:110:02) was a project to restore levees to the original design height, the purpose was to provide the same level of flood control to both Palo Alto and East Palo Alto that was originally in place when the levees were first built. The levees were not part of the long-range flood control project on the San Francisquito Creek. The long-range flood control project was unknown. Assuming in eight or ten years, everything had to be ripped out because something different was going to be done.

Council Member Beecham asked what Council Member Mossar meant by "everything."

Council Member Mossar clarified that "everything" meant the levee, the path, and the playing fields. It was not impossible that everything would have to be rebuilt. The question might not be answerable, but she queried whether it was worth \$500,000 to the IS to only have the fields for five to ten years. She questioned whether it was worth it for the City to be thinking the construction was good when it might be temporary.

Ms. Harrison said staff was fairly comfortable that the IS proposal was a no-cost option to the City. Even five or ten years of additional field usage for the City's prorated share of the maintenance, given the chronic shortage of fields in Palo Alto, was a good deal. The real question was to the IS.

Council Member Mossar thought the issue was something staff needed to address with the IS. The City was in a unique position. On one

hand, residents were being told the City would move with all due speed to solve flood hazards for residents in the flood plane of the creek, which was a high priority. To assume it would happen much later than the eight to 10-year timeframe was not doing the very best to meet the goal.

Ms. Harrison said the concern was the multi-jurisdictional effort and funding. Even if the work was handled in five to six years, it still meant five to six years of field usage for the community. Clarification was offered regarding a point that was raised several times about whether the projects of the path and the playing fields could be considered independently of one another. The City Attorney's Office felt that since there was a policy issue with regard to the use of dedicated parkland, the Council was urged to make a decision on the policy issue of the dedicated parkland for both projects. Therefore, the projects were handled simultaneously.

Chairperson Kleinberg clarified that the City Attorney's Office felt there was a legal compulsion not to sever the path issue from the parklands.

Ms. Harrison said no. The City Attorney's Office was not comfortable proceeding with the path separate from the park absent Council's policy decision on the use of dedicated parkland.

Council Member Freeman thought the best current remedy was to separate the two issues. She asked whether a lease was required if the path was not dedicated for the exclusive use of the school but rather could be used by the public.

Ms. Harrison said when private use was granted to public property, an easement process had to be utilized for each use. The process was much simpler than what was proposed.

Council Member Freeman thought the IS was the public.

Ms. Harrison said the IS was a certain segment of the public but it would be considered a private use of public property.

Council Member Freeman asked whether that was true even for a path.

Ms. Harrison said yes.

Council Member Freeman asked about the level of service (LOS) of the traffic light at East Bayshore Road and Embarcadero Road.

Chief Transportation Official Joe Kott said the traffic light at East Bayshore and Embarcadero Roads was borderline.

Council Member Freeman asked about the regulations surrounding changes that directed more traffic through a Level E intersection. Mr. Kott said the City was under duress to improve the level of service of Level E intersections. Staff was very interested in solutions short of dramatic and costly expansions of intersections.

Council Member Freeman asked about the LOS at Laura Lane and East Bayshore Road.

Mr. Kott said for the 20 minutes when the IS was at its peak, the intersection was failing or close to failing. The delay was long.

Council Member Freeman clarified there were two bad traffic lights.

Mr. Kott said yes.

Council Member Freeman asked whether there was the potential for relieving some of the level at Laurel Avenue and East Bayshore but increase at the other intersection.

Mr. Kott said there was much more capacity available at Geng and Embarcadero Roads. Staff would not expect much degradation. Certainly it would not increase to Level E with the additional IS traffic and might not even degrade to Level C.

Council Member Freeman clarified her question was for East Bayshore and Embarcadero Roads.

Mr. Kott said there were two signal light intersections. The first was East Bayshore Road and the other was Geng Road. From a traffic standpoint, the proposal would remove traffic from both Laura Lane and East Bayshore Road and remove traffic from the northbound movement on East Bayshore Road at Embarcadero Road toward Laura Lane, whereby two crowded movements would be mitigated. Traffic would be added to Geng Road in the left-turn lane and right-turn traffic out. The intersection was better able to handle additional traffic than East Bayshore and Embarcadero Roads or Laura Lane and Embarcadero Road.

Council Member Freeman thought the same cars turning left onto East Bayshore Road would proceed through the intersection so no pressure was actually relieved from the intersection.

Mr. Kott said the left-turn pressure was removed from East Bayshore Road by cars intending to follow through with the right turn onto Laura Lane for the drop off of children.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked whether the main problem was the cars lining up to take the left turn onto East Bayshore Road.

Mr. Kott said the two most acute problems were Laura Lane because of the backup of parents lining up to enter IS to pick up or drop off children, which extended into the USPO traffic. It also affected upstream on East Bayshore Road. It forced people who wanted to go through on East Bayshore Road to cross into the opposing lane, creating terrific problems with the efficiency of the intersection.

Chairperson Kleinberg wanted to consider the intersection at East Bayshore and Embarcadero Roads, not Laura Lane. Council Member Freeman was addressing the issue of the change in traffic moving east, taking a left turn on East Bayshore Road, and the cars that would merely be going straight. The question was whether there was some benefit to redirecting the cars to head straight instead of turning left.

Mr. Kott said yes. There was considerable benefit to having the cars going straight instead of turning left.

Council Member Freeman said the number of cars going through the intersection was not being reduced.

Council Member Beecham thought the point was that reducing the number of cars turning left improved service of the intersection.

Council Member Freeman asked how many vehicles could be stacked at the Geng Road light, since the vehicles going straight at the East Bayshore Road turn would be turning left at Geng Road.

Mr. Kott was unsure how many vehicles could stack at the left-turn lane from Embarcadero Road to Geng Road.

Council Member Freeman thought the number of vehicles, from her own observation, was probably four. If 50 vehicles went through the East Bayshore Road turn and were trying to turn left at Geng Road, with a stack location of only four vehicles, it might result in a problem with Geng Road and across the intersection.

Mr. Kott thought such a scenario was unlikely.

Ms. Harrison said there was an assumption that everyone would follow the same path coming down Embarcadero Road to turn on Geng Road. However, parents dropping off children from the Geng Road site might be coming from south Palo Alto and not enter the intersection at all.

Council Member Beecham said the perception of Council Member Freeman that there might be a problem and staff's assumption that

there would not be a problem was an issue that could not be resolved that evening.

Mr. Kott said there was some flexibility in the new situation. The current situation was very brittle. There was only one access into the IS. The IS and staff could work together to modulate the number of vehicles that used either access point. Work could also be done with timing of the signals; however, the signal timing issue was already maximized with the current situation.

Council Member Freeman said there were different times when people were coming and going, so there might not ever be 50 cars.

Ms. Harrison agreed.

Council Member Freeman asked whether staff investigated with the JPA or the authorizing jurisdiction of the levee whether the levee could actually be used as a path.

Ms. Harrison said staff confirmed the statement made by the IS that the SCVWD would not allow usage of the levee as a footpath. She personally met with representatives of the SCVWD at the site and the SCVWD representatives were very clear on the point.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked for staff's response to the use of RFPs as a way of developing the property.

Ms. Harrison said staff would not object to the RFP process for use of the site. However, staff had not received a similar proposal to the IS or received any indication that anyone else would be interested in investing \$.5 million into creating a field. The IS had a particular need in a particular area. The area was probably not as attractive to anyone except the IS because it was in a fairly obscure corner of the City's parkland area. Staff had no expectation that a competing proposal would be forthcoming if an RFP were to be submitted, although it could be done.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked about the timing of an RFP process.

Ms. Harrison said normally an RFP process took six to eight months.

Chairperson Kleinberg said in order to get to the RFP process, the Council still had to make policy decisions.

Ms. Harrison said the exact same policy decisions would have to be made one way or the other.

Chairperson Kleinberg expressed concern about the riparian corridor policy.

Ms. Harrison said only part of Policy N-7 was read into the record. The balance of the policy was relevant, "existing development within the 100-foot setback," which included the Baylands area and the path, "will be considered legal and non-conforming within the 100-foot setback as a goal where feasible. Redevelopment of such sites must be designed consistent with basic creek habitat objectives to make a significant net improvement in the condition of the creek." Staff would request that aspect of the Comprehensive Plan to be fulfilled in the project.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked Mr. Berman about its most urgent needs and what it most needed to be accomplished.

Mr. Berman said the IS viewed the proposal as having three different components. The path was the most important component, since it provided not only access to the BAC parking lot to reduce the traffic on Laura Lane, but the BAC fields. Currently the IS had permits to use the existing athletic fields at the BAC; however, it was virtually impossible to use the fields since it took students about 20 minutes to walk in each direction. The path, therefore, was the highest priority for the IS. The second priority was playing Field A, the larger of the fields. The lowest priority was Field B, the smaller playing field.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked staff to respond to some of the comments and concerns about vegetation and native plants, and whether the concerns were primarily with Field A or Field B.

Mr. Dias said most of the impact was to Field B, which was closer to the levee. He would not consider the fields as playing fields but rather grassy areas. Field B would require the closest scrutiny.

Council Member Freeman asked about the use of artificial turf.

Mr. Dias said staff's recommendation was for a permeable artificial turf for both fields to address the long-term maintenance issue. The City simply did not have the funds to maintain athletic fields. The IS agreed to consider, at least in concept, Field B as an artificial turf field.

Council Member Freeman asked about the impact of artificial turf on the environment, which had to be weighed against introducing non-native grasses versus grasses that were native to the environment.

Mr. Dias said native grasses could not be used on a playing field because they could not withstand play. Artificial turf would actually be an enhancement because of the current problem with

runoff into the stormdrain. There was no ground cover, so any vegetation would be an enhancement to prevent siltation and runoff.

Council Member Freeman asked whether the City had ever entered into a similar public/private partnership and what the ramifications were of entering into such a partnership.

Ms. Harrison said the only precedent, which was very recent, was the Council's agreement with the PAUSD for the use of the Terman site fields. The City Attorney's recommendation, if the Council moved forward, was to use the Terman agreement as the format for the IS agreement. Clarification about the second question was sought.

Council Member Freeman asked why the P&S Committee was required to make a policy decision if the City had previously entered into such an agreement.

Ms. Harrison said the form would be the same but the IS agreement was a step beyond the PAUSD agreement, even though it was also a school.

Council Member Freeman asked whether the difference was that the IS was a private entity versus the PAUSD, which was not.

Ms. Harrison said the Terman site had special elements of its own in terms of joint use and not just the fields but other elements of the site. The IS project required more of a policy decision than the Terman joint use.

Council Member Freeman asked why the IS project was more of a policy issue than Terman.

Ms. Harrison believed the City Attorney's concern was allowing a private entity to have preferred use of dedicated parkland, which was definitely a policy issue.

Council Member Freeman asked about the options that would be opened in the future with the IS agreement.

Ms. Harrison said the agreement would intimate that if another entity stepped forward with a proposal to create a public/private partnership completely at its own expense for the benefit of the private operations and the City, that the City would approve it. However, the vision of the Comp Plan called on the City to recommend methods of public and private financing for improved park maintenance, rehabilitation, and construction, which was addressed in the IS project.

Council Member Beecham thought the IS proposal seemed to fit with the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Freeman asked whether the meaning of the statement in the Comp Plan was not necessarily for private use, but funding.

Ms. Harrison clarified the statement meant joint use. The issue was about community facilities that could accommodate flexible functions in a number of groups.

Council Member Freeman thought the only ramification was that any other private entity, regardless of the entity, would have a policy that enabled them to approach the City with a request for use of City-owned lands.

Council Member Beecham thought the Comp Plan was not being changed but that the P&S Committee was considering a proposal to decide whether the proposal was consistent with the Comp Plan. That decision would not give rights to any other entity.

Mr. Dias said a policy was being made for a specific site and not citywide. If someone wanted to build something on El Camino Park, for example, the City would not be bound by the policy decision.

Council Member Freeman asked why the item was going through the P&S Committee, then, and not the traditional channels.

Council Member Beecham was unsure a satisfactory answer could be made to Council Member Freeman's question that evening.

Chairperson Kleinberg agreed. The proposal was difficult and complicated, but exciting as well.

Council Member Beecham thought the proposal would provide broad community benefits and was not complicated. Comments were made by the community, the school, and the postal service. The issue of the environment should be considered in light of the fact that the current vegetation was totally not native, the levee would eventually be rebuilt, the new landscaping would be sensitive to the environment, the item would be presented to the P&TC and PARC, and would go through the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process. The issue of working with a private organization to enhance the City's park was to the benefit of the City. Procedurally, there were no downsides in terms of giving rights to other organizations. Each would go through the same process to determine what would or would not fit. The benefits were broad and included the community, the IS, students, the public wanting to use the roadways, and the City.

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Kleinberg, that the Policy and Services Committee recommend to the City Council that staff proceed with preparation of an option to lease an estimated 0.75 acres of the BMC to the International School of the Peninsula as part of the public/private partnership that would develop playing fields to be used by both the school and the community and create a pedestrian pathway from the BAC parking to the school in order to relieve congestion at the school's entrance on Laura Lane, with priority given to the pathway.

Council Member Beecham said the pathway was the least intrusive aspect of the proposal and the least costly for the IS regardless of what happened in five to ten years. The pathway also provided the most immediate benefit in the traffic impact. He would encourage separating the path from the other issue so it could be expedited.

Council Member Mossar had no problem moving forward with exploring the public/private partnership, which could be good for the community and for the IS. The pathway was not only a transportation congestion school safety solution, but the City also had strong interests in having public accessibility along the San Francisquito Creek and should do everything possible to enhance the public's ability to enjoy the creek. However, she was uncomfortable about making exceptions in the riparian corridor policy on dedicated parkland. Lisa Grote's email indicated, "The redevelopment of those areas must be consistent with basic creek habitat objectives and make a significant net improvement in the condition of the creek." The statement was absolutely true. She felt a degraded, over-used, trashed area was being used as a "grandfathered" development. However, the area had suffered from the neglect of the community and was still part of the dedicated parkland. She was inclined to move forward with a plan but not the conceptual plans that were before the P&S Committee.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Mossar moved, seconded by Freeman, that the Policy and Services Committee direct staff to move forward with a public/private partnership for developing the public-access pathway that honored the 100-foot setback, while working through the Joint Powers Authority and the Santa Clara Valley Water District to strengthen the levee as a footpath and to find solutions to building playing fields that honored the 100-foot setback.

Council Member Mossar said the SCVWD could be approached in a collaborative manner. The part of SCVWD that collaboratively worked with its partners in the JPA might respond differently from an engineer who thought pathways could never be put on levees. The configuration of the fields might not be appropriate. It might be

possible over time as the public review of the City's field spaces to redesign in the area to accommodate playing fields. Playing fields in the riparian corridor would always be difficult for her. On one hand, there were benefits. She liked the partnership and wanted to find pathways that worked and do everything possible, including ways to make the existing field space available to the IS throughout the school year. Mr. Berman indicated the City was maintaining the fields during part of the year and not during other parts of the year. It might be possible to find an area where play space could be provided without having to develop additional play fields in the riparian corridor.

Council Member Beecham asked whether Council Member Mossar had agreed to everything except the addition of seeking alternatives.

Council Member Mossar was uncomfortable endorsing the proposed specifications before the P&S Committee but totally comfortable with rethinking, renegotiating, and working more closely with the JPA partners and recreation staff to find ways to allow the IS to use the existing fields.

Council Member Beecham asked whether the substitute motion should direct the City to put its efforts into working with the SCVWD to negotiate or encourage them to work with the JPA.

Council Member Mossar wanted to work through the JPA to build the public amenity of a pathway in the area that would benefit the public and the IS.

Council Member Beecham asked about an alternative if the City was unsuccessful.

Council Member Mossar was not comfortable endorsing that particular answer. If she had to endorse that answer, it would be no.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked whether the item would return to the P&S Committee if the JPA could not help the City solve the problem.

Ms. Harrison said yes. Clarification was sought for the substitute motion and the path. Even if the City was able to work the maintenance with IS, no new park would be created. She asked whether staff was free to examine the creation of a play field as long as the 100-foot setback was not entered.

Council Member Mossar said yes. In public parkland, the 100-foot setback should be honored.

Ms. Harrison clarified that as long as the 100-foot setback was honored, staff could explore alternatives to create additional fields.

Council Member Mossar said yes.

Council Member Beecham asked whether part of the motion was to clarify the policy that the 100-foot setback would be honored even where it would otherwise be the athletic facilities that might be built in the future.

Council Member Mossar said yes. As a Council Member, she would probably never be comfortable approving a playing field within the 100-foot setback. It was not an appropriate use. There were many possible public recreational uses for the riparian corridor. The purpose of the creek was for the enjoyment of the natural life that existed in the area, which was dedicated parkland. People should be able to enjoy the natural beauty in the riparian corridor.

Council Member Beecham was sympathetic to Council Member Mossar's observation. In the current situation, an athletic field already existed in the area. An area was open grassland, some of which had compost on it as well.

Council Member Freeman appreciated the IS proposal, which was extremely creative under the circumstances. City staff was extremely supportive of what the IS was doing. She was concerned about her perception that not all of the stakeholders were involved in the process. She was also concerned that she had nothing before her from staff that revealed the problem with private use of public lands. There was apparently some issue or the P&S Committee would not be having the discussion or would have already allowed the use. Something was missing. She understood the safety issues for the school and was absolutely behind a path to connect the IS through to Geng Road as long as it stayed 100 feet from the creek. The area was already designated as an athletic center. She had less problems with Field A, as long as it was 100 feet back, than Field B because it appeared less than 100 feet back. If the item was forwarded to the Council, the issues were important and should be addressed, such as the pros and cons of public use of private land and reevaluation of the JPA to strengthen numbers to enable the use of the levee.

Council Member Mossar clarified the motion to indicate that the pathway could be within the 100-foot setback, which was not the issue. The issue involved the playing fields. She said staff should be directed to move forward to find solutions for the playing field and the path that would be in compliance with the 100-foot setback.

Council Member Freeman suggested amending the motion to direct staff to provide the Council with the pros and cons of private use of public land.

Council Member Mossar said directing staff to provide the Council with that information could be another direction if the motion was approved as it was.

Council Member Freeman thought the motion included direction to staff.

Chairperson Kleinberg agreed with everything that had been said. The proposal provided with the City with a tantalizing opportunity to solve problems for many residents and people who used the IS. The City's two foremost responsibilities were safety, which impacted the traffic issue, and the environment. If the City could balance the proposal to solve both problems, as the substitute motion suggested, then the Council would have something it could carefully consider with which it could solve a couple of problems. She was concerned about the safety of the children, which was the troubling part of the issue. According to staff's testimony, traffic would be substantially reduced. Backup would still occur somewhere along Embarcadero Road; however, the area of greatest problem would be alleviated. Consideration should be given to working out an additional playing field that did not intrude on the riparian corridor both for the IS students and the rest of Palo Alto in a way that saved the City some money. If the IS was willing to spend the money, it was a generous gift. Many questions still needed to be answered and many parties needed to be involved in greater depth. Staff had enough information to proceed with gathering more research.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION RESTATED: Council Member Mossar moved, seconded by Freeman, to direct staff to proceed with public/private partnership and look at alternatives to: 1) work through the Joint Powers Authority with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to locate the pathway on the levee; and 2) to explore alternatives for playing fields that would not intrude into the 100-foot setback or the riparian corridor.

Chairperson Kleinberg understood the pathway would not be excluded if it could not be put on the levee. Council Member Beecham supported the substitute motion but wanted it to be more strongly in support of the conceptual proposal; however, it was essential to find resolution for the traffic and safety issues.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 4-0.

Ms. Harrison said when staff brought the item back to the Council, additional information would be provided showing the pros and cons of a public/private partnership.

Chairperson Kleinberg agreed. The suggestion was made for staff to return with a clear description of the relevant Comp Plan and BMP policies outlined for the Council in addition to the legal analysis. The riparian corridor could also be described in detail so the Council could understand what the corridor was all about and why it was being preserved.

Ms. Harrison asked whether the P&S Committee had concerns about having the item return on the Consent Calendar.

Chairperson Kleinberg asked Council Member Freeman to voice her concerns before a decision was made about the Consent Calendar.

Council Member Freeman wanted to make sure an EIR would be provided.

Ms. Harrison said an Environmental Review (ER) would be provided, not an EIR.

Council Member Freeman asked about the difference between an EIR and ER.

Ms. Harrison said an ER went through an entire checklist of potential environmental issues.

Director of Planning and Community Environment Stephen Emslie said all projects were subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and would go through an initial study. The next level of environmental review was a Negative Declaration, which did not mean a lesser review but declared that all the identified impacts could be mitigated to less than significant levels. If that was the case, a Negative Declaration was sufficient. If an impact could not be mitigated to less than significant levels, the full EIR was necessary.

Council Member Freeman asked when the CEQA checklist was presented to the Council.

Mr. Emslie said the checklist was approved by the appropriate body. Whoever made the final decision about the lease and entitlement would also have to consider the environmental documentation.

Council Member Beecham clarified the approval would not be presented at the current time.

Mr. Emslie replied no.

Ms. Harrison said if one of the options of the lease was the ER, and during the process a full EIR was found necessary, the project would automatically go to full EIR. When staff presented the Council with approval for the lease, the EIR would be certified at the same time the lease was approved. If a Negative Declaration was all that was necessary, that information would be conveyed to the Council.

Council Member Freeman asked where in the process the Council evaluated the checklist.

Mr. Emslie said the decision making portion of the review process included the environmental review to the Council. The Council's approval of the lease was the decision point. Under CEQA, the environmental review went along with the lease.

Council Member Beecham thought the environmental review also was presented to the P&TC.

Mr. Emslie said Council Member Beecham was correct. The P&TC would make a recommendation.

Council Member Mossar thought the P&S Committee all agreed that the path should move forward more rapidly than the playing field issue.

Ms. Harrison appreciated the clarification. The City Attorney's concern was addressed by the P&S Committee's consideration of the policy issue, which it had done.

Council Member Freeman thanked the IS for all the work it had done, taking so much time to explain and showing the need. She understood the safety issues and hoped they understood that as a public official where there were public lands, the responsibility also fell on the Council Members to ensure that the City as a whole was considered.

Council Member Beecham thought if the item was placed on the Consent Calendar that it might not remain, considering the amount of discussion.

Ms. Harrison said if the item was removed from the Consent Calendar, it would not be heard until April or May. If staff tried to place the item on the Council's agenda as a discussion item, it would not be heard any sooner.

Council Member Beecham said the Council had the option of removing the item from the Consent Calendar.

Chairperson Kleinberg was concerned about members of the public and stakeholders who had not been given the opportunity to speak on the item.

Council Member Beecham said the public would be given many opportunities to speak in the public domain.

Council Member Mossar said the problem with not putting the item on the Consent Calendar and agendaing it was that the traffic solution had to wait. There were some real benefits to moving the item forward; but it could not move forward until the basic policy decision was made. The people who had not "weighed in" on the conversation would have more interest in the specifics of the item rather than the policy decision. She encouraged the IS to encourage the Council to leave the item on the Consent Calendar and support the P&S Committee recommendation so the item could move forward, exploring alternatives and working on the path as soon as possible.

Chairperson Kleinberg said City policy directed that a unanimous vote by a committee meant the item would be placed on the Consent Calendar unless it was something very complicated. As long as the public and stakeholders would be given an opportunity to weigh in on the details and technical discussion, she was comfortable.

Council Member Freeman asked whether the item, if placed on the Consent Calendar, could be removed and merely discussed at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Harrison thought the project would be a lengthy item.

Council Member Freeman agreed that the one item she recalled Council pulling was lengthy.

Ms. Harrison said that was something staff tried not to do, given the length of the meetings.

Council Member Freeman asked whether a longer period of time would result if the item was pulled so it could be reagendaed.

Ms. Harrison said no. If the item stayed on the Consent Calendar, staff could move forward expeditiously. If pulled off the Consent Calendar, the time line would remain the same as if put on the agenda as a discussion item. The Council had a very heavy calendar not only with land use issues related to the libraries but other major planning issues. It was unlikely the item would be heard much before April or May in either case. There was no harm in putting the item on the Consent Calendar and then pulling it, if necessary.

Council Member Freeman would not want to jeopardize the item by hoping it would go through on the Consent Calendar.

Ms. Harrison said the item would return in about a month when the minutes were completed. If pulled, the item would be slated for the next available agenda.

Chairperson Kleinberg thanked everyone for being so patient and helpful.

3. Process re City Positions of Ballot Propositions

Chairperson Kleinberg asked whether anyone was present who wanted to speak to the City Positions on Ballot Propositions.

Ms. Harrison said the ballot propositions item was more of a Council item.

MOTION: Council Member Mossar moved, seconded by Beecham, to move Item No. 3 to a regularly scheduled Policy and Services Committee meeting.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0.

4. Discussion for Future Meeting Schedules and Agendas

Council Member Freeman asked about the future meetings and agendas.

Assistant City Manager Emily Harrison said the next big issue for the Policy and Services (P&S) Committee was a general discussion on Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) joint land use planning.

Council Member Freeman asked whether Ms. Harrison thought the ballot propositions could be handled on the same evening.

Council Member Mossar clarified the motion would move Item No. 3 to a regularly scheduled meeting of the P&S Committee.

Assistant to the City Manager Chris Mogensen asked whether the next meeting of the P&S Committee should be scheduled that evening. Chairperson Kleinberg said Mr. Mogensen would schedule the next P&S Committee meeting via email.

Council Member Mossar asked that the P&S Committee meetings be established on a regular schedule rather than fluctuating.

Chairperson Kleinberg agreed.

Council Member Mossar preferred to know that the meetings were always on the same day of the month.

Council Member Freeman requested changing the day of the P&S Committee meetings because of a conflict as the liaison to Neighbors Abroad, which occurred on the second Tuesday of every month.

Ms. Harrison said Council Member Burch had the same conflict last year.

Council Member Beecham asked how Council Member Burch handled the conflict.

Ms. Harrison said Council Member Burch missed the Neighbors Abroad meetings.

Council Member Freeman asked whether there was a problem with another Tuesday.

Ms. Harrison said the first and third Tuesdays were not available because the Finance Committee met on those nights. The same conflict came for staff, such as having to attend a budget meeting that evening, which had to be delayed.

Council Member Beecham said any other weeks involved other boards and commissions. He would not mind seeing whether there were other options, but recognized that it would probably be difficult.

Ms. Harrison agreed it was a problem. Regularly scheduled Thursdays sometimes worked.

Council Member Mossar said Joint Powers Authority (JPA) board meetings and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) board meetings were on Thursday nights.

Chairperson Kleinberg said she could not meet on Thursday nights. Council Member Beecham asked whether Council Member Freeman was wedded to Neighbors Abroad.

Council Member Freeman said yes, but she could not be in two places at one time.

Chairperson Kleinberg said there were also issues with PAUSD Board meetings and other staff issues. It became a difficult problem.

Council Member Freeman thought Neighbors Abroad was a important organization.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

City Clerk

Mayor

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