

Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission
AGENDA
Thursday, June 9, 2011
Lucie Stern Community Center
1305 Middlefield Road, Community Room
Time: 5:00 p.m.

This notice is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or 54956.

ATTENTION SPEAKERS:

If you wish to address an agenda item or speak during oral communications on a topic not on the agenda, please complete a speaker's card and give it to City staff. The Chair will recognize you at the appropriate time. No cards will be accepted after 5:30pm.

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the 5/26/2011 action meeting notes
3. Committee reports
4. Discussion on the future direction of the IBRC
5. Infrastructure management system report
6. Finance committee report
7. Oral communications
 - Members of the public may address the IBRC on any subject not on the agenda for a maximum of three minutes. If a speaker wishes to address the IBRC on any subject on the agenda he or she will be given the opportunity to do so for a maximum of three minutes at the time that agenda item is addressed. Speaker cards are to be submitted prior to 5:30pm.
8. Possible future agenda topics and schedule
9. Committee work time
10. Adjournment

ADA. Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in using City facilities, services, or programs or who would like information on the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact (650) 329-2550. Sign language interpreters will be provided upon request with 72 hours in advance notice.

Meeting materials will be provided at the meeting. Visit www.cityofpaloalto.org/ibrc, email ibrc@cityofpaloalto.org or call (650) 617-3174 for more information.

Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission Action Notes
Thursday, May 26, 2011
Meeting No. 14

IBRC members present:

Ray Bacchetti-Commission Co-Chair	Leland Levy-Commission Co-Chair	Robert Stillerman-Above Ground
Marc Berman-Surface	Stephen Levy-Finance	Greg Tanaka-Finance
David Bower-Above Ground	Patricia Markevitch-Surface	Gary Wetzels-Above Ground
Ralph Britton-Surface	Mark Michael-Above Ground Chair	
Brent Butler-Above Ground	Jim Olstad-Finance	
Mark Harris-Finance Chair	James Schmidt-Surface Chair	

IBRC members not present:

John Melton-Finance
Alex Panelli-Finance

IBRC staff present:

Elizabeth Ames
Phil Bobel
Steve Emslie
Richard Hackmann

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:15 pm.
2. The 5/12/11 action meeting notes were approved.
3. Above Ground Committee interim report:
The Above Ground Committee presented a Power Point Presentation of its work and findings to date. This presentation will be placed on the IBRC website.
4. The Surface and Finance Committees made very brief status reports. The Surface Committee is working on prioritization. The Finance Committee is working on its Financial Model.
5. Co-Chair Bacchetti described the attached IBRC Schedule
6. Oral communications:
There were no oral communications.
7. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.

IBRC MEETINGS
June 1-Sept. 6, 2011

*June 1: Co-Chairs and Chairs @ Channing House, 4 p.m. . Outlines for: 7/7 Reports;
preliminary discussion of 7/18 Council Work Session*

June 9: Finance Committee Report: Gap analysis and associated issues.

June 23 (Three Hours): Above Ground\Surface: Prioritizations

July 7: Committee Reports Due (No Commission meeting in first half of July.)

July 14 (Thursday): RETREAT: 2:00 - 8:30 @ Foothill Nature Preserve

1. Discuss Preliminary Draft Outline of Commission Report
2. Discuss Committee Reports (bulk of meeting)
3. Discuss and Organize New Working Groups- Select Chairs
Each Working Group creates its calendar to meet targets below:
 - a. Municipal Service Center (MSC) 7/28
 - b. Public Safety Bldg. (PSB) 8/11
 - c. Infrastructure Management System (IMS) 8/11
 - d. Other ??
4. Discuss 7/18 Council Work Session

July 18: Council Work Session

July 28: Review of Council feedback. IMS Working Group oral report

August 4: Please hold for possible meeting on issues for Sept. 6 Council work session

August 11: (3 hours) Public Safety & MSC Working Groups' oral reports

August 21 (Sunday): Reports completed on IMS, MSC, PSB

August 25: (3 hours) Discuss Working Group Reports

September 6 (Tuesday): Council Work Session

LL/RB
5/26/2011

From: Bob Stillerman [bob@rsic.biz]
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2011 5:22 PM
To: Hackmann, Richard; IBRC
Cc: Leland Levy; Ray Bacchetti
Subject: Infrastructure thoughts for your consideration

Richard, Please distribute this to the commissioners and staff liaisons in accordance with city policies. Thanks, Bob.

Dear Commissioners,

After listening carefully to the committee reports and thinking about many of the comments made during our commission meetings, I decided to put down in writing, for your consideration, some of my thinking on next steps for our commission. As noted more fully below, perhaps this is the right time for the IBRC to clarify our objectives for delivering our final report so we may complete our analysis of feasible alternatives and provide leadership regarding how infrastructure of the City of Palo Alto will best promote delivery of services that our residents want and need. Ultimately, the infrastructure plan and our report should help fulfill the future vision for our community.

I also request that these discussion points be added to our next commission meeting agenda.

Background: I find myself asking if the plan of upcoming meetings and agenda items that was proposed at the end of our last commission meeting will lead us towards a set of recommendations to the city council on CPA's infrastructure. I feel we need to focus on identifying and filling gaps in our understanding of the issues, and building consensus amongst ourselves on the way forward and then develop our recommendations.

I would first of all like to thank the committees for their efforts in putting together informative, thoughtful and insightful presentations that have enabled us commissioners to better understand the scope, and many of the details of the issues before us. I know the real work of our commission gets done by the committees. We started with little knowledge and understanding of the infrastructure issues that the CPA faces to having a better view of the complexity of the city's assets. I would also like to thank the staff for their efforts in responding to our many demands and in providing useful data to support our comprehension of the infrastructure needs.

Magnitude of Needs? The first question I have is whether there may be a gap between what the staff considers to be the costs of catching up, keeping up and improving our infrastructure compared to what our investigations have uncovered. When the Above Ground Committee examined the 'needs' of our building assets, we discovered that the city data accounts for some, but not all of the projects that the stakeholders consider as needs. The Art Center, as an example, has a current project totaling approximately \$8M that is funded by an outside donation plus city funding. For the Art Center stakeholder, this project represents the absolute minimum of what needs to be done. The value project that the Art Center feels would complete the catch up is closer to \$15M (i.e. \$7M higher) which does not appear in the city's accounting. Similarly, the Roth building has a need somewhere between \$8-12M which does not appear in the city's books. Please note that our AGC focused on the needs, and not the financing, of the assets on our list.

CIPs v. Unfunded Backlog? It is my understanding that the staff considers 'unfunded infrastructure backlog' as those CIPs that have been proposed by the city and which could have been done in the past had there been sufficient funding, but were not. Examples of these currently on the city's list are the MSC and the Public Safety Building as well as other assets totaling \$196M. In addition to these projects, our AGC has identified at least two other major projects that are not part of this backlog: City Hall upgrades and Cubberley upgrades and repair. Since these needs may not been formulated in CIP requests, they are not on the city's list.

My inference is that the actual needs of our infrastructure assets may be largely underestimated by the data the city has compiled for those assets using its current methodology. We need to understand this gap better.

Future Vision? The ‘noted philosopher,’ W. Gretzky said: “A good hockey player plays where the puck is. A great hockey player plays where the puck is going to be.” In my view, that is good advice for our commission. We have been asked to look ahead 25 years for infrastructure needs. To focus our upcoming efforts on past unfunded projects, like the MSC and the PS Building, may not be looking ahead nor considering the vision of the city.

Does Palo Alto have a consensus or an ‘official’ vision for the future of the city? Such a vision should be the starting point for what we should be looking ahead towards. In the absence of a clear vision statement, we can probably agree on some aspects of an implicit vision:

- keep CPA to be a great place to live and work;
- offer a high level of needed and desired services to residents, businesses and visitors;
- include services for the diverse needs of our community: public safety (i.e., fire, police, medical response, emergency operations), transportation, roads, bridges, parks, community centers, general administration, culture, entertainment and recreation;
- provide for the future growth of the city

Services require infrastructure in order to be delivered. However, we don’t necessarily need every asset in our city’s infrastructure. If we think creatively, we may be able to ‘package’ services in new buildings that the residents of CPA would be willing to pay for. A Municipal Services Center could be a City Services Center, housing senior center, Avenidas, teen center, etc., in addition to the city facilities that are resident there. The current civic center could be upgraded and enhanced in a different location, freeing up prime land for other uses, near to transportation as envisioned by the comprehensive plan. We need to think about where the puck is likely to be, what services will be needed and how best to provide them!

We have spent approximately four months understanding the complexity of our city’s infrastructure and how it currently serves our community. I think we have learned quite a lot but have yet to come up with a way of applying what we have learned to develop clear recommendations. I, personally, would prefer to offer forward-looking recommendations based on accurate and supportable data.

Plan & Timetable. I suggest that our next commission meeting be devoted to developing a plan to move forward. Let’s identify what we have done so far, what gaps remain, how will fill those gaps, and what we would like to deliver. Let’s then develop a timetable for getting there. If such a plan means taking more time than we have in our current schedule, then we communicate that change to the city council, with an explanation of what prompted the change. We are dealing with a complex problem, incomplete data and some confusion about what we have been asked to deliver. Let’s get ourselves aligned, gain consensus and then move forward.

Regards,

Bob Stillerman

t: +1-650-326-4800

c: +1-209-483-4800

From: Ralph Britton [mailto:ralphbritton@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, June 04, 2011 9:02 PM
To: Ames, Elizabeth
Subject: Fw: IMS question

Hi Elizabeth,

Ray requested the I send this to you for transmission to the IBRC commissioners/staff as a whole.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Thanks,

Ralph
----- Original Message -----

From: [Ralph Britton](#)
To: [Ray Bacchetti](#) ; leland.levy@wfadvisors.com
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2011 9:16 PM
Subject: IMS question

Ray & Le,

After reviewing your working group document, I see a distinction separating the IMS work from the others. I see substantially more staff involvement in that part of the effort, if we and the staff together are going to build a truly effective IMS. And staff has a dog in the show, because they will have to run it after we're gone. That is not to minimize the effort required on the other items, as there is a huge issue with getting the required public support for the needed funding, and making the cogent and accurate assessment of the needs which will be required to "sell" it.

I'm not making a recommendation about how to proceed, I just bring the issue up as a point for further discussion.

I also would like to express admiration for your putting together such a succinct document showing the way forward.

Ralph

At the beginning of its work, the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission (IBRC) divided itself into three committees to pursue the scope of work laid out by Council. These three Committees, Surface Facilities, Above Ground Facilities and Finance, working with staff, have generated an important base of information about the gap which exists between the city's infrastructure needs and the financial resources currently being made available to them. It now appears, however, that in order to provide a report of more focused value, building on our work thus far, the Commission should refocus its direction.

The Old Scope: The Old Scope represented a broad mandate for the Commission. It (Attachment 1) consisted of seven bullet points, the first two of which, naturally, received primary Commission attention:

1. What is the complete listing of the City's infrastructure backlog and future needs? What criteria should be used to prioritize this list of projects?
2. Are there ways the City's infrastructure needs can be prioritized into 5-year increments that can be financed and also effectively implemented given current staff resources?

We found these complex tasks to require considerable staff and Commission effort. In the first place, the City lacks a comprehensive spreadsheet listing all facilities and detailing maintenance and projected future capital requirements. Secondly, the apparently straightforward idea of prioritization is not straightforward at all. The multitude of differing facilities serving a wide array of city functions, services, and non-profit programs is one dimension of complexity. Another is the differing logics for maintenance that apply to different kinds of infrastructure assets.

We believe that refocusing on these three principal tasks will be the most efficient use of the Commission's time over the next six months.

Revised Scope: We propose that the Commission focus on four areas,

The Commission has worked with staff on a spreadsheet to serve as the basis for an ongoing Infrastructure Management System (IMS). The IMS will enable staff and Council to track the costs required to catch-up on overdue needs and keep-up proper maintenance of the city's infrastructure. Using the IMS, the Commission will develop recommendations for funding deferred and annual maintenance, and, where appropriate, redeploying facilities that are underutilized.

In additions to deferred and on-going maintenance, staff has identified facilities they believe require renovation or replacement. The following three account for two-thirds of the approximately \$200,000,000 Infrastructure Future Needs Backlog (*2012 Proposed Capital Budget, P. 284*): The Public Safety Building, Municipal Services Center, and at least two of the city's five fire stations. In addition to developing the IMS, the Commission will analyze each of these projects in depth.

Organization: We recommend the following re-organization into four Working Groups:

1. Infrastructure Management System
 - Complete the inventory of infrastructure assets.
 - Identify assets on which maintenance is overdue ("deferred").
 - Itemize planned annual maintenance over the next five years and in five-year groupings thereafter.
 - Identify associated revenue which could be dedicated to planned maintenance
 - Develop funding recommendations to set up the system and operate it.

2. MSC Building Replacement (MSC)
 - Assess requirements of current users.
 - Consider consolidation of other departments at site.
 - Explore alternative locations, alternative uses of the present location, and possible land swaps.
 - Funding recommendations.

3. Public Safety Building (PSB)
 - Review 2006 Study of PSB needs.
 - Consider incorporating other uses such as OES and Fire Department.
 - Consider possible relocation of some uses such as Evidence Storage, Emergency Operations and Communications.
 - Evaluate needs for renovation or replacement.
 - Consider other public or private uses of current PSB if current site is vacated.
 - Funding recommendations.

4. Fire Stations
 - Determine needs of existing stations 3 and 4.
 - Review fire and medical response data from January, 2011 *Fire Services Utilization and Resources Study.*
 - Review alternative facilities for delivering fire and medical response, i.e., merger of Stations 2 and 5.
 - Funding recommendations.

In addition, and in so far as they are able, each Working Group will provide exploratory ideas regarding future infrastructure possibilities and topics about which present uncertainty limits the potential value of analytical work, e.g., Cubberley.

RFB/LDL
6/2/2011

Attachment 1

meeting and this report to Council. The recommendations of the Committee related to the IBRC are outlined in the Discussion Section below.

DISCUSSION

The Committee discussion of a possible task force or commission to address the infrastructure deficit focused on several key elements: 1) scope of the task force's work; 2) potential task force deliverables and schedule; 3) structure of the task force and appointment methodology; and 4) staff resources necessary to support the task force.

1) Scope:

The Committee spent a significant amount of time discussing the scope and problem definition for the IBRC as this determination lays the foundation for most of the other decisions related to the IBRC. The general consensus was that the IBRC should look at the broadest definition of the infrastructure deficit and then break it down into smaller modules for analysis and recommendation. The definition of infrastructure should remain open and the IBRC should narrow it down into a scope manageable for potential financing mechanisms. There was also consensus that the schedule or timing of an election should not automatically dictate or limit the scope.

The Committee recommends that the IBRC address the following questions as part of the work effort:

- What is the complete listing of the City's infrastructure backlog and future needs? What criteria should be used to prioritize this list of projects?
- Are there ways the City's infrastructure needs can be prioritized into 5 year increments that can be financed and also effectively implemented given current staff resources?
- What are potential financing mechanisms that could be used to address the City's infrastructure needs? Should there be a one-time financing mechanism or some ongoing source of infrastructure funding? What are the options for each of these choices?
- Is a bond measure the best mechanism for funding the infrastructure backlog? If so, when should this move forward and how could it be structured?
- How can public/private partnerships be leveraged as an infrastructure funding mechanism?
- How are City project cost estimates developed and are these in alignment with other local jurisdictions?
- How do Enterprise Fund infrastructure projects intersect with General Fund infrastructure projects?

The IBRC should evaluate and make recommendations on possible election timing if a bond measure is recommended. Based on input from bond counsel, a General Obligation bond requiring a 2/3 vote of the electorate could be placed on any City election. This provides more flexibility and options for the IBRC to consider with respect to a bond measure. The potential upcoming election dates could be June 2011, November 2011, June 2012, and November 2012.

Draft guide for Working Group on . . .

Infrastructure Management System

Goal

A comprehensive and dynamic inventory of the City's non-enterprise fund infrastructure assets. [Comprehensive = includes streets, sidewalks, buildings, parks, open space, levees, dams, and similar assets. Dynamic = Continually updated so that at key intervals, such as when annual budget needs are assessed, it will provide a look at one, five, and 25 year intervals into the future of 1) planned maintenance required to keep the items in this inventory functioning at agreed-upon levels, 2) anticipated improvements, and 3) deferred maintenance, if any.] Estimate initial cost of system and annual operating and upkeep cost.

Definition of "System"

Either a commercially available or home-grown model grounded in a database that identifies individual assets (e.g., a building) or an interrelated set of assets (e.g., streets and sidewalks) and rolls up from there to identify needs for specified intervals.

Possible Elements of the System

The elements sketched below indicate but don't define the kinds of information an IMS database would include. The actual list should be developed collaboratively with staff. It should include what needs to be known to enable the IMS continuously to give a valid and reliable accounting of deferred maintenance (if any), planned maintenance, and planned or contemplated improvements. Cost estimates should include all that is needed to render a complete picture of fund requirements irrespective of fund source.

For Buildings and Parks:

- Basic data such as location, age, size, uses, condition, expected remaining life, current replacement value, records of maintenance in last 5 years, and other information useful in assessing state of repair and functionality.**

- Date of anticipated major systems repair or replacement (plumbing, roof, electrical, HVAC, etc.)
- Relation of building or other asset(s) or plans that could affect function, uses, or other factors related to future capital expenditures.
- Ratios of building operating cost (efficiency), density of use by staff and public, and other measures of its utility.
- Building flexibility, potential for other uses.
- Need for upgrades for more demanding uses, e.g., electronics.
- Planned or potential improvements (including replacement) for reasons of economy, capacity, or new uses.
- Cost estimates for the above.
- Budgeted and anticipated sources of funds.

For surface assets such as streets and sidewalks

- Description of methods for systematic annual cycle for street and sidewalk maintenance.
- Criteria for target street conditions (i.e., PCI score).
- Cost estimates for the above.
- Budgeted and anticipated sources of funds.

For Joint Powers Authority and Utilities

- Identify intersections or borders between these responsibilities and those of the City's Public Works Department, including cost estimates of City obligations.
- Cost estimates for the above.
- Budgeted and anticipated sources of funds.

A fully functioning IMS would be put to these and possibly other uses:

- As a public report card on whether budgeted and other resources (e.g., grants, taxes, fees) are keeping up with infrastructure needs.
- As a basis for annual budgeting and five-year (or longer) forecasting of capital needs.
- As a format illuminating how well budgeting and financial forecasting are tracking infrastructure needs.
- As a tool for weighing trade-offs, e.g., assessing immediate and longer-term impacts of reductions or increases in infrastructure needs and funding.

- As a tool for assessing the most efficient use of space and for looking for alternative uses.

The IMS would require subsystems for smoothing needs over time to enable the most efficient and economical use of Public Works staff and contractors. Many aspects of building systems repair are flexible as to time, e.g., a roof can be repaired in order to defer a replacement for a year or two. An infrastructure reserve would also enable smoothing budget flows to account for peaks and valleys in needs.

Resources

(Reports 1-3 can be found in IBRC Briefing Materials, October 2010)

1. Facility Assessment Report (Kitchell), February 22, 2008.
2. Infrastructure Report Card (City Auditor), March 2008.
3. General Fund Infrastructure Opportunity Report (Leadership ICMA [International City Managers Association] Team), September 3, 2009.
4. Audit of Street Maintenance (City Auditor), March 2006.
5. Report of the Surface Committee.
6. Report of the Above Ground Committee.

Deliverables

1. An initial product of the IMS will incorporate the work of the Surface and Above Ground committees into an assessment of current deferred and planned maintenance needs, improvements, resources normally allocated annually, the resulting gap, and alternatives for funding that gap through 2036. Include consideration of dedicating specific revenues to infrastructure maintenance.
2. Specifications of an Infrastructure Management System that can serve the Council, City management, and the community to keep the condition of city assets and the resources for maintaining and improving those assets continuously documented.

Working Group:

Staff Liaison: Phil Bobel

RFB/LDL 6/8/11

Draft guide for Working Group on . . .

Municipal Services Center (MSC)

Goal: Determine needs and develop alternatives for resolving substandard condition of the MSC; explore land use alternatives enabling commercial development at current site. Assess funding options. Recommend a preferred option.

Considerations:

- The 2012 Preliminary Capital Budget includes (p. 82) a CIP for hiring a consultant to study the MSC. What should be the specifications for the consultant's work?**
- Assess requirements of current users.**
- Assess deficits in current facilities (why has the MSC found itself on the Public Works' Infrastructure Needs list (pg. 284 of 2012 Preliminary Capital Budget); what is the source of the \$93 M cost estimate for replacement?).**
- Evaluate extent to which functions housed and equipment and supplies stored at the current site may be moveable to one or more other sites.**
- Evaluate whether functions or equipment and supplies currently at other locations may be consolidated to the MSC.**
- Land swap with auto dealers on Embarcadero should be explored.**
- Animal Shelter is contiguous to MSC and is slated for replacement. Consider plausible cost-effective links to recommendations on MSC.**
- Utilities Department pays for space. What are the mechanisms for Utilities to invest in renovation, renewal, or replacement of MSC?**

Deliverable

A report, including cost estimates, financing alternatives, and alternative locations, including potential land swaps, that can inform the MSC element in the Commission's final report and, through that final report, serve as the basis for a Council decision on moving forward

to engage a consultant (as indicated in CIP PE-12004) or take other appropriate action.

Resources:

- 1. Public Works analysis of MSC as candidate for replacement.**
- 2. Tour of facility.**
- 3. City business development analyses (Tommy Fehrenbach).**

PW liaison:

MSC liaison:

**RFB/LDL
June 7, 2011**

Draft guide for Working Group on . . .

Public Safety Building

Goal

Develop alternatives and a recommended choice for housing the Police Department, Fire Department Administration, Communications Center, Emergency Operations Center, and Office of Emergency Services in one or more buildings that meet applicable building codes, are efficient, meet Palo Alto standards for architecture and esthetics, and can satisfy public safety needs for 30 or more years into the future. In addition, if recommendation is to move public safety functions out of current locations in the Civic Center, recommend alternative uses for the vacated space.

Considerations

- Assess pros and cons of co-locating all public safety functions in one building or of distributing them to more than one location, including both capital and operating costs.**
- Because not all components are governed by “essential services” (i.e., strict) building codes, explore alternative locations for functions that can be housed in less expensive quarters, e.g., evidence storage.**
- Assess organizational options under consideration, i.e., merger of police and fire, collaborations with other jurisdictions, and their implications for building options.**
- Evaluate pros and cons of renovations of current space or replacement of that space by new building(s). [In case of renovation of current space, assess cost of temporary space for the Police Department, Communications Center, and Emergency Operations Center while construction is underway.]**
- If Civic Center space is vacated, consider other public or private uses of that space. Estimate cost to the city of re-use.**
- Delineate financing alternatives for the building alternatives identified and the one(s) recommended.**

Deliverable

A report, including cost estimates and financing alternatives, that can inform the PSB element in the Commission's final report and, through that final report, serve as the basis for a Council decision on moving forward.

Resources

- 1. Blue Ribbon Task Force report on Public Safety Building Project, June 19, 2006 (included in IBRC Briefing Materials, October 2010).**
- 2. Feasibility Study, Public Safety Building, May 18, 2010.**
- 3. Fire Services Utilization and Resources Study, January 2011.**
- 4. Service Efforts and Accomplishments (SEA) Report for 2010, January 2011.**
- 5. Tours of current facilities.**

Working Group:

Public Works Staff Liaison:

Public Safety Staff Liaison:

1) Dennis Burns, Acting Director, Public Safety; Chief, Palo Alto Police Department; Interim Fire Chief

Email: Dennis.Burns@cityofpaloalto.org

Phone: 329-2556

Assistant: Barbara Teixeira

Email: Barbara.Teixeira@cityofpaloalto.org

Phone: 329-2556

2) Pete Hazarian, Senior Administrator

Email: Pete.Hazarian@cityofpaloalto.org

Phone: 329-2346

**RFB/LDL
June 7, 2011**

Draft guide for Working Group on . . .

Fire Stations

Goal:

Determine needs and develop alternatives for resolving deteriorated building condition of Fire Stations 3 and 4; and review fire and medical response problems associated with Fire Stations 2 and 5. Though these two sets of problems have different origins, the Working Group should consider them under the rubric of fire stations in the overall assessment of infrastructure needs.

Considerations:

- Fire Stations 3 (Newell & Embarcadero) and 4 (Middlefield and East Meadow) have been identified by Public Works as in need of major repair.**
- Fire Stations 2 (Hanover, near Page Mill) and 5 (Clemo and Arastradero) are recommended for merger in a new location by the Fire Services Utilization and Resources Study. This study's recommendations have not yet been acted upon; the Co-chairs will get further guidance on the status of this recommendation as soon as possible.**
- Fire stations are a critical part of the Emergency Preparation plans in Palo Alto.**
- Consultation with fire officials will be necessary to understand the extent to which laws and other strictures govern the design, construction, and location of fire stations.**

Deliverable

A report, including cost estimates and financing alternatives, that can inform the Fire Stations element in the Commission's final report and, through that final report, serve as the basis for a Council decision on moving forward.

Resources:

- 1. Fire Services Utilization and Resources Study, January 2011.**
- 2. Service Efforts and Accomplishments (SEA) Report for 2010, January 2011.**
- 3. Public Works' analysis of cost of renovation of fire stations 3 & 4.**
- 4. Tours of current facilities.**

Working Group:

PW Liaison:

Fire Department Liaison: Catherine Capriles, Acting Deputy Chief
Email: Catherine.capriles@cityofpaloalto.org
Phone: 329-2265

RFB/LDL
June 8, 2011