

CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL DRAFT MINUTES

Regular Meeting August 18, 2014

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:08 P.M.

Present: Berman, Holman, Klein, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd

Absent: Burt, Price

STUDY SESSION

1. Potential Topics for Discussion During the City Council Study Session with Supervisor Joe Simitian.

Greg Betts, Director of Community Services, thanked Supervisor Simitian for the \$150,000 contribution from the Park Charter Fund for the Magical Bridge Playground Project. Substantial construction had been made to the pathways on both sides of the bridge to make it more accessible to people with disabilities. The gift set the pace for Friends of the Magical Bridge to reach and exceed their financial goal. The Magical Bridge Playground would be an inspiration to other parks in Santa Clara County.

Supervisor Joe Simitian thanked the community for making the Magical Bridge Playground a reality. The Board of Supervisors agreed the project had regional significance and was an appropriate beneficiary of the Park Charter Fund. People would view the Magical Bridge Playground as a regional benefit and facility.

Cybele Lovuolo-Bhushan appealed for a cold-weather shelter to be located in north Santa Clara County. This was another opportunity for the City and County of Santa Clara (County) to be trendsetters.

Supervisor Simitian had three goals in mind in when he returned to the Board of Supervisors. The first goal was to ensure the County carefully utilized taxpayer dollars and promptly delivered services. His second goal was being involved in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. His third goal was to be mindful of the needs of his District. Palo Alto faced a few challenges when working with the County: Palo Alto was geographically

remote from the county seat and the misperception that Palo Alto had no social service needs. The Sunnyvale Armory, which had served as a cold-weather shelter, was being redeveloped for housing. The County adopted a strategy called Housing First to identify and house people having the greatest level of need. The County realized it needed a shelter for the homeless until they could be served through Housing First. The County continued to search for a replacement shelter. The County utilized Measure A funds to contract with Project We Hope in East Palo Alto for five beds and case management. The County utilized Palo Alto's \$250,000 matching funds and case management for additional housing vouchers. Additional County offices would be located near the North County Courthouse in order to provide housing, mental health, and substance abuse services to residents with cases before the Palo Alto Review Court.

Council Member Schmid recalled the homeless discussion before the Council in 2013, which resulted in new shelter space, housing vouchers and case management, and County services for local residents. The community remained sensitive to social service needs.

Vice Mayor Kniss advised that the Opportunity Center and dwindling resources for nonprofit agencies remained concerns for the City. Local nonprofit agencies should look to the County for long-term support.

Supervisor Simitian noted that the Housing Authority was a separate legal entity from the County and, thus, not under County control. The Housing Authority suffered under Federal sequestration. As a result, the County provided \$1 million to transition Section 8 voucher recipients into new living situations. He met with the Human Relations Commission (HRC) and suggested they approach both the City and County with issues and programs as often as necessary to obtain a response. City government had a limited role in social services. There were limits to what the County could afford and to what he could persuade the Board of Supervisors to do.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if the City should approach the County the following spring with proposals for matching grants or programs.

Supervisor Simitian stated the City should begin a conversation sooner rather than later. More services could be offered through leveraging funds or obtaining matching grants.

Council Member Berman inquired about criteria for a building to replace the Sunnyvale Armory shelter. He hoped the local press would write about the County's efforts and criteria so that the community could propose suitable locations.

Supervisor Simitian reported the County needed a bare structure that could be retrofitted, basically a large warehouse. Shower and restroom facilities, cooking facilities, office space or partitioned areas were not essential. The primary concerns were size, location, and access to public transportation.

Council Member Holman requested Supervisor Simitian comment on ways the City could coordinate with the County in terms of timing and programs, and ways the City and County could leverage outside resources. Perhaps the City and County could work across counties to solve human issues.

Supervisor Simitian remarked that one advantage was the County and City had the same fiscal year. The City should present proposals early. Any conversation should begin by determining whether a proposal was within the County's purview. He asked the Council to keep in mind that he had obligations to other cities as well as Palo Alto.

Council Member Holman asked Supervisor Simitian to define early.

Supervisor Simitian suggested conversations regarding proposals should begin now.

Council Member Klein thanked Supervisor Simitian's staff for their support and efforts in the transfer of the Airport.

Supervisor Simitian felt the transfer of the Airport was sensible. His only role was to speed efforts to meet grant cycles.

Council Member Klein remarked that the Council concluded that the Silicon Valley Leadership Group's (SVLG) tax proposal for 2014 shortchanged Caltrain and thus Palo Alto. He inquired whether the Board of Supervisors had discussed the proposal for 2016 or deferred it to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

Supervisor Simitian recalled an op-ed article he wrote in 2000 for a similar tax proposal. In that article, he argued that his constituents were quite enthusiastic about County-wide and regional solutions, but they had a legitimate expectation of some tangible benefits. When approached by the SVLG in 2014, he raised the same issue. Postponing the measure to 2016 provided the County with time to determine what it wanted so it could partner with cities to raise issues.

Council Member Scharff believed a sub-regional process for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) contained benefits and risks for Palo Alto. The Santa Clara County Cities Association had started working on a sub-regional process with trades.

Page 3 of 24 City Council Meeting Draft Minutes: 08/18/14

Supervisor Simitian understood the process focused on voluntary efforts. No one wanted to congregate all affordable housing in a few communities. There were opportunities for collaboration.

Council Member Scharff inquired about the status of work on Oregon Expressway.

Supervisor Simitian advised that a subcontractor failed to perform and was six months behind schedule. The project should be finished in the next two weeks. Improvements included dedicated left-turn lanes at a number of intersections and improved traffic synchronization.

Mayor Shepherd was interested in thoughts from area Boards of Supervisors regarding the SVLG tax proposal and the survival of Caltrain.

Supervisor Simitian commented that measures could be placed on a ballot through different methods. SVLG would utilize the method that most accommodated its goals. At the first meeting in September 2014, he would initiate a discussion of County needs and priorities and historical amounts of funding provided to the area. He encouraged the community to participate on one of the County's 70 Boards and Commissions.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

James Keene, City Manager, announced construction of the California Avenue Streetscape Project was at the halfway point. complexities of the project, Staff expected construction would be complete in Mitchell Park Library would undergo a flushing of the March 2015. ventilation system in order to remove dust and odors from the facility. On September 27, 2014, the City would celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the British Invasion with a preview of the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center. The Grand Opening Celebration of the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center was scheduled for December 6, 2014. Staff was drafting a compliance and enforcement plan for the Emergency Dry Year Water Waste Restrictions adopted on August 4, 2014. Senior Engineer Mike Nafziger of the Public Works Department developed a new and innovative way to reuse groundwater removed during construction excavation of basements. City Staff monitored traffic at the entrance to Palo Alto High School and responded to minor problems on the first day of classes. The Twilight Concert Series would conclude August 23, 2014 and feature local teen bands.

Mayor Shepherd noted a new entrance to Gunn High School.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Cybele Lovuolo-Bhushan learned about a joint meeting of the cities in Supervisor Simitian's district. She encouraged the City's representative to attend that meeting to continue pushing for a new cold-weather shelter.

Mark Weiss felt the Council should hold a dialog regarding public safety. Recent articles in the newspaper reported improprieties in the 2011 Measure D ballot initiative affecting the collective bargaining agreement with one public safety union. The media and perhaps public safety sensationalized the Gunn graffiti hate crime case. He supported a seamless transition from neighborhood preparedness to public safety. He did not support privatizing or outsourcing public safety functions.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Herb Borock spoke regarding Agenda Item Number 7. The Council should not act on this item, because environmental review had not been performed. The project was not exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Citations in the Resolution did not apply to the action being taken.

Council Member Holman requested the City Attorney respond to the speaker.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, had reviewed the item. It was appropriately placed on the Consent Calendar, and findings were appropriate. Environmental review would be performed at the appropriate time.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to approve Agenda Item Numbers 2-7.

- 2. Approval of a Purchase Order with Peterson Cat in a Not to Exceed Amount of \$395,915 for the Purchase of Three Caterpillar Backhoes (Scheduled Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Capital Improvement Program VR-14000 and VR-15000).
- 3. Approval and Authorization for the City Manager to Execute 5 Utilities Public Benefits Program Contract Amendments Extending Each Contract Term through June 30, 2015: (1) Amendment No. 3 to Ecology Action Contract C11140925 Increasing Compensation by \$400,000; (2) Amendment No. 2 to Synergy Companies Contract C11138611A Increasing Compensation by \$150,000; (3) Amendment No. 2 to Synergy Companies Contract C11138611B Increasing Compensation by \$166,000; (4) Amendment No. 3 to Enovity Inc. Contract C09130404A with No Increase in Compensation; and (5)

Amendment No. 2 to Energy Resource Solutions Contract C11141001 with No Increase in Compensation.

- 4. Approval of Agreement with Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board for Rail Shuttle Bus Service Administration to Provide Community Shuttle Service on the Existing Embarcadero Shuttle Route from July 2014 till June 2015.
- 5. Approval and Authorization for the City Manager to Execute a Master Country Agreement with Equinix LLC and Delegating the Authority to the City Manager to Execute Individual Service Orders Under That Master Agreement for a Term Not-to-Exceed Five Years and a Total Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$500,000.
- 6. <u>Budget Amendment Ordinance 5266</u> entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto in the Amount of \$233,030 for Development of Sustainability and Climate Action Plan (S/CAP)."
- 7. Resolution 9455 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Authorizing the Acceptance of the Allocation of Funds and the Execution of a Grant Agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in the Amount of \$500,027 or Other Amount Specified in the FAA Grant Letter for an Airport Improvement Program Matching Grant for the Palo Alto Airport Runway and Taxiways Rehabilitation Improvement Project."

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Burt, Price absent

ACTION ITEMS

8. Adoption of an Ordinance Dedicating 7.7 Acres Of Land Deeded To The City By Russell Lee To Become A Part Of Foothills Park And Approve Letter Of Appreciation To The Lee Family.

Greg Betts, Director of Community Services, reported the Council directed Staff to dedicate the 7.7 acres; to vet possible uses of the property through the Parks and Recreation Commission (PARC); to return in late fall 2014 with recommendations from PARC along with cost estimates; and to return with a timeline for opening the property to the public. Page 3 of the Staff Report should state the second reading of the Ordinance would occur September 8, 2014 rather than September 1. He had reviewed with Mayor Shepherd an initial draft of a thank-you letter to the Lee family. Staff hired an outside survey consultant to ensure the City had the correct metes and bounds description of the property. The survey also identified all easements on the

property. The property was one of the fastest connections for fire responders to reach Foothills Park. The City obtained the property as part of a deed from the Lee Family in 1981. In 1983, the Lee Family reserved an estate on the property and sold the right of access to American Title. In 1985, the Council granted permanent easements for emergency egress, utilities, and landscape. In 1985-1996, the property was held by American Title. In 1996, a year-to-year lease was issued for Mr. Arrillaga's continued use of the property. In 2005, the lease with Mr. Arrillaga was terminated. Since 2005, Acterra had leased part of the property for a native plant nursery. The lease with Acterra was renewed by mutual consent in 2010 and would expire in 2015.

J. Craig Holland believed the Council should approve the item, because it met the wishes of the donor.

Herb Borock noted easements from 1985 granted control of the property to a private party. The City received some rights through those easements in exchange for granting easements to the private party. He questioned whether the City needed the easements for emergency fire access as the City now owned the property.

MOTION: Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to: 1) adopt the Ordinance reserving 7.7 acres of land deeded to the City of Palo Alto by the Russell V. Lee Trust in 1981, for park, recreation or conservation purposes, and incorporating existing granted easements; and 2) authorize the Mayor to finalize and sign the attached letter of sincere thanks to the Lee Family for the gift of the parcel to the City.

Council Member Holman wished to celebrate the dedication of the property as parkland. She inquired whether PARC would collaborate with adjacent property owners regarding design of the fences that needed to be moved.

Mr. Betts indicated fences were off the property line by 8-12 feet in four areas. The chain-link fences were covered with low-visibility, black plastic. He assume they would be replaced in-kind.

Council Member Holman asked if the City had the ability to require a design more appropriate to parkland.

Mr. Betts would research the issue and report to the Council. Typically, the City did not install fences around parks and open space. Neighbors usually installed fences for privacy. The fences were installed by neighbors at their own expense, and replacement of the fences would be at the neighbors' expense as well. If the City could provide direction on more appropriate fencing, it would do so.

Page 7 of 24 City Council Meeting Draft Minutes: 08/18/14

Council Member Holman requested the City Attorney comment.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, believed the general rule was that a neighbor had leeway to select fencing if the fence was on the neighbor's property. She did not know if the City had any specific rules to direct the neighbor's choices.

Council Member Holman encouraged Staff to work with the neighbors to design fences appropriate for open space.

Council Member Scharff was pleased to dedicate another 7.7 acres as parkland. He asked when the property could be open to the public.

Mr. Betts advised that Acterra would have to construct a safety fence around the nursery to prevent deer entry into the nursery. A second factor was PARC's recommendations for uses of the property. Different uses would require different construction schedules. Staff met with MIG regarding incorporating ideas for the property into MIG's public outreach process.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether PARC would provide its recommendations to the Council or begin the outreach process in the fall of 2014.

Mr. Betts indicated PARC hoped to hold its outreach with interested users and stakeholders in the fall of 2014 and follow up with recommendations to the Council by the first of 2015.

Vice Mayor Kniss was enthusiastic about dedicating any amount of land as parkland. The property was not pristine parkland. She asked about the period of time Acterra had leased the property.

Mr. Betts responded nine years.

Vice Mayor Kniss wished to ensure Acterra was included in public outreach. She suggested PARC tour the property before making recommendations for use of the property.

Council Member Schmid thanked Mr. Borock for providing detailed maps at the Council's Closed Session discussion of the item. Along the northern border of the property was an exclusive easement for landscaping. He inquired whether the City was legally responsible for that easement.

Ms. Stump reported at the time the easement was granted, the City held fee title to the land, but not use and access of the land. Use and access was reserved by the estate. The easement was permanent and not subject to

the City's unilateral change. The dedication lay on top of the easement. The City was required to honor the easement.

Council Member Schmid noted an 8 1/2-foot chain-link fence within the easement was located on City property. He asked if that fence was the City's responsibility. Earlier the City Attorney stated the City did not have responsibility for fences outside City property.

Ms. Stump clarified that fences located outside City property were not in City ownership; however, rules could apply to fencing. She could not recall those rules at the moment. Staff would review that issue.

Council Member Schmid reiterated that the fence was on City property.

Ms. Stump was not aware of whether the fence was on the line of the easement. Perhaps real estate Staff could indicate whether anything was in the easement affected the fencing.

James Keene, City Manager, reported the fence was located on the easement line inside City property.

Mr. Betts added that the easement ran on a steep slope. Use of the property containing the easement was limited because of the steep terrain.

Council Member Schmid remarked that the 1985 agreement indicated the fence was subject to site and design review. He asked if the Council would accept the 8 1/2-foot chain-link fence by voting to dedicate the property as parkland.

Ms. Stump would review the fencing issue. No action to dedicate the land would disadvantage the City in any respect.

Council Member Schmid believed the largest stakeholder for the property was the public. He inquired whether the parkland would be open for a short period of time for public viewing prior to PARC holding outreach meetings.

Mr. Betts answered yes.

Mayor Shepherd asked if Staff had any safety concerns regarding the quarry located adjacent to the property.

Mr. Betts replied no.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the fence surrounding the quarry would be relocated.

Mr. Betts responded no. Fences to be moved were located on the opposite side of the property.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Burt, Price absent

9. Status Report on Parking Garage Technologies That Can be Used to Manage Parking Supplies and Council Direction Regarding Implementation of Parking Guidance Systems.

Mayor Shepherd recalled the Council's direction to Staff regarding parking strategies in February 2014. On August 11, 2014, the Council approved a study for the design of satellite parking. In September 2014, the Council would consider locations for a new Downtown parking garage.

Jessica Sullivan, Senior Project Engineer, explained that transportation demand reduction and parking supply measures were three tracks for parking initiatives. Parking management strategies considered who parked where, for how long, and at what cost. The Downtown Residential Parking Permit (RPP) Program was part of that strategy. Transportation demand reduction strategies focused on methods to remove people from cars while providing them with viable options. Parking supply measures focused on managing existing parking supply, building new supply, and effectively using existing parking supply. Staff was reviewing a number of strategies for various components of parking initiatives. A technology pilot program was underway in front of City Hall. Puck sensors placed in parking spaces provided occupancy information to a local router that then provided information to a server and created a dashboard for users. Data indicated which spaces were occupied, how long each space had been occupied, and the average length of occupancy. Occupancy data for the Downtown area indicated the area was fully parked on a typical day in April at noon. Staff calculated 1,851 cars as the demand number for that April day. The total number of parking spaces on the street in the Downtown area was approximately 6,500, of which 5,500 spaces were located in residential areas. At the current time, only one program had been instituted to create additional parking supply—the Lot R Valet Assist Program. When the RPP Program implemented, satellite parking would be was close implementation. Valet Assist Programs could be implemented at other garages to increase parking supply; however, costs prohibited long-term use Staff hoped to utilize technology to increase of Valet Assist Programs. utilization of garages. Caltrain and Stanford commuters would not be able to purchase a permit for the RPP Program. Future scenarios offered new garages and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to reduce the total demand for parking. Staff was attempting to reduce the total demand for parking by about 50 percent over the next few years. As

part of its investigation into technology, Staff engaged the Parking Committee to discuss parking challenges in Palo Alto, specifically the Downtown area. The Parking Committee identified challenges of underutilization of garages, over-parking in neighborhoods, inability to transfer parking permits, lack of data for garages, lack of centralized parking information, moving cars among color zones, and lack of parking options for hourly workers. From the challenge discussion, Staff developed three goals: improve parking controls, make parking easier, and develop solutions that maintained the charm of Downtown. The Parking Committee made these improve branding and standardize sign installation for recommendations: Downtown garages; enhance the City's parking website; develop a Downtown parking app; develop online permit sales; revise parking time limits; expand permit pricing options; eliminate Downtown color zones; introduce off-street paid parking options; and enhancement parking enforcement. A Parking Guidance System (PGS) was one component of signage and wayfinding. A few different technologies could perform this work. The simplest technology was loop detectors which could be installed Dynamic signage would provide information regarding within a garage. permit parking and hourly parking. The second component for solicitation would be Revenue and Access Control. Revenue and Access Controls had many forms. One system could timestamp vehicles and provide data to PGS technology. Revenue and Access Controls that utilized gates could be a deterrent to patronage of Downtown businesses. License Plate Recognition (LPR) was a new technology. A car could be driven into a garage with no gate, receive a timestamp, and pay through a pay station or an invoice in Another option was standalone meters at each parking space. Staff preferred to work with consultants to determine which strategy best supported the goals for Downtown garages. In the near term, Staff wanted to review on-street, paid parking solutions as part of an integrated Staff requested the Council direction to proceed as soon as possible with a Request for Proposal (RFP) for PGS technology and thereafter an RFP for Revenue and Access Control technology or to issue a solicitation for an integrated system combining both technologies. Staff would need additional time to prepare and issue a solicitation for an integrated system combining both technologies.

Eric Rosenblum indicated the slate of technology was encouraging. He was glad to hear that infrastructure for payments would be considered and installed. He suggested Staff consider different types of employees who parked in Downtown.

Sea Reddy believed the City should provide spaces for employees in Downtown to park for six or seven hours, so the employees would not have to move their vehicles.

Vice Mayor Kniss questioned the lack of public participation, given the need for additional parking. She could not think of any reason the Council would not proceed quickly given the demand for parking. She asked why the City had not installed sensors sooner.

Ms. Sullivan reported that cost was a concern. If PGS was installed as soon as possible and Revenue and Access Controls installed six months later, then some PGS would be redundant in the later Revenue and Access Controls.

Vice Mayor Kniss requested an estimate of the cost for loop technology.

Ms. Sullivan advised the cost would be slightly less than \$500,000 for PGS and \$1.5 million for Revenue and Access Control equipment.

Vice Mayor Kniss felt the investment was needed. She inquired whether a gate system or loop technology would provide the number of spaces available.

Ms. Sullivan explained that loop technology would provide information needed for PGS. It did not allow drivers to pay for parking.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if signs would state the number of spaces available and where those spaces were located.

Ms. Sullivan indicated it would be possible to see the location of available spaces. Loop technology for multiple floors was useful in multi-directional garages.

Vice Mayor Kniss believed PGS would not be difficult to implement. The offstreet paid parking options were more complicated. She would support the first recommendation.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether off-street, paid parking options meant different pricing for permits.

Ms. Sullivan explained that it meant the infrastructure to allow people to pay for parking past the two-hour limit for free parking.

Council Member Scharff asked if an option would be meters or machines at surface parking lots.

James Keene, City Manager, added that garages would be included.

Council Member Scharff wished to emphasize ease of use for the public. He did not like to use pay-by-phone or meters. He felt payment infrastructure

could be implemented faster in parking lots than in garages, and asked if the Council could direct Staff to begin implementing it in parking lots.

Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning and Community Environment, wanted to utilize one Revenue and Access Control for both parking lots and garages. Staff's question for the Council was whether to proceed directly with PGS or to chose a technology for Revenue and Access Control and then implement that with PGS.

Mr. Keene advised that there was a time differential between the two choices of approximately six months.

Ms. Gitelman added that a realistic delay would be three to six months.

Mr. Keene clarified that Option 2 would delay PGS and Revenue and Access Control by approximately six months.

Council Member Scharff inquired about a timeframe for Option 2 to be operational.

Ms. Gitelman reported that signage and integrated PGS could be implemented concurrently with the RPP Program at the beginning of 2015. Integrating PGS with Revenue and Access Control would take longer.

Council Member Scharff concurred that at some point PGS would need to be integrated with Revenue and Access Controls. Option 1 could be implemented more quickly than Option 2, but could require removal of recently installed equipment.

Ms. Gitelman advised that signage would not necessarily need to change. The software would need to change and recently installed equipment could be abandoned.

Mr. Keene remarked that the Council could miss full consideration of design alternatives for an integrated system if it chose to act quickly. Decisions were driven by the RPP Program deadline. Implementing PGS along with the RPP Program was an easy visual cue for the public. On the other hand, people could find available spaces in garages without PGS.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether additional Valet Assist Programs could be instituted while Staff worked on Option 2.

Ms. Gitelman understood the chart indicated additional Valet Assist Programs would be utilized when additional parking supply was needed.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether Valet Assist Programs could be instituted at additional garages just for the six-month period until an integrated PGS and Revenue and Access Control system could be implemented. Option 2 seemed to be the correct choice if there was no RPP Program deadline. He wanted to increase parking supply to meet demand when the RPP Program was implemented while giving the Council time to evaluate an integrated system.

Ms. Gitelman assumed that concurrent with RPP Program implementation, there would be an investment in Valet Assist Programs in order to increase parking supply. Staff also assumed technologies would be used to improve utilization of existing parking supply. Both would increase parking supply in the initial phases of RPP Program implementation.

Council Member Scharff asked why gate controls were not recommended. They appeared to be the simplest and easiest method.

Ms. Gitelman explained the consultant recommended Staff issue an RFP to ensure the City received a full range of options for Revenue and Access Controls.

Council Member Scharff asked if that would be Option 2.

Mr. Keene clarified that the consultant recommended the City issue an RFP under Option 1 as well. Integrating PGS and Revenue and Access Controls could be accomplished faster and more efficiently, which was Option 2.

Council Member Klein believed the lack of parking options for hourly workers was a matter of debate. Neighbors felt professional people were parking in neighborhoods. He inquired about data Staff had or could obtain that would clarify that point.

Ms. Sullivan agreed there was a lack of data. It would be difficult to determine the number of hourly workers and their parking locations without implementing some technology and the RPP Program. Revenue and Access Controls could allow Staff to transfer permits within a business, which could solve the issue of parking by hourly workers.

Council Member Klein asked if Staff had given any additional thought to the problem. He wanted to have data in advance of implementing technology. He questioned Staff's assertion that there were technical difficulties with developing a parking app. Apps were developed every day for any and everything.

Ms. Sullivan wanted useful data to be a part of the app. The City did not have the technology solution in place to provide useful data to an app.

Mr. Keene added that the hardware had to be installed in parking garages and lots to provide information to an app.

Ms. Sullivan could quickly have an app that indicated locations of garages and lots and cost of parking permits, but no real-time data.

Council Member Klein assumed that once data infrastructure was implemented, the app would be developed.

Ms. Sullivan concurred.

Council Member Klein asked if Staff could reduce the six-month delay under Option 2 by compressing time for Architectural Review Board (ARB) review of signage or time to issue an RFP.

Ms. Gitelman noted ARB review applied to both Options 1 and 2. The delay could be six months, because the Council had not made a decision regarding which Revenue and Access Controls to pursue and the size of the program. The community had not discussed the different technologies. Staff wished to issue an RFP in order to learn about costs, strengths and weaknesses of each technology and then make a decision. The decision-making process could extend the delay.

Mr. Keene suggested the delay could be shortened by compressing the time for Council and community discussion.

Council Member Klein suggested Staff review each component of the process and determine whether the time for any component could be shortened.

Ms. Gitelman advised that Staff would work as quickly as possible if the Council adopted Option 2. Staff would solicit proposals on a number of technologies and then return to the Council and community for a difficult decision.

Council Member Klein recalled the statement that loops could cost \$500,000 and could be obsolete within six months. He inquired whether Staff could identify any other costs that would be lost by starting with Option 1. The tradeoff appeared to be \$500,000 versus six months with a potentially better system under Option 2.

Mr. Keene wished to be clear about the schedule issue. The six-month delay applied to the delay in implementation of PGS. Staff had not spoken to the

total delay. The Council was interested in not only the time to install PGS but also the time to install the second phase.

Ms. Gitelman did not have a precise schedule. Issuing two solicitations required more time and energy than one solicitation. The sum total of time required under Option 1 would be somewhat longer than under Option 2.

Mr. Keene added that there would be overlap between the two solicitations.

Council Member Berman believed Access and Revenue Control technology would provide a marginal benefit. PGS added ease to finding available parking spaces. Other benefits occurred through Access and Revenue Controls.

Ms. Sullivan concurred. People liked PGS; however, PGS did not provide the biggest impact on parking.

Council Member Berman felt the RPP Program rather than PGS would drive increased utilization of garages. He was not in a rush to implement PGS. Integrating PGS with Revenue and Access Controls initially was more logical. He felt the concern over gated garages was overblown as gates were commonly used in garages. He preferred not to install parking meters. Gateless technology was not proven and probably not necessary. He inquired whether a Council decision to utilize gates would shorten the delay period.

Ms. Gitelman wanted to issue a solicitation in order to obtain more data to make that decision. The item was focused on garages, and Staff had not considered systems to use in other locations and when to implement those systems.

Council Member Berman suggested parking limits in surface lots remain at two hours. He asked when the Council would discuss instituting Valet Assist Programs in other garages.

Ms. Sullivan advised that Staff could return with a discussion in October or November 2014 along with a discussion of the RPP Program.

Council Member Berman inquired whether Staff would have sufficient time to implement valet parking with the RPP Program in that timeframe.

Ms. Gitelman explained that the City's contract included the ability to add structures.

Council Member Holman inquired about the \$1.5 million amount mentioned earlier.

Ms. Sullivan reported Staff budgeted approximately \$500,000 for PGS. Revenue and Access Control equipment was budgeted at \$1.6 million.

Council Member Holman requested Staff provide the cost of each program listed in the table on Page 8. Parking management technology generated only 60 spaces for a large investment.

Ms. Sullivan indicated Staff was very conservative with those figures. Technology was essentially a management strategy. It would provide the City with control and management of inventory. The real value of technology was the effective and efficient management of existing inventory.

Council Member Holman expected more parking spaces to be generated for that amount of money. She asked about the source of funds for technology strategies.

Ms. Sullivan reported the University Avenue Parking Permit Fund would pay for PGS.

Council Member Holman inquired about the balance of that fund.

Ms. Sullivan did not know.

Ms. Gitelman could return with a detailed cost breakdown of all programs.

Council Member Holman was concerned that the City was expending too much money for one program.

Mr. Keene remarked that the City was distributing funds across many programs. Cost estimates were not final. With a tighter pricing and management system, parking garages could reach 85 percent capacity more often. A cost of \$2 million for GPS and Revenue and Access Control would generate 60 parking spaces at a cost of \$33,000 per space. That was less than the cost to build one parking space in a garage.

Council Member Holman inquired about the source of the \$1.6 million.

Ms. Gitelman would return to the Council with more detail.

Council Member Holman asked if the City could sell two- and three-day permits in addition to weekly and monthly permits.

Ms. Gitelman noted the consultant recommended a review of different types of permit. At the current time, the City offered only monthly permits. Staff would pursue additional types of permits.

Council Member Holman requested the status of the program for City Hall Staff to utilize Go Passes.

Ms. Sullivan advised that 47 Staff had signed up for that program.

Council Member Holman asked if 47 spaces had been vacated.

Ms. Gitelman would provide the Council with a full explanation of the program. Some of those people probably were not driving before the program began. The number of spaces available would be less than the number of people participating. However, 47 people who could occupy parking spaces are not.

Council Member Holman inquired whether the consultant considered use of private garages.

Ms. Sullivan advised that the Parking Committee felt there was not a great deal of opportunity in private garages based on the perception that private garage owners were not willing to lease space overnight or evenings.

Council Member Holman commented that the Staff Report contained no notes about Parking Committee discussions. The Council could only assume the recommendations were the work of the Parking Committee. She asked if notes or minutes were available for Parking Committee meetings.

Ms. Sullivan explained that Parking Committee discussions were brainstorming sessions facilitated by the consultant. All ideas in the Staff Report were generated by the group. Verbatim comments were not available. Leaders of the group reviewed the report and agreed upon the recommendations.

Council Member Holman remarked that Palo Alto streets were cluttered with signs. She inquired whether Staff considered parking signs being placed on poles with signs supporting businesses and nonprofit groups.

Ms. Gitelman indicated the consultant reviewed the current sign program and found it confusing and lacking. The number one recommendation was for signs to be more clear. Using signs for multiple purposes might not align with that goal.

Council Member Holman believed signs could be designed so that they cohabitated.

Ms. Sullivan explained that the RFP for signage included a complete signage inventory and existing conditions in order to provide a cohesive product.

Mr. Keene suggested Staff provide some images of signage.

Council Member Holman asked if a delay in action on the item would delay implementation of the RPP Program.

Ms. Sullivan answered no.

Council Member Schmid referred to Page 3 regarding a 68 percent occupancy rate and Page 8 regarding an 85 percent occupancy rate. He asked which figure was accurate.

Ms. Sullivan attempted to demonstrate in the Staff Report that over the summer months occupancy of garages increased. In the table Staff assumed that occupancy of garages in September would reach 80 percent or higher.

Council Member Schmid noted the occupancy rate averaged 68 percent during March, April, May, June, and July.

Ms. Gitelman indicated the same paragraph on Packet Page 376 explained that occupancy rates increased over the summer months; whereas, occupancy rates typically decreased during the summer. All those numbers were estimates. Staff felt it was appropriate to use 80 percent to reflect possible occupancy rates in the fall.

Council Member Schmid reiterated that the occupancy rate averaged 68 percent through July.

Ms. Gitelman presented the average occupancy rate and then the potential trend line of up to 81 percent occupancy in July.

Council Member Schmid asked if occupancy rates increased due to the increase in permit sales or some other reason.

Ms. Sullivan reported Staff raised caps for permit sales at each garage in March 2014. More people were buying permits in summer than in previous years, and Staff wanted to highlight that trend.

Council Member Schmid remarked that it was difficult to project occupancy rates based on a few weeks of new data.

Mr. Keene advised that if the numbers were lower than estimated and occupancy could reach 85 percent, then obviously Staff could add more spaces. Estimates were conservative. The change would not be sufficiently significant to warrant modifications of any decisions.

Council Member Schmid requested Staff provide the source of funds for parking technologies. He inquired about the current amount of income from and expenditures for metering of parking spaces. He requested Staff provide the funding source for the \$500,000 and means to reimburse the funds. He generally favored Option 2, because it provided a large number of pricing variables that the Council could adjust. The Council had not discussed ways to distinguish between office workers and service workers.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the technology that included mailing invoices for parking was similar to the Fast Track program.

Ms. Sullivan indicated Fast Track utilized the same technology.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the technology was commonly used.

Ms. Sullivan reported that a great deal of behind-the-scenes activities were required to make the technology function properly. The technology did not have the accuracy rate of a gated system. Human intervention was needed to check license plates that were missed.

Mayor Shepherd inquired whether a Fast Track card could be scanned to allow entrance to a garage.

Ms. Gitelman was unsure whether the City's program could be integrated with the Fast Track program; however, the processes were similar.

Mayor Shepherd was very interested in integrating City garages with the Fast Track program. She wished the public had been present to comment.

MOTION: Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to direct Staff to: 1) move forward with an RFP for integrated Parking Guidance System, and Access and Revenue Control technology, and 2) direct Staff to bring forward an informational report that includes a timeline for Council review and to possibly truncate and provide options for the timeline.

Mayor Shepherd commented that the Council was studying many concepts and attempting to comprehend them. Staff's methodology was providing the Council with a sense of the immensity of the parking problem. Implementing existing technology would be less confusing for users.

Council Member Scharff believed the community had high standards and expected implementation to go smoothly. He could not support spending \$500,000 for hardware and then removing it six months later.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to direct Staff to provide a timeline as soon as reasonably possible along with suggestions to shorten the timeline.

Ms. Gitelman would be happy to provide a timeline and condense it as much as possible. She expressed concern about returning with a timeline in that Staff had a great many Agenda Items to present to the Council.

Council Member Scharff stated Staff could provide an informational report.

Mr. Keene reported an informational item would not delay other Agenda Items.

Mayor Shepherd felt the only real time constraint was the Council making a decision. A timeline would allow the Council to prepare for making a decision.

Council Member Klein supported the Motion as a coherent and thoughtful way to proceed. The Council was more likely to choose a poor product under Option 1, which would not save time. If Council Members who supported a study of satellite parking would reconsider, then it could be folded into a better approach.

Vice Mayor Kniss was open to offering an Amendment to integrate satellite parking into the study rather than implementing it prior to other strategies.

Mayor Shepherd understood the Council in February 2014 directed Staff to work on a bundle of parking initiatives. She asked how integrating satellite parking would change anything.

Council Member Scharff inquired whether the topic was agendized.

Mr. Keene explained that the Council was working on many parking options and had identified past Council directions to Staff and the impact on the overall parking problem.

Vice Mayor Kniss remarked that on August 11, 2014, the Council separated satellite parking.

Council Member Scharff advised that the Council directed Staff to obtain information only for both satellite parking and parking technologies.

Vice Mayor Kniss requested Council Member Klein explain his comment further.

Council Member Scharff was concerned that the topic was not agendized.

Council Member Klein indicated the Council could agendize an item for the next meeting.

Mr. Keene inquired whether Council Member Klein was suggesting a reconsideration of the decision regarding satellite parking.

Council Member Klein explained that the Council could not reconsider the item but could agendize an item.

Vice Mayor Kniss added that the item could be agendized for another time.

Council Member Scharff asked if the proposal was to agendize another discussion of satellite parking.

Vice Mayor Kniss felt Staff did not provide a strong recommendation for the Council. She inquired whether there was any reason the RPP Program would not be implemented in January 2015.

Mr. Keene reported parking technology was an individual strategy to improve parking supply and would be needed when the RPP Program was implemented. The item supported implementation of the RPP Program.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if Staff anticipated delivering the program by January 2015.

Ms. Gitelman stated the Council asked Staff to return by the end of 2014 with an Ordinance establishing a City-wide framework for RPP Districts and a Resolution establishing the first priority RPP District. Staff intended to do that. If the Council adopted the Ordinance and approved the Resolution, then Staff would begin implementation after the first of 2015.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if Option 2 would delay implementation of the RPP Program.

Ms. Gitelman replied no.

Vice Mayor Kniss asked if Staff could respond quickly.

Mr. Keene reported Staff would do their part to provide an Ordinance in time for the Council to adopt it.

Ms. Gitelman noted implementation would be complicated and would likely occur in phases with adjustments.

Vice Mayor Kniss believed the Council would always choose an integrated approach over a piecemeal approach. The ability to proceed quickly was important.

Council Member Berman remarked that the net employee demand would decrease based on implementation of different parking strategies. Under the RPP Program, many commuters would not have a parking space. The Council had a responsibility to address the consequences of its decisions.

Council Member Holman noted the numbers in the table did not represent new demand. She inquired about the next strategy Staff would present to the Council.

Ms. Gitelman advised that in late September 2014 Staff would return with a discussion of parking supply strategies or new garages.

Council Member Holman requested Staff provide an informational report regarding the schedule of the business registry. The Council needed that information to understand the density of office occupancy.

Mr. Keene would work with the Mayor on scheduling that topic.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 7-0 Burt, Price absent

10. Authorize the City's Delegate to the League of Cities to Support the Proposed Resolution Urging a Statewide Summit to Address Safety and Environmental Impacts of Illegal Marijuana Cultivation.

Mayor Shepherd reported the League of Cities meeting would be held on September 25, 2014, and she would be the City's voting delegate at the meeting. Staff recommended the Council support the proposed Resolution.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to authorize the City's voting delegate to vote yes on the resolution to be considered at the 2014 Annual League of California Cities (LOCC) Conference urging a statewide summit to address safety and environmental impacts from illegal marijuana cultivation.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Burt, Price absent

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Mayor Kniss announced a community forum would be held the following week regarding smarter parking.

The City Council went into Closed Session at 9:45 P.M.

Page 23 of 24 City Council Meeting Draft Minutes: 08/18/14

CLOSED SESSION

11. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY/LEGAL COUNSEL

Potential Litigation (as petitioner)

One Matter Subject: Federal Regulatory Water and Power Cost

Allocation

Authority: Government Code Section 54956.9

Mayor Shepherd advised no reportable action.

12. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY/LEGAL COUNSEL

Existing Litigation

Subject: <u>International Association of Fire Fighters, Local 1319, AFL-CIO v. City of Palo Alto</u>, California Public Employee Relations Board,

Case No. SF-CE-869-M

Authority: Government Code Section 54956.9

Mayor Shepherd advised that with a unanimous vote (7-0 Burt, Price absent) the Council authorized the filing of an appeal of the PERB Decision in IAFF, Local 1319 v. City of Palo Alto.

13. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY/LEGAL COUNSEL

Potential Litigation (as respondent)

One Matter Subject: College Terrace Centre Planned Community Zone

Authority: Government Code Section 54956.9

Mayor Shepherd advised no reportable action.

The City Council reconvened from the Closed Session at 11:15 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 P.M.