



POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE SUMMARY MINUTES

Regular Meeting
May 11, 2021

The Policy and Services Committee of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in virtual teleconference at 7:01 P.M.

Present: Kou, Stone, Tanaka

Absent:

Oral Communications

None.

Agenda Items

1. Update and Potential Recommendations on Pending State and Federal Legislation.

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Deputy City Manager gave a brief update on what was happening at the federal level. The American Rescue Plan was slated to provide funding to communities and Staff has factored those resources into the Proposed Fiscal Year 2022 Budget. The federal government has brought back the federal earmark funds. Palo Alto (City) applied for three different earmark projects and was successful in having two pushed forward through Congress Member Eshoo's office. The earmark funds are not guaranteed and if successful, the funds will pay for the City's Crisis Assistance Helping Our on the Streets (CAHOOT)-like program and the rail grade separation study and the Downtown Coordinated Area Plan related to Palo Alto Avenue. The project that was not pushed forward was the reconstruction of Fire Station #4, but the City was pushing that project through the State Senator's office. The Census results have been released and a link to that information could be found online in the Staff report.

Niccolo De Luca, Townsend Public Affairs Senior Director gave an overview of efforts happening at the capital. He announced that there was a big legislative deadline on May 21, 2021, which was the meeting Appropriation Committee for both the Assembly and Senate. After May 21, 2021, Appropriation Committee meeting, bills that are approved go to the House of Origin floor. On Friday, May 14, 2021, the Mayor of California will put

SUMMARY MINUTES

forward his May revised budget. The Assembly's priorities included addressing homelessness, small business support, COVID relief, and other items. The City will have an opportunity to apply for homeless funding, broadband funding, and other funds to forward City initiatives. In terms of the bills that City was interested in, Senate Bill (SB) 9, which the City had taken an oppositional position on, would allow ministerially a property owner to split a lot located in a single-family residential zone to have two units per lot split. The reason why the City had taken up opposition on that bill was that it would allow ministerial approval, it was by-right and would not require California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. The second bill the City was interested in was SB 10, which allowed the City to pass an ordinance for a Parcel Tax of up to 10-units that would not require CEQA review. As SB 10 was written, the City Council (Council) could overturn a voter-approved initiative. Staff had advised the City in January of 2021, to build a good repour with new Senator Josh Becker. He proposed a bill that would help build senior affordable housing as well as provide units for transitioned-aged youth (TAY).

Andres Ramirez, Townsend Public Affairs Representative noted that Assembly Bill (AB) 703 had to do with open meetings related to the Brown Act. The bill proposed to remove notice requirements relating to teleconferencing and would allow continued teleconferencing of public meetings past the State of Emergency. The bill was proposed to be a 2-year bill. SB 2 had to do with the peace officer's certification of civil rights. The bill proposed to eliminate any immunity provisions for peace officers or custodial officers. In terms of SB 556, the bill was related to street light poles, traffic poles, and small wireless facility attachments. The bill prohibited local government or local, publicly owned electric utility from unreasonably denying the leasing or licensing of street light or traffic poles to communication service providers. The City has submitted a letter of opposition for that bill. The bill was amended recently which now authorized local governments or local, publicly owned electric utility conditioned access to street lights and traffic poles on reasonable terms and conditions. In terms of SB 765, the bill had to do with Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) setbacks. The bill authorized an applicator to submit a request to the City with an alternative rear or side yard setback requirement if the City's setback requirements made the construction of the ADU infeasible. The bill was proposed to be a 2-year bill.

Council Member Stone asked if there are limitations on what the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds can be spent on.

Ms. Gaines noted that the Treasury Department has released additional guidelines on how the funds can be spent.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. De Luca specified that the money cannot be spent on reserves.

Council Member Stone mentioned that the City lost a Congressional seat recently and inquired what Congressional Districts are impacted by that.

Mr. Ramirez disclosed that he was not sure, when the information is released, it will be passed to the City.

Council Member Stone requested further clarification on AB 537 and was Staff considering sending a letter of opposition.

Mr. De Luca explained that AB 537 proposed to make modifications to permitting deadlines for wireless facility applications. He advised the Policy and Service Committee (Committee) and Council to wait to see what happens in the Appropriation Committee meetings before deciding to oppose the bill.

Council Member Stone inquired what level of Council direction or approval is needed if the City wanted to oppose or support legislations.

Molly Stump, City Attorney articulated that there needed to be a simple majority vote.

Ms. Gaines added that the City has taken positions on bills that align with the legislative guidelines that Council adopted in earlier February of 2021.

Council Member Stone asked what does it mean if AB 703 does not move forward for in-person Council meetings.

Mr. De Luca announced that several bills were in progress that addressed teleconferencing. Many of the online meeting requirements were tied to the Governor's Executive Order and the Executive Order was still in place.

Ms. Stump mentioned that Staff was anticipating the Executive Order to be removed by the end of the calendar year. The Brown Act does allow teleconferences but there are specific requirements that must be followed. Two requirements were printing the address of where the Council Member is participating from and that the place must be open to the public. Also, the City has a provision that Council Members could only use that type of participation three times per year.

Council Member Stone inquired if the federal funds allocated for the CAHOOT-like program could also be used for the Park Pilot Program.

Ms. Gaines shared that Santa Clara County was working on a mobile response program and the City has been strongly advocating for north

SUMMARY MINUTES

country representation in the program. Santa Clara County has included a north county site and Staff's earmark proposal was broad enough to allow that type of support for Palo Alto residents. She noted that the PERK program was also moving forward.

Council Member Stone appreciated Staff's hard work in moving those programs forward. He mentioned that the City's zoning in R-1 allowed for an ADU and Junior ADU (JADU) on all single-family lots. He asked if SB 9 would make it so that all lots in the R-1 Zone would be allowed to have two ADUs on the newly divided lots.

Mr. De Luca articulated that Staff's interpretation of SB 9 was if a lot used the SB 9 split, the applicant could only do two units on one lot with two on the other. A JADU counts as one unit, an ADU counts as one unit, and a duplex counted as two units.

Council Member Stone pressed that folks would not be able to add on the City's additional ADU allocation.

Mr. De Luca answered no unless the City has a local ordinance that can be done for every component that SB 9 recommends.

Council Member Stone noted that the City will have to change its ordinance to accommodate that request.

Ms. Stump understood that the City's ADU and JADU Ordinance largely conformed to state law. Staff will continue to watch SB 9 as it moves through the process. If the City's ordinance does come out of compliance, the City can adjust the ordinance.

Council Member Tanaka expressed that many Council Members and the public like the Zoom meetings. It has promoted more public engagement.

Ms. Stump interjected that there is no existing aspect of the Brown Act that prevents the City from using Zoom during in-person meetings.

Council Member Tanaka encouraged the Council to continue using Zoom to allow the public to engage more.

Ms. Stump noted that the City Manager has placed an item on the Council's agenda to discuss it.

Council Member Tanaka requested information on the \$2.3 trillion infrastructure plan that was proposed by President Biden.

Ms. Gaines declared that the plan was in the very early phase of design.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. De Luca added that the President proposed the plan but Congress had to decide if the plan where to move forward and what the process was. There was a strong effort to help with district projects. He recommended that in terms of infrastructure projects, the City should highlight its regional support, regional benefit, and jobs create. Also, highlight the community support for the project at the beginning of the submittal process. He concluded that the City does not want federal funding to be the only source of funding when submitting infrastructure projects.

Council Member Tanaka inquired when does Staff anticipate that \$2.3 trillion will be available.

Mr. Ramirez noted that dates have not been released as of yet but Staff will investigate it.

Council Member Tanaka reported that the City has many infrastructure projects that are being deferred. He asked if the funding from the infrastructure plan can be used to fund those projects.

Mr. De Luca emphasized that the City needs Congresswoman Eshoo to sponsor the City's projects. He noted that projects that usually receive funding are large infrastructure projects.

Council Member Tanaka challenged how the Federal Government decides how to allocate the funds.

Mr. De Luca claimed that normally the funds are allocated in the priorities of the Congressperson.

Ms. Gaines added that large community support can elevate a project above other projects.

Council Member Tanaka inquired if the funds will be spread evenly across all the districts.

Mr. Ramirez stated that there is a priority to be fair and equitable with funds. However, certain districts or regions have greater needs than others as it relates to infrastructure. Projects that show a large benefit to an entire region will rise above other proposed projects.

Council Member Tanaka articulated that the City will need more funding for the grade separation project and he asked if the money could be used for that.

Mr. De Luca agreed that the grade separation project is a good candidate, but there are still federal requirements that have to be met.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka inquired if Townsend was advocating on behalf of the City to receive the funds for the grade separation project or do the Council Members have to do that.

Mr. De Luca announced that Townsend is happy to advocate for funding for the grade separation project.

Council Member Tanaka indicated that funding for the grade separation project is important. He questioned what recommendations Staff was seeking from the Committee on grade separation funding.

Ms. Gaines explained that there is enough Council authority to have Townsend have those conversations on behalf of the City.

Chair Kou agreed that there is interest at the Council level to seek funding for the grade separation project from the Federal Government. She requested how does SB 591 makes it easier to build senior and TAY housing.

Mr. De Luca explained that SB 591 allows senior housing and TAY housing to be integrated under one structure.

Chair Kou agreed that SB 591 is a great bill. She noted that SB 10 is similar to AB 1322 and she encouraged Staff to call out any similar bills so that the City can oppose those similar bills as well. She believed that SB 9 contained similar language to SB 477 and SB 478. She hoped for a more in-depth examination of all the bills. In terms of SB 703, she advised there be community outreach to provide visibility to the bill in the community.

Winter Dellenbach wanted to understand SB 16 and will the City be supporting that bill as well as SB 2. She asked if Staff thought those bills would be adopted. She mentioned that having a sworn officer riding with a CAHOOT's team is the opposite of how the program is run in other Cities.

Mr. De Luca commented that SB 2 did not move forward last year due to liability concerns. Staff suspected amendments will be made when the bill moves to the Second House. SB 16 expanded the categories of police personal records that are subject to the Public Records Act. Staff recommended that the City endorse SB 16. He advised the City to wait on SB 2 to see what type of amendments are made to it.

Ms. Gaines explained that the PERK Program has a clinician riding with a sworn officer. The CAHOOT Program does not involve an officer.

Chair Kou articulated that there are several bills that she believed the Council should discuss in supporting. She advised Staff to group all

SUMMARY MINUTES

legislations that are proposing to impede on local control, legislation that the City should support as well as legislation to watch. She shared that Townsend has provided memos to other agencies that provide descriptions on all the bills, who supports the bill, if the jurisdiction should support or oppose the bill, and recommended actions. She encouraged Townsend to provide that type of report to the City.

Mr. De Luca confirmed that Townsend can do that report for the City.

Chair Kou requested further clarification on AB 34.

Mr. Ramirez explained that the goal of AB 34 was to put out a bond measure in the amount of \$10 billion for local broad band infrastructure financing. As written, the language does give a portion of that \$10 billion to go to underserved communities or unconnected communities. Palo Alto would not fall within that category; however, the City would not be excluded from applying for the funds. He advised that the City to be engaged in the progress of the bill.

Chair Kou mentioned that AB 34, SB 4, and SB 28 all address broadband. She asked if the City should support all three bills to promote equity.

Mr. De Luca declared that the City's effort would best be served by supporting a formal budget action. He advised the City to support a funding request as opposed to specific bills.

Chair Kou disclosed that SB 15 grants City's resources if they voluntarily rezone big-box buildings for affordable and workforce housing. She shared that was another bill worth supporting.

Mr. De Luca responded that the bill does not fall within the adopted legislative platform that was adopted in January of 2021.

Chair Kou asked if Council has to discuss supporting the bill since it is not in the adopted legislative platform.

Ms. Gaines answered yes.

Chair Kou expressed that she was also interested in supporting AB 787.

Ms. Stump clarified that the Committee must make a motion to Council to agree that the City should take a position on bills that do not fall within the adopted legislative platform.

Chair Kou recommended the Council support AB 1258, Affordable Cares Act (ACA) 7, ACA 2, AB 491, AB 617, and AB 787.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ms. Stump asked what Chair Kou's intention was by listing all the bills.

Chair Kou restated that Staff should group the bills together into categories of if they fit within the legislative guidelines or not. Then Staff can issue letters of support on the ones that do without having to go to Council.

Ms. Stump agreed that Chair Kou could make a list and if supported by the Committee, the Committee could make a Motion to recommend Council direct Staff to review the bills, allow Staff to make the determination on which bills fit within the guidelines, bring that information back to the Committee, and then the Committee could then make another recommendation to Council.

Ed Shikada, City Manager expected a large portion of the bills will require full Council action. A question for Council to answer was whether the Council should take a position on a large number of bills and how that fits within the legislative strategy.

Chair Kou emphasized that several of the bills are well written and can further the construction of affordable housing and address equity issues. She disclosed that some analysis needs to be done.

Mr. Shikada asked what is the ratio of bills introduced versus bills that become law.

Mr. De Luca estimated one in three bills become law.

Mr. Shikada stated historically, the City has not taken a position on every bill. He requested advice from Townsend on how best to advise the Council on effectively influencing the legislative process.

Mr. De Luca agreed that it takes a lot of work to pursue authors to include items that can make a bill swing in the favor of the City. He shared that support letters sent to delegations are helpful. He believed it was smart to have a universe of no more than 20 bills that Staff is actively working on to support or oppose.

Chair Kou disclosed that the City of Lafayette and the City of Cupertino are receiving a lot more information than Palo Alto. She emphasized that it is worrisome when bills that are similar to bills that the City has opposed are adopted without the City knowing.

Mr. Shikada suggested that if Chair Kou likes a specific model that another jurisdiction uses, that should be included in the Committee's Motion to the full Council. He suggested the Committee discuss different models and then

SUMMARY MINUTES

recommend that model to Council. He mentioned that the items listed by Chair Kou will require a lot of work and may not all be covered by the City's current contract with Townsend.

Mr. De Luca suggested that the analysis be done after the Appropriation Committee has met.

Chai Kou supported that recommendation.

Council Member Stone inquired if the City will have to amend the contract with Townsend in order to fill the work.

Mr. De Luca answered no.

Council Member Stone supported the concept of having a discussion about other jurisdiction's models at the Committee level before going to Council.

MOTION: Chair Kou moved, seconded by Council Member Stone to recommend the City Council approve the action on the following pending State and Federal bills or policy:

- A. Direct Townsend Public Affairs to group the proposed legislative bills that fit within the City of Palo Alto's legislative guidelines, the City of Palo Alto's Resolution 9942 (which preserves local control and democracy), and those that would need City Council action in order to take a position; and
- B. Return to the Policy and Services Committee with other city models that contain a legislative committee and more oversight of proposed legislation, such as those in the City of Lafayette and the City of Cupertino.

Ms. Stump requested further clarification regarding Motion Letter B.

Chair Kou word smithed Part B.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER: "Direct Staff to look at other city..."

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER: "...and return the results to the Policy and Services Committee for discussion and review."

Chair Kou asked if Townsend has other models they use besides the models used by the City of Lafayette and the City of Cupertino.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. De Luca answered yes. He said once the question how involved does the City want to be is answered, Townsend will understand better what models to provide to the City for discussion.

Ms. Stump highlighted that there are two process issues with the Motion. One was the item was agendaized as a legislative update with the potential for the Committee to recommend some items to Council to take a position on. Staff was not prepared to discuss changing the model in which the City engages with legislation. She cautioned against the Committee generating substantial work assignments to Staff at the Committee level.

Mr. Shikada felt that the Motion allows for the item to be moved to Council for approval and then leads to subsequent work at the Committee level. He summarized that if the Motion is approved, the Committee is making the recommendation to Council. Council would have to approve the recommendation before Townsend does the categorization and comparison of the bills to the legislative guidelines. He emphasized that the City's legislative analysis already does a lot of the work that is being recommended.

Chair Kou noted that the analysis that the legislative advocates do never comes to the Committee or Council and that's the problem.

Mr. Shikada stated that the interpretive piece was that many bills fail and it would not be wise for the City to spend resources on bills that will never be adopted.

Chair Kou agreed but the City should allow Townsend to do the work to provide information to the Committee and Council on what bills have been dropped.

Mr. Shikada cautioned that if the City provided positions on all the bills, it would diminish the City's voice in the process.

Chair Kou agreed but she trusted that Townsend was knowledgeable to know what bills would affect the City and those would be brought forward for the Committee and Council to review.

Mr. De Luca was confident that Staff has not missed any bills this session. He noted that if there are amendments that the City wants to make to a specific bill, that requires a lot of time and work.

MOTION AS AMENDED: Chair Kou moved, seconded by Council Member Stone to recommend the City Council approve the action on the following pending State and Federal bills or policy:

SUMMARY MINUTES

- A. Townsend Public Affairs to group the proposed legislative bills that fit within the City of Palo Alto's legislative guidelines, the City of Palo Alto's Resolution 9942 (which preserves local control and democracy), and those that would need City Council action in order to take a position; and
- B. Direct Staff to look at other city models that contain a legislative committee and more oversight of proposed legislation, such as those in the City of Lafayette and the City of Cupertino, and return the results to the Policy and Services Committee for discussion and review.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0

2. Review and Recommend to the City Council Adoption of the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan Update for City Buildings, Parking Facilities, Parks, and Public Right-of-Way Sidewalks and Curb Ramps.

Brad Eggleston, Public Works Director reported that Palo Alto's (City) American with Disability Act (ADA) Transition Plan is an important roadmap for making sure that the City facilities and services are available to folks who have disabilities. He noted in the General Fund Capital Budget that was reviewed by the Finance Committee, there is approximately \$500,000 being budgeted annually for work on accessibility issues.

Holly Boyd, Public Works Assistant Director shared that the ADA was passed in 1992. The Act provides civil rights protections to folks with disabilities in areas of employment, state and local government services, transportation, telecommunications, and access to public accommodations. The City's existing ADA Transition Plan complied with federal regulations issued in 1991, and in 1993 the City established an annual Capital Improvement Fund (CIP) to fund improvements identified in the plan. The ADA standards were updated in 2010 and the City's existing plan became out of compliance. The City hired a consulting group in 2015 to update the ADA Transition Plan. Staff recommended that the Policy and Service Committee (Committee) recommend the Council adopt the ADA Transition Plan Update. The ADA Transition Plan included four requirements. One was to identify physical obstacles that limit the accessibility to City programs and services. Secondly was to describe what methods would be used to make the facilities accessible. Thirdly, a schedule must be included that outlined how the City will achieve compliance and lastly, indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan. The plan's objectives included providing accessible points of arrival, provide access to buildings, provide access to primary function areas, and provide access to building elements. In terms of

SUMMARY MINUTES

public rights-of-way, the City has an annual sidewalk program as well as the City handles sidewalk, curb, and gutter requests on a case-by-case basis. Any ADA ramps are brought into compliance when resurfacing and development occurs.

Valerie Tam, Public Works Project Engineer reported that for City facilities, the priorities included pedestrian access from point of arrival to the building's entrance, access to locations with primary building functions, provide sanitary facilities and access to them, and provide barriers with low severity effects. The Facility Survey Reports identified all barriers and physical elements that affect the accessibility of primary building functions. Key factors were considered while drafting the plan. Age of the facility, cause or remediation, and long-term facility planning were heavily weighted factors in prioritizing the City's facilities. The ADA Transition Plan was divided into three implementation phases and spans 60-years. Public outreach was conducted to receive input from the community and to help guide the development of the plan. Cubberley Community Center, Mitchell Park Library, Mitchell Park Community Center, and Lucie Stern Community Center were named the top three most used City facilities.

Council Member Stone was impressed with the analysis. He questioned what liability was the City under for accidents that might occur due to poorly maintained sidewalks.

Molly Stump, City Attorney acknowledged that at any one time the City does have a small handful of claims or lawsuits that involve an injury due to poor sidewalk management. Sometimes the City was successful in defending against those types of litigation but other times the City provides compensation.

Ms. Boyd clarified only 20 percent of the sidewalks located in the City were assessed.

Council Member Stone inquired if there are federal funds available to remediate accessibility issues.

Ms. Boyd disclosed that she was not aware of any specific grants, but Staff can explore that further.

George Hoyt, Chief Building Official agreed with Ms. Boyd's statement.

Council Member Stone asked what ADA issues are there in terms of website accessibility.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ms. Tam gave the example of having PDFs being read by text readers as well as colors.

Council Member Stone inquired if the 30-year district by district replacement program timeframe was comparable to other jurisdictions.

Ms. Boyd explained that the City was unique in that it takes responsibility for all sidewalk repairs. Annually, the City pays \$1 million to maintain sidewalks.

Mr. Eggleston added that the City has many trees and many of the issues are caused by tree roots.

Council Member Stone requested what a cost-sharing model looked like for sidewalk repair.

Mr. Eggleston explained that some communities require residents to fix the sidewalk and some communities have a cost-share arrangement between the City and residents.

Council Member Stone disclosed that many of the public outreach meetings were scheduled when working community members cannot attend and he encouraged Staff to be more cognizant of that. He concluded that he will be supporting the Staff recommendation.

Council Member Tanaka agreed with Council Member Stone regarding public outreach. He indicated that the City's website has many PDFs and it is easier for the public to access documents if they are regular webpage.

Mr. Eggleston could not provide comments on why the City uses PDFs but explained that a lot of thought went into the structure of the new website.

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor, Chief Communications Officer announced that the City is exploring other opportunities that would increase the searchability of documents. Staff has been trained on ADA accessibility for websites and those skills are incorporated into the new website. The new website now has a score in the 80-percentile range.

Council Member Tanaka emphasized that PDFs are cumbersome and hard to navigate on various devices. He asked how does the plan address frivolous lawsuits.

Ms. Stump stated that having a City facility listed in the plan and providing a timeframe on when the City plans to make updates gives the City some protection from frivolous lawsuits.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka asked where does the City fall in terms of a scale of doing everything possible and doing the bare minimum.

Ed Shikada, City Manager noted that the Finance Committee was currently discussing it but the City has been making large investment. He explained that the Capital Program and retrofits for accessibility are done hand in hand.

Council Member Tanaka asked what could happen to make the plan more successful.

Mr. Shikada answered increase funding.

Council Member Tanaka inquired what the current funding allocations were for the plan.

Mr. Eggleston articulated that there was one Capital Project that was solely for implementing ADA improvements and that fund is roughly \$500,000 a year. He emphasized that most of the work happens through other capital projects.

Council Member Tanaka stated that the Committee is approving the plan but there is no funding attached to it.

Mr. Eggleston clarified that the Proposed Budget included the funding for the plan.

Ms. Stump confirmed that the item is a planning document only.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to know what happens to facilities that are on the plan that closed.

Mr. Shikada stated that the hope was that the facility will not stay closed for long and the ADA updates to that facility will remain in the plan.

Council Member Tanaka wanted buildings that are open to receive upgrades before closed buildings as well as buildings that are not used frequently should be lower on the priority list.

Mr. Eggleston noted that one criterion used to prioritize facilities was the number and type of programs and services that take place in the facility and the frequency of use by the general public.

MOTION: Chair Kou moved, seconded by Council Member Stone to recommend the City Council adopt the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan Update.

SUMMARY MINUTES

MOTION PASSED: 3-0

3. Update on Community Engagement Activities, Including Town Halls.

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor, Chief Communications Officer noted that the Staff report does call out several areas in addition to Town Halls that were focused on in the current year as well as in the upcoming fiscal year. Staff hosted several public engagement events, which included the Rail Town Hall and a Budget Town Hall. Staff used several methods of best practices to engage the community such as using survey cards and holding question and answer sessions. Staff recently launched an online survey regarding the budget which received a high engagement rate. In terms of future engagement efforts, Staff will be hosting a Town Hall in the fall, chat with the Mayor meetings will be held twice a year, neighborhood Town Hall meetings will be held once a month, and continue communications through the City's Boards and Commissions. Staff will continue to use an online virtual format through December 2021. Staff will be providing the results of the National Community Survey to City Council (Council) soon.

Cherrill Spencer announced she is a member of the Cities for Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) Coalition. She mentioned that the summit for women and girls is scheduled to take place on June 12, 2021. She wanted to know how the summit will be advertised and she urged the City to use all forms of communication to advertise the summit. She was excited to see the results of the National Community Survey.

Council Member Stone asked if Staff is exploring a in-person/virtual hybrid model for future community engagement.

Ed Shikada, City Manager mentioned that Staff is focusing on having a hybrid model for City Council first.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor agreed that Staff plans to start exploring the potential to having a combination of virtual/in-person meetings.

Council Member Stone expressed his excitement about the plan and he appreciated Staff's work. He noted it is critical coming out of the pandemic to facilitate community connections. He recommended that Staff explore community meetings that target the City's youth population.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to understand more about the City Manager's Service Feedback initiative.

Mr. Shikada confirmed that the initiative will begin its pilot program soon.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka encouraged the City to have short and more frequent surveys rather than a long, once a year survey.

Ms. Horrigan-Taylor noted that the City has a new platform called Palo Alto Town Hall and Staff plans to use that platform to do more surveys.

Council Member Tanaka emphasized that there are many members of the community who are not as engaged and Staff should explore all ways to reach those citizens.

Chair Kou announced she is excited about the Neighborhood Town Hall meetings. In terms of the National Community Survey, she asked if the results will be used for next year's priority setting at Council.

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Deputy City Manager disclosed that per the budget, Staff was proposing to have the National Community Survey be conducted every other year. She announced that the timing of the survey next year will be aligned with Council priority setting.

Future Meetings and Agendas

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Deputy City Manager specified the items for the June 2021 Policy and Service Committee meeting included the review of the Tree Ordinance, an audit report, the procedures and protocols for City Council, and the quarterly update on Staff's equity work. There will be no meeting in the month of July.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 P.M.