



City/School Liaison Committee Special Meeting Minutes



Special Meeting
June 12, 2019

Chairperson Kou called the meeting to order at 8:31 A.M. in the Community Meeting Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: City of Palo Alto Representatives
Alison Cormack, Council Member
Lydia Kou, Council Member
Chantal Gaines, Assistant to the City Manager, Staff Liaison

Palo Alto Unified School District Representatives
Jennifer DiBrienza, Board President
Todd Collins, Board Vice President
Jim Novak, District Chief Business Officer, Staff Liaison

Absent:

Oral Communications

None.

Minutes Approval

2. Superintendent's Comments and City Manager's Comments.

Don Austin, Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) Superintendent, reported the PAUSD Board of Education (Board) had mentioned the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP) during its meeting the previous night. Stanford University had reiterated its plan to maintain the deal it had negotiated with PAUSD. The school year had ended, and school personnel would be dispersing for summer break over the next few weeks.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, advised that the Council would hold a follow-up discussion of guidelines for placement of wireless communication facilities on wood poles during the next Council meeting.

MINUTES

3. Review of Recent City Council and PAUSD Board Meetings
 - a. CITY: Recent Council Agendas Recap
 - b. PAUSD: Recent Board Agendas Recap.

Council Member Cormack reported the Council had not discussed any topics that would be directly relevant to schools except an Ordinance banning single-use plastics. She was uncertain whether the Ordinance applied to schools.

Don Austin, Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) Superintendent, noted the PAUSD Board of Education (Board) would hear a Zero Waste presentation at the next Board meeting.

Chair Kou inquired whether City Staff would present the Zero Waste information.

Mr. Austin replied no. The PAUSD's vendor, Sodexo, would discuss options for compostable and reusable foodware with or without the Ordinance.

Chair Kou asked how the presentation would provide the Board with information about the single-use plastics Ordinance.

Mr. Austin indicated there was not a direct connection between Zero Waste and the Ordinance.

Board Member DiBrienza clarified that Sodexo was trying different pilot programs for compostable and reusable utensils. She would share information from the presentation with the City/School Liaison Committee and ensure PAUSD was aware of the Ordinance. PAUSD should be in compliance with the Ordinance.

Council Member Cormack indicated City Staff would share the Ordinance information directly with PAUSD.

Board Member Collins remarked that Sodexo had been planning to eliminate single-use plastics for the past year and a half. Sodexo was aware of the available options for compostable and reusable foodware. The primary issue was whether the Ordinance applied to schools.

Chair Kou asked if laws were automatically applicable to schools.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, was unsure as to how City Ordinances applied to PAUSD in general. The Ordinance contained a definition of food service establishments that he suspected would not affect school cafeterias. He would address the issue with the City Attorney.

MINUTES

Chair Kou remarked that City Staff would need to include PAUSD in the stakeholder discussion if the Ordinance applied to PAUSD.

Board Member Collins requested the name of the Ordinance.

Mr. Shikada explained that the Council typically did not give Ordinances names.

Council Member Cormack suggested the use of Disposable Foodware Ordinance.

Board Member DiBrienza reported the Board discussed a Resolution to request setbacks for wireless communication facilities during its meeting the previous evening. The Board would vote on adopting the Resolution at its next meeting. Board Members had raised questions about the conflicting science around wireless communications facilities, making evidence-based decisions, and improving communications between the Board and the City. She believed the Board would support the Resolution out of an abundance of caution. The Board had discussed the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP), approved many new contracts for the coming school year, and reviewed the budget.

Board Member Collins as an individual and an elected official requested a meeting with City Staff regarding the wireless communications facilities Ordinance.

Mr. Shikada agreed to schedule a meeting with Board Member Collins, who would not represent the Board in the meeting.

Board Member Collins clarified that individual Board Members did not speak as a Board representative. The Board President could act as the Board's spokesperson.

4. Cubberley Master Plan Next Steps.

Kristen O'Kane, Community Services Department Director, reported the final Community Co-Design meeting was held on May 9 with approximately 180 participants. City Staff had recommended the Council direct Staff to proceed with a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a Business Plan and to provide direction regarding the level of housing to include in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) project description. As a programmatic document, the CEQA document would not include as many details as a project document. The CEQA document should assess what might be constructed in a reasonable timeframe. At some future time, the CEQA document would likely need to be amended because not all information was

MINUTES

available at the current time. The Council had directed City Staff to include 112 housing units in the CEQA project description and to schedule a joint Study Session with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) Board of Education (Board).

Board Member Collins requested clarification of the number of housing units stated in the Council's Motion.

Ms. O'Kane clarified that the Council directed Staff to include 112 total housing units with the 112 units divided between City and PAUSD property.

Council Member Cormack reported she had initially proposed Option Number 3, which was amended to Option Number 4 with 164 housing units. The maximum number of housing units would be 112 units, but there could be scenarios for a maximum of 100 units on City property and for a maximum of 112 units on PAUSD property near San Antonio.

Robert Golton, PAUSD Bond Program Manager, advised that the Board had previously approved three priorities: a new school, PAUSD administrative offices, and housing. The Board had not provided direction with respect to the CEQA study. Alternatively, the project description could include 164 total housing units, presuming that any scenario feasible for 164 units would be feasible for fewer units.

Board Member Collins remarked that the Council's direction to City Staff regarding housing appeared to preempt a PAUSD determination of the appropriate number of housing units.

Ms. O'Kane suggested the Board and the City discuss the number of housing units during the joint Study Session.

Board Member Collins understood preparation of the CEQA document would begin prior to the joint Study Session

Ed Shikada, City Manager, advised that the schedule for the CEQA analysis was within the schedule for the Cubberley Master Plan in that the Master Plan should be complete by the end of the year. A clarification and reconciliation of the number of housing units could occur during a joint Study Session and before the environmental analysis was complete.

Board Member DiBrienza noted the Board's recess would prevent it from meeting prior to August.

Board Member Collins added that the Council would recess for July.

MINUTES

Council Member Cormack felt knowing the Board's intent with respect to housing sooner rather than later would be helpful. Absent an action item, comments by some Council Members were not binding on the Council. One scenario assumed all housing would be constructed on PAUSD property. The Board should indicate whether that was one of its interests. If it was not, the environmental document did not need to assess that scenario. She did not understand how a joint discussion would resolve the issue absent the Board approving a direction for environmental analysis.

Board Member DiBrienza asked if the Council wanted to know whether PAUSD was interested in all housing being located on PAUSD property or housing being located on PAUSD property.

Council Member Cormack replied both.

Board Member DiBrienza reiterated that the Board had discussed and expressed support for housing on the 525 San Antonio site.

Council Member Cormack indicated if the Board was not interested in building 112 units on the Greendell School site and 525 San Antonio, the environmental analysis probably should not include a scenario for that possibility. The Council had designed the environmental analysis to study multiple scenarios for housing. This could be the appropriate time for the Board to take action, especially since Board Members had concerns about the Council's action. If the Board could take action prior to its recess, the joint Study Session could result in decisions moving forward and timing.

Board Member Collins felt the Board taking up the issue prior to its recess was unlikely. The Board had not done the work needed for Board Members to have informed views. Before investing time, funds, and a facility, the Board needed to understand the numbers and how housing would work. Personally, he preferred the environmental analysis include the broadest range of options. He requested the number of housing units that the Jefferson School District was constructing in San Mateo County.

Mr. Golton answered 132 units. The Jefferson School District had an enrollment of 4,800 students.

Board Member Collins continued, stating the Jefferson School District was one-third the size of PAUSD. The Mountain View Whisman School District had signed up for 144 units, and it was half the size of PAUSD. Given this context, he would have difficulty agreeing to only 112 housing units.

Council Member Cormack asked if the Board would be prepared to make a decision during the joint Study Session.

MINUTES

Board Member DiBrienza responded no. The City and the Board had been operating with different timelines for a little bit. The Board needed information and discussion before making any decisions. Board Member Collins and she were concerned that if 112 units was the maximum number for analysis, there was a chance fewer than 112 units would be built. The Council's cap on the number of housing units appeared to limit the Board's decisions.

Council Member Cormack reported there was not sufficient Council support for 164 housing units.

Board Member Collins remarked that the Council limiting the maximum number of housing units that PAUSD could build on PAUSD land was odd.

Chair Kou indicated Council Member Tanaka had raised the issue of not knowing the Board's desires and needs for housing. The public had expressed concerns that housing on the Cubberley site would limit future community use of the site. The public's concern was the basis for the Council limiting the maximum number of housing units to 112.

Board Member DiBrienza reiterated that at the current time the Board did not know the number of housing units that would benefit PAUSD. The public seemed to have some misconceptions about the project. The public should be made aware that every scenario for the Cubberley site included a secondary school. If the Board had been invited to attend the Council meeting, it probably could not have added to the conversation because the Board had not made any decisions about the amount of housing. Studying the impacts of the greatest amount of housing possible on the site was logical.

Chair Kou clarified that the public's concerns pertained to use of City property.

Board Member DiBrienza indicated she heard concerns about use of both City and PAUSD property.

Council Member Cormack concurred with Board Member DiBrienza..

Chair Kou related that the Council's initial decisions indicated housing on 525 San Antonio would be acceptable.

Council Member Cormack suggested the Council would need a Board decision to revisit the issue and perhaps to reach a different outcome; however, the Board probably would not reach a decision for some time. Perhaps Staff could work on resolving the issues.

MINUTES

Mr. Shikada believed Staff would need to find a way to modify the timeline of the Cubberley lease or find a way to proceed with sufficient clarity around housing if the Board was not prepared to proceed with an environmental analysis based on the Council-approved project description.

Council Member Cormack emphasized the need for a formal decision from the Board.

Board Member Collins clarified that the Board had not been invited to the Council meeting, but PAUSD Staff had been invited to the meeting. Mr. Golton had attended the Council meeting; although, he had to leave the meeting prior to the Council discussion of the project. He referred to the previous Cubberley Community Advisory Committee report that stated the City could build a wonderful community center on its eight acres. He questioned whether the City would consider changing the current paradigm of co-ownership to one of neighbors so that each body could proceed on its own timeline and pursue its interests on its land. A paradigm of neighbors would eliminate the concept of shared-use facilities.

Don Austin, PAUSD Superintendent, reported he had received questions as to how the pace of the project had accelerated, and he could not answer the questions. The Greendell School site and 525 San Antonio were not part of the original project. The project had no clearly defined purpose on which everyone had agreed. He could not begin to frame a meaningful agenda item for the Board. He asked how the pace of the project had accelerated.

Board Member DiBrienza commented that some community members would state the pace had been painstakingly slow.

Ms. O'Kane advised that comments at the first community meeting concerned inclusion of the Greendell School site and 525 San Antonio. Based on those comments, she and Mr. Golton had obtained Council and Board approval to include the two sites in the scope of work for planning the Cubberley site. Including the two sites could allow more community programs and services to occur on the Cubberley site. The process had accelerated partially because Concordia's design process was intended to produce an outcome rapidly. Another reason was the lease that called for the City and PAUSD to collaboratively develop a master plan for the site by December 2019. Extending the community process for another year would probably not result in more or different information. The design for the Cubberley site was flexible and adaptable to accommodate future changes.

Mr. Golton reported the Cubberley lease between the City and PAUSD had been renewed multiple times over the years. In a sense, the December 2019 timeline was self-imposed. In his opinion, an agreement to redraw the

MINUTES

property lines was not an agreement because both parties had not agreed to or approved new property lines. PAUSD was willing to consider redrawing the property lines.

Council Member Cormack suggested there was some urgency, given the condition of the buildings and the populations that use the site. In a 2018 meeting of the City/School Liaison Committee, Dr. Austin may have been the person who mentioned PAUSD's willingness to add the Greendell School site and 525 San Antonio. The process did not feel rushed as the first Master Plan was completed in 1990, the Cubberley Community Advisory Committee completed its work in 2012, and Staff was not working on the project in February 2017. It would be a shame if the City and PAUSD were neighbors rather than partners.

Board Member DiBrienza related that the wonderful experience with Concordia had produced several options and obtained a great deal of community involvement. Being partners was more ideal than being neighbors. The City needed the Board to decide what it may want to construct on the site. The City and Board needed to determine what they wished to accomplish in a joint Study Session before scheduling it.

Mr. Shikada could work with Mr. Austin to arrange a joint Study Session and develop an agenda informed by the current discussion.

Board Member Collins suggested the agenda include a determination of whether the City and PAUSD wanted to be partners or neighbors.

5. Updates on Ongoing Matters
 - a. Grade Separation Update
 - b. Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP) Update.

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Assistant to the City Manager, reported representatives of Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) and a few other entities had been added to the Community Advisory Panel for grade separations. The first of six or seven meetings was scheduled for June 19. Staff's goal was to provide a recommendation from the group to the Council in October.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, added that on June 24 the Council would consider a contract amendment so that the consultants could support the Community Advisory Panel and the engineering and community engagement processes.

Don Austin, PAUSD Superintendent, had nothing new to report regarding the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP).

MINUTES

Mr. Shikada advised that the County of Santa Clara County (County) Planning Commission was holding hearings on the conditions of approval for the GUP. The City had submitted a letter to the Planning Commission and was preparing a more specific follow-up communication to the Planning Commission.

Chair Kou asked if the Planning Commission would hold two additional meetings.

Mr. Shikada replied yes.

6. Committee Format Discussion (Continued From February 21, 2019 Meeting).

Board Member DiBrienza inquired regarding the convenience of the 8:30 meeting time of the City/School Liaison Committee (Committee).

Council Member Cormack advised that the start time was not ideal, but she had adjusted her schedule to accommodate it.

Council Member Cormack seemed to recall that Staff would prepare some recommendations.

Chair Kou understood the intent of the discussion was to craft a purpose statement.

Ms. Gaines recalled a theme of sharing information between the City and Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD), particularly sharing projects and events that could impact one of the parties, in addition to the meetings between the City Manager and the Superintendent.

Council Member Cormack indicated a clear purpose statement would be helpful.

Chair Kou proposed a purpose statement of "[t]he committee meetings are the only times when members of PAUSD and City Council come together officially and on a regular basis. It provides a unique opportunity for the elected representatives and associated Staff to: (1) establish stronger relationships between and among electeds and Staff across separate jurisdictions operating in the same community; (2) gain an understanding of the perspectives, opportunities, and constraints of both PAUSD and the City; (3) share current actions and activities; (4) raise and share current and ongoing issues of mutual interest; (5) potentially resolve issues and/or devise means to prevent means from arising in the future; and (6) work together on community projects."

MINUTES

Board Member Collins liked the proposed statement. The meetings had evolved positively over the past few years. Constituents expected the City and the PAUSD Board of Education (Board) to work together to serve them. The City Manager's and Superintendent's attendance at the meetings was a fantastic improvement. Committee Members could surface issues to the other body and report to their respective bodies. He or Board Member DiBrienza was submitting written reports of the Committee meetings to the Board and verbal reports during the Board Operations portion of the agenda. These reports had raised the visibility of the Committee and increased the Board's ability to think and act collectively. He inquired whether Council Members reported to the Council.

Chair Kou responded no, but a report could be given during Council meetings.

Council Member Cormack requested the timing of the reports during Board meetings.

Board Member Collins explained that Board Operations occurred at the end of Board meetings, and Board Members typically shared recent activities relevant to the Board.

Council Member Cormack remarked that the Council would need a philosophical shift to receive reports from advisory bodies in addition to the Committee.

Board Member DiBrienza appreciated having a brief summary of Committee meetings that could be included in Board minutes. She suggested the initial sentence of the proposed purpose statement reflect the PAUSD Board of Education rather than PAUSD. Committee Members being aware of the need to share information at Committee meetings elevated the conversation. The City Manager's and Superintendent's presence ensured all issues were shared during meetings.

Council Member Cormack suggested a forward-looking list of projects could benefit the Committee as a method to surface potential issues. Perhaps the Committee could look at private schools and preschools through Safe Routes to School, emergency preparedness, or traffic and transportation.

Board Member Collins concurred with developing a forward-looking list of projects. Reviewing future projects could raise and prevent potential issues.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, reported the City Attorney had confirmed that schools were not subject to local regulation; therefore, the single-use

MINUTES

plastics Ordinance would not apply to schools. Staff could draft a list of ten or so upcoming projects. The Castilleja expansion would be on the list.

Chair Kou would provide the proposed purpose statement to Committee Members for review and revision.

Board Member DiBrienza asked if Committee Members should share proposed revisions to the purpose statement at the next meeting.

Chair Kou clarified that she would provide the purpose statement to Staff, who would provide it to Committee Members. Committee Members should send revisions to Staff.

Mr. Shikada added that a discussion of the purpose statement at the next meeting would provide the community with transparency. Maybe the Board and the Council could review and discuss the purpose statement at the joint Study Session.

Chair Kou suggested the Committee could invite private schools to present information. Including private school representatives on the Committee could broaden the Committee's focus too much.

Council Member Cormack clarified that particular topics could warrant an invitation for private schools to provide input. She questioned whether the City had a formal emergency preparedness program with private schools and preschools similar to the program with PAUSD. The City had a responsibility to the broader community than PAUSD.

Board Member DiBrienza believed the Committee had a specific purpose, and involving private schools would dilute that purpose. If the City wanted to inform PAUSD about a specific topic, it might want to inform private schools as well.

Council Member Cormack noted some private schools were located on PAUSD property.

Board Member Collins advised that PAUSD leased property to private schools. The only relationship between PAUSD and private schools was as lessor and lessee. This would be a good topic for the two bodies to discuss internally.

Council Member Cormack was not suggesting a change in the composition of the Committee but a broader perspective for the Committee.

MINUTES

Future Meetings and Agendas

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Assistant to the City Manager, reported the City/School Liaison Committee (Committee) had expressed interest in an item for vaping.

Chair Kou requested Staff invite staff from the County of Santa Clara (County) to participate in the discussion.

Ms. Gaines advised that she had a meeting scheduled with the County for an initial discussion.

Board Member DiBrienza requested the date of the next Committee meeting.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, recommended the July meeting be canceled.

Board Member DiBrienza noted the next regularly scheduled meeting was August 15.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 A.M.