

Special Meeting
December 17, 2007

- 1a. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY -- EXISTING LITIGATION..... 3
- 1b. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY -- EXISTING LITIGATION..... 3
- 1c. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY -- EXISTING LITIGATION..... 3
- 2. Resolution 8778 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Section 1601 of the Merit System Rules and Regulations Regarding a Memorandum of Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the Palo Alto Police Officers Association (PAPOA)" and Resolution 8779 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Adopting the Compensation Plan for Police Non-Management Personnel and Rescinding Resolution Nos. 8244, 8253, 8346 and 8498. 4
- 3. Resolution 8780 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Resolution No. 8632 and Approving the Amended Northern California Power Agency Green Power Project (NGPP) Third Phase Agreement for the Purchase of Renewable Energy of Up to 15 Average Megawatts of Energy over 25 Years at an Estimated Cost of Up to \$388 Million (In 2008 Dollars)" 4
- 4. Approval of a Contract with Vanguard Construction in the Amount of \$659,000 for FY 2007-08 Sidewalk Replacement Project – Capital Improvement Program, Sidewalk Replacement Project PO-89003 4
- 5. Recommendation from Policy and Services Committee to Approve a Mutual Cooperation and Support Agreement with the Friends of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo 4
- 6. Resolution 8781 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Discontinuing All Monthly Stipend Payments to Members of City Boards and Commissions Effective December 31, 2007 and Repealing Resolution 4825" 4
- 7. Ordinance 4984 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007-08 to Authorize the

Appropriation of Funds from the Budget Stabilization Reserve in the Amount of \$100,000 to Complete Cost-Benefit Analysis and Encourage Public Participation in Climate Protection Plan's Proposed Actions"	4
8. Request for City Council Direction on an Interim Relocation of the Palo Alto Recycling Center	4
9. Approval of the Summary Scope of Services and Review of Evaluation Process for the Development of the Request for Proposals for the New Solid Waste and Recycling Collection and Processing Services Agreement.....	8
10. Planning and Transportation Commission Recommendation for Approval of Proposed Local Transit and Shuttle Service Changes in Palo Alto Resulting from the VTA Palo Alto Community Bus Study	16
COUNCIL COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES	20
ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 10:37 p.m.	20

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:15 p.m.

Present: Barton, Beecham, Cordell arrived at 6:20 p.m., Drekmeier, Kishimoto, Klein, Kleinberg, Mossar, Morton

CLOSED SESSION

- 1a. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY -- EXISTING LITIGATION
Subject: Palo Alto Sanitation Co. v. The City of Palo Alto, et al.;
Santa Clara Superior Court Case No.: CV107084380
Subject Authority: Government Code section 54956.9(a)
- 1b. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY -- EXISTING LITIGATION
Subject: Michael Schmidlin v. The City of Palo Alto, et al.; California
Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District Case No.:
H027685 (SCC # CV794565)
Subject Authority: Government Code section 54956.9(a)
- 1c. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY -- EXISTING LITIGATION
Subject: Michael Schmidlin v. The City of Palo Alto, et al.; California
Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District Case No.: H026841 (SCC #
CV794565)
Subject Authority: Government Code section 54956.9(a)

Closed Session adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Mayor Kishimoto announced there was no reportable action.

CONSENT CALENDAR

City Attorney Baum noted for the record the amendment of Item 5:

Staff would offer the following edits to the proposed contract between the City of Palo Alto and the Friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo:

Recital 2, line 4: delete "City Manager (the "City Manager").
Section 1.4, line 3: insert "for the JMZ program" after "appropriated."
Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, lines 1: delete "(or may)."
Section 2.1(A), line 5: delete "permanent."
Section 2.3(C), lines 1-2: replace "any progress made in" with "the status of."

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Morton, to approve Consent Calendar Items 2-7 with the amendments to Item 5 as noted.

2. Resolution 8778 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Section 1601 of the Merit System Rules and Regulations Regarding a Memorandum of Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the Palo Alto Police Officers Association (PAPOA)" and Resolution 8779 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Adopting the Compensation Plan for Police Non-Management Personnel and Rescinding Resolution Nos. 8244, 8253, 8346 and 8498."
3. Resolution 8780 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Resolution No. 8632 and Approving the Amended Northern California Power Agency Green Power Project (NGPP) Third Phase Agreement for the Purchase of Renewable Energy of Up to 15 Average Megawatts of Energy over 25 Years at an Estimated Cost of Up to \$388 Million (In 2008 Dollars)"
4. Approval of a Contract with Vanguard Construction in the Amount of \$659,000 for FY 2007-08 Sidewalk Replacement Project – Capital Improvement Program, Sidewalk Replacement Project PO-89003
5. Recommendation from Policy and Services Committee to Approve a Mutual Cooperation and Support Agreement with the Friends of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo
6. Resolution 8781 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Discontinuing All Monthly Stipend Payments to Members of City Boards and Commissions Effective December 31, 2007 and Repealing Resolution 4825"
7. Ordinance 4984 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007-08 to Authorize the Appropriation of Funds from the Budget Stabilization Reserve in the Amount of \$100,000 to Complete Cost-Benefit Analysis and Encourage Public Participation in Climate Protection Plan's Proposed Actions"

MOTION PASSED: 9-0.

REPORTS OF OFFICIALS

8. Request for City Council Direction on an Interim Relocation of the Palo Alto Recycling Center

Director of Public Works Glenn Roberts stated that the key issue was that the Recycling Center was located on the Landfill Property. Timing was critical because there was one year left before that area turns into landfill. There were multiple regulatory requirements and policy issues from multiple

agencies. The options were: 1) to shrink the footprint and reduce the operations; 2) close the Recycling Center; 3) significantly change the landfill-grading plan; 4) proceed with the temporary plan that was allocated last year. The first option would be consistent with the Municipal Code, the Byxbee Park Plan and the State approved grading plan. However, there would be revenue lost due to not processing as many materials, additional costs for hauling, and negotiating the amendment to the PASCO agreement would only be a temporary solution. Option two would be consistent with the Master Plan and the State Plan but would have lost revenue and no local drop off and would violate our Municipal Code, Comprehensive Plan and Zero Waste Plan. Option three would maintain the revenue sorting operations by keeping the Recycling Center but would not be consistent with the Byxbee Park Plan, the State approved plan, would lose the landfill capacity and it would be temporary. Option four would maintain the revenue operations, be consistent with the Municipal Code and Grading Plan but would not be consistent with the park dedication status and would be a temporary solution. Staff proposed shrinking the Recycling Center and moving it to the front as a smaller operation. This plan was a concept plan and staff was asking for policy direction.

Emily Renzel, 1056 Forest Avenue stated she supported this project and asked that the 2007 Hargreaves Report be referred to the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) and the Parks & Recreation Commission (PARC).

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether the City would be saving fossil fuels by getting items to be recycled.

Mr. Roberts stated the source separation had a higher market value but we will no longer be doing the separation. There are benefits from recycling and energy but also from the environment point of view.

Council Member Drekmeier asked what the timeline for discussing composting was and how this might affect that decision.

Mr. Roberts stated these were two independent decisions and in January a status report and timeline would return regarding composting.

Council Member Morton asked whether the plastic bags and styrofoam were able to be added to the single stream.

Mr. Roberts stated the single stream technology did not currently enable those items to be separated out.

Council Member Morton asked whether the families adding these to the single streams were causing the problems.

Mr. Roberts stated that would be part of the contamination factor. It was part of the new Zero Waste initiative that would be introduced into the new collection contract.

Council Member Morton asked what the plan was for long-term.

Mr. Roberts stated that this project would give us an opportunity for the future to locate a permanent recycling center.

Council Member Morton stated there would be many demands on that site.

Council Member Mossar asked why the access road would need to be paved.

Mr. Roberts stated an all weather permanent surface for accessibility and use would be necessary.

Council Member Mossar asked whether the road went from the entrance to the water treatment plant.

Mr. Roberts stated the road they were discussing was a dirt road which would be paved to access the landfill area.

Council Member Mossar asked whether above that road was a strip of dedicated parkland.

Mr. Roberts stated that was correct.

Council Member Mossar asked why we would duplicate the single stream bin concept at this recycling center when this service was distributed around the community already.

Mr. Roberts stated there people who did self-haul either by residents or contractors and this would become a centralized location.

Council Member Mossar asked whether this would be a regional service we would be providing.

Mr. Roberts stated this would be for people in the area.

Council Member Mossar asked about the florescent bulb recycling capacity or motor oil recycling.

Mr. Roberts stated that was an oversight and those programs were intended to be continued.

Council Member Mossar expressed her concern by the wording "strive to maintain".

Mr. Roberts stated the issue was there was not a specific site design and was just a concept.

Council Member Mossar stated that any materials that disappear from the recycling center that have a water quality toxicity component would be a huge mistake.

Council Member Kleinberg asked whether the access road could be made with a permeable naturally degrading substance.

Mr. Roberts stated no that when dealing with vehicles of this weight required more durable substance.

Council Member Kleinberg asked how the City could get the community to recycle.

Mr. Roberts stated that was part of the next item on the agenda regarding the Scope of Services for the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the collection and hauling contract where the new Zero Waste program elements were being recommended as part of the Scope of Services.

Council Member Kleinberg asked whether the size and layout of the Recycling Center proposal would accommodate a drop off service.

Mr. Roberts stated this site would be too small for a significant expansion of a drop off. However, the new collection contract would contain added programs at curbside.

Council Member Kleinberg asked whether some of the P&TC could review the 2007 Hargreaves Report and return it to the Council with recommendations.

Mr. Roberts stated the Report was already asked to go to the P&TC.

Council Member Kleinberg stated she only wanted to clarify that the entire report was open for review.

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Mossar, to approve staff recommendation to:

1. Significantly reduce the size and scope of the current Recycling Center facility;
2. Proceed with the relocation of landfill entrance, offices, truck scale, and toll booth;
3. Make minor revisions to the State-approved landfill grading plan

for consideration by the Parks and Recreation Commission (PARC) and the Planning and Transportation Commission as an amendment to the Byxbee Landfill Park Master Plan to be considered and adopted by Council in July 2008.

4. Begin negotiating a contract amendment with the Palo Alto Sanitation Company (PASCO), if needed, to address a reduction in Recycling Center revenue; and
5. Investigate cost effective ways to continue diverting recyclable materials from disposal.

Council Member Beecham stated this proposal was the best option and changes to the former Los Altos Water Treatment Site could still be made.

Council Member Morton stated he wanted a permanent solution that would make recycling a permanent part of this community.

Council Member Kishimoto added that this vision would be a real community legacy for the future generations and adding Zero Waste helps implement both.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0.

9. Approval of the Summary Scope of Services and Review of Evaluation Process for the Development of the Request for Proposals for the New Solid Waste and Recycling Collection and Processing Services Agreement

Director of Public Works Glenn Roberts stated that the evaluation process was new information not seen previously and contained specific recommendations. He stated there were three components for the summary of the Scope of Services: 1) current baseline services; 2) Zero waste services; and 3) other service innovations. The current baseline service include some modifications to current services. Zero waste services would expand the organics program for commercial and residential organics in 2010. There would be expansion of the single stream materials and bulk item collection to include more reuse and recycling of bulky items and increasing the construction demolition diversion and expanding the commercial recycling. Other service innovations would allow the proposers to initiate things to help further the zero waste goals and diversion. Staff was proposing a six-step process: 1) initial evaluation; 2) cost proposal evaluation; 3) Council would select service level; 4) ranking of proposals; 5) contractor selection; and 6) contract approval and execution.

Mayor Kishimoto thanked the staff for all of their work on this project.

James Furgas, 295 89th Street, Daly City stated the employees who currently worked for PASCO should be hired for the job and he supported this project.

Herb Borock, P.O. Box 632 stated the Council should approve the actual complete language of the Scope of Services.

Vice Mayor Klein asked when the Request for Proposal (RFP) was to be approved.

Mr. Roberts stated the Council did not approve the full contract document of the RFP.

Vice Mayor Klein asked for clarification that the bid factors were not tied to any certain bidder.

Mr. Roberts stated he was correct.

Vice Mayor Klein stated if there were two bidders, they could not be anonymous.

Mr. Roberts stated that it was a possibility.

Vice Mayor Klein asked for clarification whether they would know what bid went for each bidder.

Mr. Roberts stated no, there would not be any details given for each bidder.

Bob Hilton, HF&H Consultant, stated we should be focusing on the services and not on the selection of a contractor. He added that the highest rated companies would be proposed to the Council and would allow the Council to focus on the two companies.

Vice Mayor Klein asked whether all of that would be further down the process.

Mr. Hilton stated the services and cost benefits of step three were being focused on.

Vice Mayor Klein clarified that step three would just be a range of numbers and the low-end numbers in one category could be from three different bidders.

Mr. Hilton stated he was correct.

Vice Mayor Klein asked where the numbers would come from.

Mr. Roberts stated it was a combination of new standards, looking at what other agencies and Cities had done in the past and discussions with the staff.

Vice Mayor Klein asked how free the Council was on the selection process.

Senior Assistant City Attorney Cara Silver stated the end decision would be the Council's decision.

Council Member Mossar asked for clarification on the City Manager's Report (CMR) stating "customers requesting service on private streets and alleys" whether that meant private streets and private alleys.

Mr. Roberts stated it was intended to standardize the pickup at one location, at curbside on the street in front of the properties.

Council Member Mossar asked for the definition of an appropriate processing facility was.

Mr. Roberts stated one that was certified to handle single stream materials.

Council Member Mossar stated the CMR should state appropriate for processing single stream materials.

Mr. Roberts stated that could be clarified in the detail of the RFP.

Council Member Mossar asked whether the City wanted to continue with Clean-up Day.

Mr. Roberts stated it was a beneficial service from a waste reduction and environmental standpoint and allowed bulky items to be collected and reprocessed.

Council Member Mossar asked regarding page three of Attachment A stating "The contractor may propose its or a subcontractor's processing site which shall be subject to City approval." She asked whether there was criteria for what would be acceptable to the City.

Mr. Roberts stated there would be detailed technical criteria in the RFP.

Council Member Mossar expressed concern regarding the distance traveled, processing sites for solid waste, and the lack of discussion on environmental impact.

Mr. Roberts stated the criteria, which we have for technical and environmental, would contain an evaluation of haul distance, air quality impacts and would evaluate those factors when considering where the site would be located.

Council Member Mossar asked whether the contract could be reviewed by the City if the hauler tried to change the processing site.

Mr. Roberts stated they would be required to maintain the site that they proposed and they would not be able to change it at their discretion. He also asked to clarify that all processing sites would be outside of Palo Alto.

Council Member Mossar stated she hoped that materials were not going to be sent to the landfill facility on the edge of the Sassoon Marsh.

Council Member Barton asked whether we were obligated to pick a low bidder.

Ms. Silver stated this was setup as an RFP and the City was not required to pick the lowest bidder.

Council Member Barton stated we were not limited to cost but would be obligated to choose the firm with the highest score.

Ms. Silver stated in step three of the evaluation process there were cost options and at that point, based on cost benefit analysis, which option would be implemented.

Council Member Barton asked for clarification that after all of the processes were over, the City could still choose who they wanted.

Ms. Silver stated that staff recommendation was based on a point spread and then approval of the bidder should be based on the factors that were identified in the RFP.

Council Member Barton asked if the lowest bidder had racial problems in their firm or something came up would we be obligated to stay with this criteria.

Ms. Silver stated we could not re-weight it at the end of the process.

Council Member Barton asked for clarification that we would have to select the firm with the highest score after we select our service levels.

Ms. Silver stated the proposer with the highest score would be based on staff recommendation. If the Council wanted to reexamine the

recommendation and give different points to the proposers based on the information provided in the proposals there would be a situation where the Council's decision would differ from the staff's recommendation.

Council Member Barton asked if Council chose to make a change could we have a bid protest.

Mr. Roberts stated that staff should return to the Council and bring any information, which would cause us to question our initial evaluations before the Council should have to make a decision.

Council Member Barton asked how asked how much flexibility we had for changes.

Council Member Morton stated he wished we had just added financial strength as one of the qualifications and he was concerned we had no flexibility.

Council Member Cordell asked if staff had discovered something about the company that was not mentioned prior it would fall in the criteria.

Mr. Roberts stated this was a middle step in the process and there was initial screening at the beginning and those bidders would not move forward.

Ray E. McDevitt of Hanson Bridgett Law firm, stated in the Public Resources Code the statute states that any city or county may award contracts of this kind, with or without competitive bidding. The City had decided to proceed with a competitive evaluation, which would produce the best value for the City. He added that the most unusual aspect of the factors to rank the proposers was the low score given to cost and he urged to significantly change the score regarding cost.

Vice Mayor Klein asked whether the Council could use whatever formula they deemed appropriate.

Mr. McDevitt stated it would not a wise policy to allow a process where the majority of the Council was dissatisfied with one element of it.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether we could encourage the best use of office paper in order to save trees.

Mr. Roberts stated that reuse was a primary focus and we were encouraging our proposers to pursue this issue.

Council Member Drekmeier asked for clarification that we would be turning compost into usable products and that it was not just going to the landfill.

Mr. Roberts stated that this contract would use the existing composting operation until after the landfill closed and the State has approved the closure, we would guarantee the haulers the use of current composting operations through 2011. After that would depend on the policy direction given from the Council about the future of composting.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether we were composting all of our green waste.

Manager of Solid Waste Public Works Russell Reiserer stated out of 21 thousands tons there was three hundred tons used for Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) at the landfill.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether there was opportunity to compost food waste.

Mr. Roberts stated that would require separate permits at a much higher standard.

Council Member Morton asked for: less weighting for the first category, to combine financial strength under qualifications and have it no more than 25 percent, and to raise the cost to 40 percent.

Mr. Roberts stated this was a subsequent step in the process and was based 100 percent on cost and the cost ranges on the Scope of Services. The Council would have an opportunity to give direction based on cost.

Council Member Morton asked whether the evaluation criteria would be public record.

Mr. Roberts stated that was correct.

Council Member Morton asked whether there would be a basic definition of what the baseline services were.

Mr. Roberts stated there was an attempt to show that in Attachment A.

Council Member Morton stated he did not know if that defined what we were expecting or what we currently do.

Mr. Roberts stated these were what we were expecting to add under Zero Waste.

Council Member Morton expressed his concerns with protecting current PASCO employees.

Council Member Beecham asked regarding the evaluation process and the weighting that two vendors could have a 50 percent difference in cost and would only appoint 10 points on the weighting scale. He stated that cost was significantly underrated and needed to increase to 40 percent.

Mr. Roberts stated this was not a competitive process but the proposals that come to us would be competitively shaped and would give us a cost that was competitive.

Council Member Beecham expressed his concern with being locked into a system that we would not find acceptable.

Council Member Kleinberg expressed concern with how much we would pay for a clean environment. She added that these kinds of services in regards to recycling and Zero Waste from a provider would cost money.

Council Member Mossar stated on page four of five on the CMR stated "Facilitate Council's selection of the best-qualified contractor (rather than the lowest cost). She stated there were some issues of what the new service profile was going to cost the consumer and what the goals were that we were trying to meet with the new contract.

Council Member Cordell clarified that if the Council were to choose a contractor that had a lower score than other contractors that it was not illegal.

Mr. McDevitt stated it was not illegal.

Council Member Cordell asked whether other Cities had utilized this selection system.

Mr. McDevitt stated yes other Cities like Fort Bragg had relied on this. Council Member Cordell asked whether there were other Cities had used a system that had criteria and weighted.

Mr. Hilton replied yes.

Council Member Cordell stated other than Fort Bragg was there another City.

Mr. Hilton stated yes, but he could not remember the specifics.

Council Member Cordell asked if he remembered how well it worked in those two Cities.

Mr. Hilton replied he did not remember any problems.

Council Member Cordell stated if we went with this system, the cost weight should be greater than the five.

Council Member Beecham asked whether staff was asking for approval or disapproval of the weighting matrix.

Assistant City Manager Emily Harrison stated it would be helpful for staff if the Council wanted to change to a larger weighting of cost at this time.

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Morton, to approve staff recommendation to approve the summary Scope of Services and provide feedback on the evaluation process proposed for the upcoming Request for Proposals (RFP) for the new solid waste and recycling collection and processing services agreement, significantly increase the weighting of cost component and staff proportionately decrease the other items.

Council Member Mossar stated that if we do not give direction on what items we were willing to de-weight then staff would have to figure out what the Council wanted to do.

Council Member Beecham stated he suggested for the Motion that staff more or less de-weight the other items.

Council Member Barton stated there was an environmental component to this and when the cost is increased, we automatically reduce the environmental component. He asked if there was a way to increase the cost component to an extent where it does not affect our ability to be good Stewards of the environment.

Mayor Kishimoto stated the first phase was initial evaluation for compliance and the second phase would be a Zero Waste versus cost profile. She asked why cost was in the third phase.

Mr. Roberts stated they needed to differentiate between the proposers who were involved at that point and the proposers may all fit what the Council has directed staff to pursue.

Mayor Kishimoto stated in the second phase it was asked to make the trade off between the Zero Waste goals and the cost, and there may be a cost difference that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Roberts stated that was correct.

Council Member Beecham stated in Attachment A in the Zero Waste services there was still six specific programs that the bidders will need to address.

Vice Mayor Klein stated that staff would need to pay more attention to cost.

Council Member Mossar stated the people who are for Zero Waste first always end up paying much more than their share of the waste and that was one of the consequences whether you use the services or not.

Council Member Morton stated a published set of criteria should be more in line with where we were as the Council and increasing the cost factor was a significant one.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

10. Planning and Transportation Commission Recommendation for Approval of Proposed Local Transit and Shuttle Service Changes in Palo Alto Resulting from the VTA Palo Alto Community Bus Study

Transportation Manager Gayle Likens stated this project started with the Comprehensive Operations Analyze Study that the VTA began last summer. The goal was to look at reinventing the VTA came back with a recommendation to change bus routes in Palo Alto. The recommendations took bus services out of Palo Alto and into Mountain View, which were not supported by the Council. The Council asked that the VTA board embark upon a study process.

Kevin Connolly, VTA Transportation Planning Manager stated there were new vehicles, new express routes and a system established for continual improvement. The system should respond to the market on a yearly basis. The market analyses stated that trips to and from Palo Alto were 17 percent and three percent were the traveling public that used the transit. He added that the people using the transit were not time sensitive but price sensitive and tolerant of the transit experience and referred to as "transit trippers".

Council Member Mossar asked for a profile of the "transit trippers".

Mr. Connolly stated they were nine percent of the total traveling market, high transit users, households with no vehicles, and high school educated. The "mellow movers" were 14 percent of the total traveling market, social sensitivity, lower income, high school educated, and shared vehicles. The "links and minks" were six percent of the total traveling market, childless households lower to middle income, time sensitive, and pro environment. The "boomers and blazers" were four percent of the total traveling market, the retired group, and time sensitive. The "young and the restless" were 18 percent of the total traveling market, college years, time sensitive, pro

environment, and price sensitive. The “movers and shakers” were fifty percent of the total traveling market, double income, married with children, flexibility with travel, time sensitive, pro environment, social sensitivity and highly educated.

Council Member Drekmeier asked for clarification that the “movers and shakers” were half the market but were low transit users.

Mr. Connolly stated the “movers and shakers” were much bigger in size. The VTA services were doing very well where 50 percent of Palo Alto riders were riding the 22 line on El Camino and 28 percent were riding the 25 line on Middlefield Corridor. In conclusion, 80 percent of Palo Altans were riding two lines.

Mayor Kishimoto thanked the VTA team and consultants who worked on this project.

Planning and Transportation Commission Lee Lippert stated the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) did recommend the adoption of the staff recommendations with some additional comments. The plan of January 2008’s recommendation was asked to be implemented. The G line of the cross-town shuttle was being replaced with VTA service during bell hours and the P&TC were asking for an after school hour buses. There was a hole in the transit line, which would need to be addressed.

Mayor Kishimoto thanked the P&TC for their work on the project.

Council Member Kleinberg asked regarding the recommendation titled “staff and P&TC recommendation” on page one and on page three there were “P&TC unanimous recommendations” which are not the same.

Mr. Lippert stated page one was to approve staff recommendations and page three number one was to approve staff recommendations which were referring to page one.

Karen Sundback asked for clarification on number one to get rid of the 89 line and replace it with a bus going from the Research Park to Caltrain. She asked whether it should be going from the VA Hospital to Caltrain and she noted her support for the project.

Eugene Bradley, P.O. Box 390069, Mountain View stated there was no service to Menlo Park and time transfers should be available.

Sheri Furman, 3094 Greer Road stated if we wanted people to use public transit we would need to provide service within a walk able distance from their home and at a reasonable frequency through the day.

Penny Ellson, 513 El Capitan Place stated regional transit growth should support growth as the region presses Palo Alto to expand housing and Stanford Medical Center.

Robert Moss, 4010 Orme St. stated the VTA keeps cutting back and taxpayers should be getting service in return and he did support the project.

Ben Metcalf, Bridge Housing, 345 Spear St #700, San Francisco encouraged further study on serving Downtown, having a the monthly pass concept and he supported the project.

Herb Borock, P.O. Box 632 stated there was a recommendation from the VTA and P&TC using the money from the cross-town shuttle for a different Palo Alto shuttle or paying for a new VTA route and he supported this project.

Council Member Morton asked whether the connection to Menlo Park was feasible.

Mr. Connolly stated the connection to Menlo Park was part of the original Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) recommendation the Board voted on in August. The route carried about 400 people daily and was already covered by Samtrans with a free transfer between Samtrans and VTA patrons at the transit center.

Council Member Morton asked what the expectations for evaluation and feedback were in terms of the community bus lines.

Mr. Connolly stated the standard was the average of all of the community bus lines in the County in terms of their productivity. They would be evaluated on a quarterly basis with report cards on their performance.

Council Member Mossar asked for clarification on what the recommendation was if the Council approved staff's recommendation.

Ms. Likens stated the P&TC supported all staff recommendations and added to the Motion other items that they suggested us to work with VTA in the future.

Council Member Morton asked if the Motion was to adopt staff's recommendation with the direction to staff to continue the discussions with VTA as proposed by the P&TC.

Council Member Morton stated the patterns of usage and under usage were struggles and the VTA struggles with the financing part of the usage. The

community bus line may be in risk in a year from now but would have to face it then.

Council Member Mossar stated this was better than what the COA was originally and provided benefits for the City.

Council Member Kleinberg stated she had hoped that the Motion was more expansive.

Council Member Morton stated that continuing the discussion was the language he used.

Council Member Kleinberg asked to include all of the P&TC recommendations on page three. She stated she asked that WiFi capability on the bus routes which would help attract the younger crowd.

Mr. Connolly stated they would be introducing the Fremont Express as a pilot and were testing the technology.

Council Member Kleinberg stated she was on a commission which suggested a city shuttle service with a GPS service to find out where the bus was. She asked whether they were looking at innovative technology which would attract the young transit riders.

Mr. Connolly stated there was a capital program to do real time information which was GPS based. The El Camino Corridor would be the first transit to have the ability to show when the next bus would be coming, how far away it was and the ability to access it by a cell phone or a personal digital assistant (PDA).

Council Member Kleinberg asked whether a parent could track their child from where they got on the bus to where they were delivered.

Mr. Connolly stated yes.

Council Member Kleinberg asked what was planned for the growing group of seniors who would need to get from their homes to the Palo Alto Medical Foundation.

Mr. Connolly stated that would be a partnership with Stanford that would need to be worked on.

Council Member Kleinberg stated she supported the Motion.

MOTION: Council Member Morton moved, seconded by Mossar, to approve staff and the Planning and Transportation Commission to:

- 1) Endorse the proposed elimination of Community Bus line 89 in the Stanford Research Park and the reinvestment of service hours into a modified Community Bus line 88.
- 2) Endorse the proposed July 2008 modification of Community Bus line 88 route to serve both the midtown and South Palo Alto neighborhoods and expanded peak period service to Gunn High School during school commute hours.
- 3) Direct staff to work cooperatively with VTA staff to explore a long-term solution for community transit needs in the City, including potential changes to the Palo Alto shuttle program, and report back to the Planning and Transportation Commission and City Council prior to October 2008.
- 4) Request the VTA staff pursue establishment of student and adult monthly passes for Community Bus fares.
- 5) Request that VTA staff evaluate the feasibility of converting bus line 35 to a Community Bus route.
- 6) Authorize the Mayor to send a letter to the VTA Board of Directors summarizing the Council's action.

Furthermore, staff is directed to continue discussion with VTA with regards to the additional recommendations made by the Planning and Transportation Commission (CMR 466:07).

MOTION PASSED: 9-0.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES

Council Member Drekmeier noted he received a letter from the California Farm Bureau Federation requesting support of the California Property Owners and Farmland Protection Act.

Mayor Kishimoto stated the Urban Ministry was welcoming toys and presents for their Holiday Toy Shop at the Opportunity Center or the United Methodist Church at 625 Hamilton Avenue. For families who would like to receive toys, there were shopping hours on December 18, 19 and 20, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 10:37 p.m.