



# CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Special Meeting  
March 18, 2013

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:03 P.M.

Present: Council Members: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss, Price, Scharff, Schmid, and Shepherd

Utilities Advisory Commission: Cook, Eglash, Foster, Hall, Melton, Waldfogel

Absent: Utilities Advisory Commission Member Chang

## STUDY SESSION

1. Study Session with the Utilities Advisory Commission Regarding 1) Potential Expansion of the City's Fiber Optic Network and 2) Utilities Department and Utilities Advisory Commission Priorities for 2013 and Beyond.

Utilities Advisory Commission (UAC) Chair James Cook gave a brief overview of the last joint study session which occurred in 2011. Chair Cook reminded the audience that two particular issues were flagged in the last joint study session: a carbon neutral goal for the electric utility and a second electric transmission interconnection to Palo Alto. By way of quick update, Chair Cook noted the recent success marked by the Council's approval of the implementation plan to achieve a carbon neutral electric supply, and Staff's current and on-going efforts with regard to a second electric transmission interconnection. Council Members expressed support for re-visiting and renewing efforts to develop a fiber-to-the-premise plan in the context of Palo Alto being a "Connected City" and in the context of economic development. Several members reiterated their strong interest in electric reliability for the City through a second electric transmission interconnection. Other items of interest raised by Council Members included cybersecurity, smart grid, and programs to continue to fulfill climate protection plan objectives.

# MINUTES

## ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

William Rosenberg was disturbed by the Council's discussion regarding the plastic bag Ordinance at the prior week's meeting. His comments would have been different if he had known the proposed Motion before he spoke. He wished the Council would have a Motion on the table before discussing a topic.

Stephanie Munoz stated property owners' rights were limited to what the City allowed. She asked the Council to make planning decisions in the interest of the community.

## MINUTES APPROVAL

**MOTION:** Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd to approve the minutes of February 2 and February 4, 2013.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

## CONSENT CALENDAR

Vice Mayor Shepherd recused herself from Agenda Item Number 2, because she lived in the Southgate Neighborhood.

Herb Borock spoke regarding Agenda Item Number 7, and related the history of sidewalk improvement programs. Repairing a particular neighborhood and finishing neighborhoods was the third priority for sidewalks. All neighborhoods should be treated the same.

**MOTION:** Mayor Scharff, Vice Mayor Shepherd, and Council Member Schmid moved to remove Agenda Item Number 3 from the Consent Calendar to become Action Item Number 10a.

**MOTION:** Council Members Burt, Holman, and Klein moved to remove Agenda Item Number 10 from the Consent Agenda to become Action Agenda Item Number 13.

**MOTION:** Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to approve Agenda Item Numbers 2 and 4-9.

2. Approval of Contract Amendment No. One to Contract No. C12143146 in the Amount of \$165,000 with RBF Consulting, Inc. for the Final Design and Construction Support Services for the Southgate

# MINUTES

Neighborhood Storm Drain Improvements and Green Street Project, Capital Improvement Program Project SD-10101.

3. ~~Finance Committee Recommendation that the City Council Appoint an Electric Undergrounding Advisory Body.~~
4. Resolution 9323 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Utilities Rate Schedule C-1, Utility Service Calls."
5. Resolution 9324 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving, and Authorizing the City Manager to Negotiate and Execute, Electric Master Agreements and Delegating the Authority to Transact Under the Master Agreements."
6. Finance Committee Recommendation of a Five-year Contract Extension for the Palo Alto Golf Course Management Services Agreement with Brad Lozares (Lozares); Amendment to Golf Course Pro Shop Lease with Lozares to Reduce the Term of the Option to Extend the Lease From Ten Years to Five Years; and Five-Year Contract Extension for the Golf Course Maintenance Services Contract with Valley Crest Golf.
7. Budget Amendment Ordinance 5189 in the Amount of \$2.2 Million to Utilize the Additional Funds Added to the Infrastructure Reserve in FY 2013 for Infrastructure "Keep-up" to address street and sidewalk problems and to accelerate street and sidewalk improvements.
8. Ordinance 5190 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Reducing the Size of the Library Advisory Commission from Seven to Five Commissioners and Amending the Frequency of Regular Meetings to Bi-Monthly (1st Reading: March 4, 2013, Passed 9-0)."
9. Recommendation from the Council Appointed Officers Committee to Exercise an Option to Extend for One Year a Consulting Contract with Sherry L. Lund Associates for a Total Cost Not to Exceed \$49,350 for; 1) Consulting Services related to the 2012-2013 Annual Performance Reviews for Four Council Appointed Officers for a Total Cost Not to Exceed \$32,300; 2) Solicitation of Staff Feedback Related to Performance Evaluations for a Total Cost Not to Exceed \$9,500; and 3) Mid-year Performance Review Updates for a Total Cost Not to Exceed \$7,550.
10. ~~Policy & Services Committee Recommendation to Approve Revisions to Section 2.4 of the City Council Protocols Setting Forth the Conduct of Council Liaisons to Palo Alto Boards and Commissions.~~

# MINUTES

**MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 2:** 8-0 Shepherd not participating

**MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBERS 4-9:** 9-0

## AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS

13. (Former Agenda Item Number 10) Policy & Services Committee Recommendation to Approve Revisions to Section 2.4 of the City Council Protocols Setting Forth the Conduct of Council Liaisons to Palo Alto Boards and Commissions.

**MOTION:** Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to move Agenda Item Number 13 (former Agenda Item Number 10) "Policy & Services Committee Recommendation to Approve Revisions to Section 2.4 of the City Council Protocols Setting Forth the Conduct of Council Liaisons to Palo Alto Boards and Commissions" to a date uncertain.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

## ACTION ITEMS

10a. (Former Agenda Item Number 3) Finance Committee Recommendation that the City Council Appoint an Electric Undergrounding Advisory Body.

Tom Ping, Utilities Electric Engineering Manager, reported in 2012 Staff presented recommendations for the structure of an advisory body to evaluate the undergrounding program. The tasks of an advisory body were to learn about the program in Palo Alto and actions taken by other cities; to identify possible modifications to the program and funding mechanisms to facilitate changes; to work with the community to gather input; and to make recommendations to the Utilities Advisory Commission (UAC) and City Council. Topics for the advisory body to address were whether to continue the program, funding for the program, and the amount customers were willing to pay. Staff identified two alternatives for structure of the advisory body: 1) a citizen advisory committee appointed by the City Council; or 2) a citizen advisory committee appointed by the City Manager or Utilities Director. The UAC, Finance Committee, and Staff recommended the City Council appoint a Citizen Advisory Committee.

Vice Mayor Shepherd felt there was a great deal of confusion regarding undergrounding of utilities. Because grants were no longer available, appointing a committee was the wise move.

# MINUTES

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to appoint an advisory body to solicit community input on potential changes to the City of Palo Alto Utilities electric overhead to underground conversion policy.

Vice Mayor Shepherd believed the community deserved an answer regarding undergrounding utilities. Undergrounding utilities would be outside the purview of the Infrastructure Committee.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether the advisory body would be Ad Hoc.

Vice Mayor Shepherd indicated Staff would present further options for appointing the advisory body. The advisory body would exist until the Council decided whether or not to underground utilities in the entire City.

Council Member Kniss believed public engagement was needed to understand and explain the situation. Having an advisory body would make a long-term difference.

Council Member Schmid asked if the intent of the advisory body was to gather complex information about safety, efficacy, and costs, or to generate public comment on the issues.

Mr. Ping stated the primary intent was to gather public comment. Staff would provide support and information.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the advisory body would provide a recommendation rather than alternatives to the Council.

Mr. Ping indicated the advisory body would make a recommendation, but it would consider different alternatives in developing its recommendation.

James Keene, City Manager, remarked that part of the impetus for an advisory body was an acknowledged gap between the potential scale of needed undergrounding and the City's ability to fund undergrounding. That raised many questions and implications in the purview of the Council. Staff would provide support and technical work.

Council Member Schmid preferred the body return to the Council with a range of alternatives after public engagement.

Council Member Klein stated an advisory body was not in the same category as recommendations from the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission

# MINUTES

(IBRC). The Council already knew the issue was lack of funding for undergrounding utilities. Increasingly homeowners opposed undergrounding when they learned their cost for extending utilities to the home. An advisory body would learn that undergrounding utilities was not financially feasible, and the Council already knew that. The UAC should consider this topic, if needed.

Council Member Burt concurred with Council Member Klein's comments. He did not believe undergrounding utilities was a critical issue for the community. An advisory body would distract from infrastructure initiatives and dilute resources.

Council Member Holman agreed with Council Members Klein and Burt's comments. Perhaps a few paragraphs could be added to the Utilities page of the City's website to update the public.

Council Member Price concurred with Council Members Klein, Burt, and Holman.

Mayor Scharff believed undergrounding utilities was a lingering issue. The community needed to know the costs and alternatives for funding. A citizens committee would be helpful in providing community input and information regarding costs. The Council should support the UAC's recommendation to have an advisory body.

**MOTION FAILED:** 4-5 Berman, Kniss, Scharff, Shepherd, Yes

## 11. Downtown Parking Update and Direction Regarding Near-Term Parking Actions.

Curtis Williams, Director of Planning and Community Environment, recommended a series of actions for short-term implementation related to Downtown parking issues. The proposed Motion was to direct Staff to evaluate and implement specific programs of: a) an attendant parking trial; b) a City commitment to reduce employee parking spaces in the City Hall garage; c) the potential for a public-private partnership for a new parking garage on Lot P; d) restrictions on the creation and use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR); e) revision of other zoning provisions related to parking exceptions; and f) potential parking restrictions or a Residential Permit Parking Program (RPPP) in the surrounding neighborhoods. Several of those programs would need Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) input. Staff would continue to be active in parking studies in a number of venues. The Garage Parking Study was reviewing five parking lots in Downtown and the potential feasibility of constructing a parking

# MINUTES

structure on each one. Staff was also reviewing zoning use and parking exemptions, specifically in the Emerson Street Retail Corridor. Phase 1 of the Downtown Development Cap Study focused on data collection and analysis of Downtown parking issues. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was scheduled to be released by the end of March 2013. Staff would return in April 2013 for more discussion of the Arts and Innovation District at 27 University Avenue.

Jaime Rodriguez, Chief Transportation Official, reported Staff monitored parking occupancy on the street and in parking structures and surface lots. The use of parking permits within garages decreased compared to a year ago. One reason for the decrease was the turnover of companies within the Downtown area. The demand for permits remained high; however, usage decreased. The South of Forest Area (SOFA) had a consistent demand for parking. The City released a large number of permits for structured parking garages, and increased permit sales at surface parking lots. On-street parking increased compared to the prior year, because of companies transitioning in the Downtown area.

Mr. Williams would not eliminate the likelihood that a number of people were not buying parking permits, because it was less expensive to park free in the neighborhoods. The existing Development Cap for Downtown was 350,000 square feet. As of the end of 2012, 223,000 square feet were approved. Pending in the development review process were 95,000 net additional square feet, for a total of 318,000 square feet. At least one additional project of 13,500 square feet had been discussed but not submitted. Staff estimated projects under construction or in process would generate a need for 665 new vehicle spaces not provided on-site. The projects were compliant with parking requirements, but they had other means for providing parking. Between the saturation issues and the potential for new project impacts, it was appropriate to discuss near-term actions. Lot P provided 51 surface parking spaces, all hourly spaces, as part of the Downtown Parking Assessment District. Staff requested the Council direct them to return within two months with more details regarding a parking garage on Lot P. Staff expected to release the Phase 1 Downtown Development Cap RFP by the end of March; was scheduled to return to the Council on April 15, 2013 to outline a process for the 27 University Avenue Project; and was scheduled to present the preliminary Garage Parking Study by the middle of May 2013, possibly with more details on a proposal for Lot P. Staff suggested establishing a stakeholder task force to work through these processes. He hoped to have an attendant trial in place at one garage by July 2013; to have transportation demand management (TDM) measures and parking reductions in place by September 2013 as well as neighborhood parking restrictions and TDR discussions.

# MINUTES

Molly Stump, City Attorney, explained the Political Reform Act prohibited government officials from participating in or seeking to influence any governmental decision in which they had a financial interest. When a public official had a conflict under the Political Reform Act, he must recuse himself from any participation in the decision. Under the Political Reform Act, any interest, both ownership and leasehold longer than 30 days, in real property valued at more than \$2,000 presented a conflict of interest. Any governmental decision within 500 feet of a real property interest presented a conflict. A number of Council Members and key Staff held real property interests in or near the Downtown area. Citizens, developers, and interested community members were not barred from talking to officials who could have conflicts. Officials with conflicts could not participate in governmental decisions even if everyone was confident the officials had the best interest of the community in mind and were not engaging in self-dealing. Determining Council Member and key Staff conflicts would be an iterative process as issues related to Downtown parking and development were presented to the Council. Specific proposals developed by Staff in the future were likely to focus on particular properties and specific programs; therefore, Council Members and key Staff not eligible for the current discussion might be eligible for future discussions. All Council Members and key Staff could participate in items (a)-(c) of the Agenda item. Council Members and key Staff would need to recuse themselves for items (d)-(f), and those items should be discussed separately to allow recusals.

Michael Hodos stated Downtown workers used neighborhoods for free parking. Downtown workers, businesses, and/or developers should subsidize the cost of any RPPP. He urged the Council to direct Staff to consider proposing a RPPP similar to Santa Cruz.

Neilson Buchanan suggested the Council provide the public with one week to comment on Agenda Items. The Report did not include quality standards for livability.

Marion Odell indicated the neighborhood parking situation was not new. Her street was 100 percent saturated. The intersections crossing Everett Avenue were dangerous for cars and cyclists.

Ken Alzman noted many areas in the map he provided were 100 percent parked during the day. The approved development projects would result in parking spreading into more neighborhoods. Resources enjoyed by Downtown businesses should be shared in order to resolve the parking issues created by Downtown businesses.

# MINUTES

Joseph Baldwin felt the Comprehensive Plan had been breached rather than observed. He urged the Council to remember the goals of the Comprehensive Plan in making decisions.

Emily Renzel stated parking problems existed as early as 1973. The Parking Assessment District was not effective. The City encouraged bonus development as transit-oriented development around transit stations without protecting parking for transit stations.

Ana Carvalho could find parking at her home in Philadelphia, because residential parking permits were effective. She felt residential permits were needed in Palo Alto.

Ian Irwin reported cars went the wrong way on a one-way street in order to reach parking spaces. Many accidents occurred in the area of Homer Street. He suggested the Council engage neighborhood residents and other stakeholders in resolving parking issues. Residential parking permits worked well in other cities.

Christopher Storer indicated the goals of TDRs were to protect older buildings and to increase seismic safety. TDR programs provided true public benefits. Constructing a parking structure on Lot P was not a near-term issue, and the long-term impacts were unknown.

Faith Bell, Bell's Book Store, felt developers should have an obligation to include adequate parking on the property. The 1:1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) should be eliminated. Placing a parking structure on Lot P would grievously impact the flow of goods and services to businesses. Parking structure R had no signage at the High Street entrance to indicate public parking.

Richard Brand stated the Staff Report did not contain a density calculation, which affected the total number of potential cars parking in neighborhoods. It was critical for parking exemptions to be well constructed. A TDM enforcement process should be included in the recommendations to the Council.

Beth Bunnenberg believed TDRs were a powerful incentive for preserving historic buildings.

Michael Griffin reported parking problems negatively impacted quality of life and lowered property values in neighborhoods, while increasing the profits for Downtown developers. He hoped the Council would be empathetic to residential concerns when considering zoning issues.

# MINUTES

Herb Borock believed Council Members were required to state the reason for recusing themselves. The Council should direct Staff to place an Ordinance for a moratorium on the creation and use of TDRs on the Council Agenda. The California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) would choose a location for a rail station based on the kind of intensive development and parking structures currently being proposed and considered for Downtown.

Chop Keenan stated developing Lot P would have zero deficit for the 135 Hamilton project. He would work with residents to find a solution for parking problems. Developing Lot P would solve many problems.

Elaine Meyer, President of the University South Neighborhood Association, requested the Council not allow developers to construct projects with insufficient parking. Neither residents nor the City should pay for new garages.

Adina Levin, Sierra Club and Palo Alto Cool Cities Team, supported Staff's consideration of a TDM program to conserve the use of parking by City employees. The current cost of parking passes incentivized driving. The Council should consider reducing parking in Downtown before investing in parking structures.

Sally Ann Rudd stated the Council should implement neighborhood parking permits as quickly as possible. Building additional parking spaces resulted in more people driving into Downtown. She did not support a public-private partnership to construct a parking structure on Lot P.

Council Member Burt requested Staff provide more detail regarding the program to reduce employee parking spaces.

Mr. Williams reported Staff would explore allowing employees to choose between receiving the parking fee or a parking space, and creating other transit pass programs. Staff was surveying employees regarding incentives not to park in the garage.

James Keene, City Manager, indicated Staff could explore effective TDM programs that cost far less than building parking spaces. He was optimistic about providing a series of incentives for employees to use TDMs.

Council Member Burt believed incentivizing the use of alternative transportation applied to the private sector as well as the public sector. He requested an update regarding the City's ability to utilize the Caltrain Go Pass system.

# MINUTES

Mr. Rodriguez proposed two concepts of pilot Caltrain Go Pass programs. The first program would focus on City employees. Only those employees who could utilize Go Passes would be required to have them.

Council Member Burt inquired about Caltrain's willingness to participate in such a program.

Mr. Rodriguez reported Caltrain was willing to discuss the proposal. The second proposal was to develop a Caltrain Go Pass program for companies too small to participate in the larger Go Pass program. Those companies would participate in the proposed program for a maximum of two years in order to realize the benefits of participation. At the end of two years, the companies would rotate out of the program, and other companies would rotate into the program.

Council Member Burt noted the City of Menlo Park was willing to collaborate with the City in these new programs. He wished to discuss broader policy and program alternatives, such as variable pricing, for existing parking structures, and inquired whether that could be discussed with the full Council.

Ms. Stump indicated Staff's proposals for parking structures concerned areas of the Downtown that did not raise conflict issues; therefore, Council Member Burt could direct his comments to those areas with the full Council present.

Council Member Burt explained some parking spaces were valued more highly because of their proximity to desired locations, and inquired whether Staff had evaluated a variable pricing system as a means to increasing utilization of parking structures.

Mr. Rodriguez reported Staff was considering options, including variable pricing of permits, for implementation at all existing parking facilities to increase usage.

Council Member Burt asked if those options would include metered parking at prime spaces.

Mr. Rodriguez answered yes.

Council Member Burt felt the public was willing to pay for meters at prime parking spaces.

# MINUTES

Mr. Keene explained the most valuable parking spaces were located in the most crowded lot. As parking supply dwindled, variable pricing became an option.

Council Member Burt stated that was dynamic pricing. Variable pricing was fixed pricing at different locations.

Council Member Klein noted the Staff Report did not mention the impact of parking fees on low-income employees who worked in Downtown, and inquired whether Staff had considered that.

Mr. Williams reported Staff discussed more affordable pricing for upper levels of parking garages. The difficulty was ensuring people parking in less expensive areas needed the lower price. Staff would consider that in more detail for permit parking programs.

Council Member Klein inquired whether Staff would engage employers and employees, and utilize surveys regarding prices.

Mr. Williams answered yes.

Council Member Klein inquired about the purpose of implementing parking programs, the metrics for determining saturation and determining the needed parking spaces.

Mr. Williams indicated Staff would review some of the same topics included in the Downtown North report in the short term. Determining the number of needed parking spaces would require a long-term analysis.

Council Member Klein suggested parking programs could increase the value of residents' properties, and that needed to be considered. Neighborhood parking restrictions were the City's crucial short-term program. He asked if Staff could return with neighborhood parking restrictions sooner than September 2013.

Mr. Williams reported Staff intended to hold a series of meetings with each neighborhood, the community in general, and the business community. It would be difficult to follow that process in a shorter timeframe.

Council Member Kniss noted the recommended Motion indicated Staff would evaluate and implement programs within six months; yet, Mr. Williams just stated the neighborhood parking program would not be ready in six months.

# MINUTES

Mr. Williams explained Staff would attempt to obtain Council approval for programs within six months.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether the City previously had an attendant at one of the parking garages.

Mr. Williams was not familiar with that.

Council Member Kniss seemed to recall a parking attendant was utilized around the holiday season.

Mr. Williams suggested an attendant was utilized during the holiday season for visitor parking. Staff proposed utilizing an attendant for permit parking spaces in garages. Once a garage was full, an attendant would double park cars on upper levels, resulting in approximately 20 percent more parking spaces.

Council Member Kniss asked if the cost for constructing a parking garage through a public-private partnership would be approximately half the normal cost.

Mr. Williams reported the City's cost would be approximately half for each net parking space gained. That amount did not include the availability of additional parking spaces at night and on weekends.

Council Member Berman believed Staff could increase the number of permits for parking garages without Council approval. The plan was to increase the number of permits in the garages that did not have waiting lists. He asked how Staff would increase demand for parking permits.

Mr. Rodriguez noted the elimination of waiting lists at some garages were the result of Staff increasing the number of permits.

Council Member Berman indicated the garages at the Civic Center and High Street had decreased usage, and inquired whether Staff considered increasing the number of permits for those facilities.

Mr. Rodriguez explained input from parking enforcement teams indicated high occupancy at the Civic Center garage; therefore, Staff felt it appropriate to consider increasing the number of parking permits at a later time. The correct occupancy for the High Street garage was 85 percent, so Staff wanted to monitor the situation for a few months.

# MINUTES

Council Member Berman inquired whether Staff was reviewing use of technology and signage to direct visitors to parking garages.

Mr. Rodriguez answered yes. Staff was meeting with technology companies to discuss concepts for monitoring the availability of both on-street and off-street parking. Staff's report would include technology options.

Council Member Berman asked if there were plans to take advantage of the availability of parking spaces in the Civic Center parking lot every other Friday.

Mr. Rodriguez stated technology could be utilized to report the Civic Center parking lot as open to anyone on those days.

Council Member Berman felt more information was needed regarding the number of employees in Downtown, density, and traffic.

Mr. Rodriguez encouraged the community to complete the City-wide traffic survey to provide that type of information.

Council Member Holman was unsure why the zoning evaluation and parking impact for Emerson Street ground floor retail was delayed. If the retail space was converted to office space, it would most likely have a greater impact.

Mr. Williams explained preserving retail space would ameliorate some of the day-long parking of an office use. Emerson Street ground floor retail was part of the package of Downtown changes under consideration as far as uses relating to parking.

Council Member Holman felt more retail space would convert to office in order to avoid a proposed moratorium.

Mr. Keene noted Staff would return in April with recommendations for Emerson Street.

Council Member Holman inquired whether the Council could address the lack of enforcement provisions for TDM programs.

Mr. Rodriguez indicated the majority of projects required TDM monitoring only. If those projects were submitted for new permits, then the City could require enforcement.

# MINUTES

Mr. Williams reported the Council required some enforcement mechanisms for the 195 Page Mill project. Very few development projects had any type of TDM program.

Mr. Keene stated the real deficit was rooted in the past in that the City's actions had not matched progress.

Council Member Holman said the threshold for triggering implementation of change could be very low. Enhanced code enforcement was needed to correct illegal office and retail locations. The Staff Report did not reference mixed use application and parking exceptions based on mixed use. Staff should review the impact of existing private parking garages. She questioned why Staff did not include residential square footage in Planned Communities. The City needed to manage construction vehicles in neighborhoods. She requested information regarding the feasibility of a Caltrain parking validation program, and an update of neighborhood handicapped parking spaces.

Mr. Williams indicated Staff was scheduled to discuss handicapped parking with the P&TC in the next one or two months.

**MOTION:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to direct Staff to evaluate and implement near-term (1-6 months) downtown parking improvements, including but not limited to: a) an attendant parking trial in select downtown parking garages or lots (Lot R); and b) a City commitment for reducing 50-100 employee permit spaces in the City Hall garage.

Council Member Holman believed these two programs did not require additional information and could be implemented quickly.

Council Member Schmid was interested in the spread of neighborhood parking, and the Development Cap Study was critical to understanding that. Without the Development Cap Study, the Council had difficulty taking definitive actions. Staff identified these two programs as programs that could be implemented now to have an impact.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to direct Staff to evaluate and implement near-term (1-6 months) downtown parking improvements, including but not limited to: a) an attendant parking trial in select downtown parking garages or lots (Lot R); b) a City commitment for reducing 50-100 employee permit spaces in the City Hall garage; and c) evaluation of a potential public-private partnership for a new parking garage on Lot P.

# MINUTES

Vice Mayor Shepherd was interested in the results of the attendant parking program. The Council was not taking action to implement the private-public partnership for the garage. She wanted the Council to have concepts for that site.

Council Member Kniss stated item (c) was an evaluation of restrictions. Building a parking garage was both difficult and expensive.

Council Member Price felt Staff analysis was needed for intelligent Council discussion. She requested Staff briefly explain how technology and availability of parking spaces fit into the studies and analyses.

Mr. Rodriguez reported Staff would return to the Council in early May 2013 with the garage study, which would include an analysis of the feasibility of all sites, concepts of parking structure sizes, estimates of costs, building constraints, and options to make existing sites more efficient.

Mayor Scharff felt Staff evaluation of item (c) was important. The parking issue required a multi-pronged approach.

Council Member Burt requested the Mayor split the Motion into items (a) and (b), and item (c).

Mayor Scharff declined to split the Motion.

Council Member Berman supported items (a) and (b); however, he wanted more information and details regarding item (c) in order to make a proper analysis.

Council Member Schmid opposed the Substitute Motion. The City would receive 31 parking places from the partnership, for a benefit totaling approximately \$860,000. Mr. Keenan paid \$7 million, but \$6.7 million of that amount was the in-lieu parking fee he would have to pay. His net cost was approximately \$300,000. Granting rights in perpetuity relinquished options for the public.

Mr. Williams clarified that Mr. Keenan could pay \$2.4 million in in-lieu fees and move ahead with his project. Additional parking was covered by TDRs and construction of 23 parking spaces.

Mr. Keene indicated the City would have to find funding for its portion of construction costs for a parking garage. There were other potential sites for garages or other uses for Council consideration. Parking structures were

# MINUTES

one part of a parking solution. Staff was reconsidering the Parking Assessment District model as part of parking changes.

Council Member Klein supported item (c), because it was a direction to Staff to evaluate the potential of a public-private partnership of a parking garage.

Council Member Holman suggested Staff's analysis for item (c) include assessment of the value of the lot if it was zoned PF or CDC.

Vice Mayor Shepherd inquired whether that request would change Staff's work.

Mr. Williams was concerned that Staff would be analyzing many aspects of parking.

Vice Mayor Shepherd did not wish to be prescriptive.

Mr. Williams asked the Council to provide their concerns.

Vice Mayor Shepherd requested Council Member Holman state her requests for Staff.

Council Member Holman requested Staff evaluate the value added to the City, the cost savings for the developer, how loading zones would be addressed, and possibilities to maximize the utility by having underground parking.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED:** 8-1 Schmid no

Council Member Holman recused herself from item (d) at 9:45 P.M., because she received income within the past 12 months from the Palo Alto History Museum, which could be impacted by item (d), and she had an interest in her residence, which was within 500 feet of a residential neighborhood adjacent to the Commercial Downtown District.

**MOTION:** Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to direct Staff to evaluate and implement near-term (1-6 months) downtown parking improvements, including but not limited to: d) evaluation of restrictions on the creation/use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked Staff to address the conflict between restricting TDRs and incentivizing preservation of historic buildings.

# MINUTES

Mr. Williams noted the TDR program had extensive success in Downtown in helping preserve historic buildings. There were substantial property rights issues with TDRs.

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked if developers had to remodel the property in accordance with standards prior to selling the TDR.

Mr. Williams replied yes. One option for restricting TDRs could be allowing additional square footage of a TDR but not the parking exemption. Given the value of buildings in Downtown and the number of buildings with seismic upgrades, incentivizing seismic upgrades may not be necessary. The key was whether to allow future TDRs to be created.

Vice Mayor Shepherd believed the Downtown Cap Study did not include TDRs that were not implemented. TDRs added value to Downtown.

Council Member Schmid indicated the impact on historical buildings was important. The Motion was to direct Staff to evaluate restrictions.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to add after "restrictions," "and/or provide alternative incentives."

Council Member Price inquired whether Staff's update would focus on alternatives and amendments as well as revisions to make the TDR program more suitable to the current situation.

Mr. Williams responded yes.

Council Member Price asked if proposed restrictions would be presented to the Historical Resources Board, the P&TC, and then the Council.

Mr. Williams answered yes.

Mayor Scharff requested Staff explain the two components of a TDR.

Mr. Williams explained generally a TDR allowed an additional 2,500 square feet for an historic building and an additional 2,500 square feet for seismic upgrades. Each site could receive up to 5,000 square feet, and each receiver site that purchased the TDR could use up to 5,000 square feet of purchased TDRs exempt from parking. Developers could buy more than 5,000 square feet, but the amount over 5,000 square feet was not exempt from parking requirements.

# MINUTES

Mayor Scharff inquired whether purchasing TDRs over 5,000 square feet would allow the developer to build a bigger building.

Mr. Williams replied yes, but the developer would have to park the space.

Mayor Scharff inquired whether Staff would review deleting the parking component or parking solely with TDRs.

Mr. Williams reported Staff would review both.

Mayor Scharff believed allowing the square footage but with no parking would be an incentive.

Mr. Williams noted the incentive would not be as great.

**MOTION PASSED:** 8-0 Holman not participating

Vice Mayor Shepherd recused herself from discussion of items (e) and (f) at 9:45 P.M., because she had an interest in real property at 550 Hamilton Avenue, which was within 500 feet of the eastern edge of the Commercial Downtown District.

Mayor Scharff recused himself from discussion of items (e) and (f) at 9:45 P.M., because he had an interest in real property at 616 University Avenue, which was within 500 feet of the eastern edge of the Commercial Downtown District.

Mr. Keene recused himself from discussion of items (e) and (f) at 9:45 P.M., because he had an interest in real property, which was within 500 feet of the eastern edge of the Commercial Downtown District.

Council Member Holman returned at 9:45 P.M.

Council Member Klein recalled Staff estimated 665 new unparked vehicles would be generated from approved but not occupied projects. He asked if Staff had any ideas how the Council could not add to those unparked spaces.

Mr. Williams had no ideas for approved projects. The only method not to add more unparked spaces would be to adopt a moratorium for projects not approved. A moratorium would require eight votes of the Council.

Council Member Klein requested the number of unparked spaces generated by projects not approved.

# MINUTES

Mr. Williams reported probably half the number of spaces if the Council stopped all planning site approvals.

Council Member Price referenced Packet page 621 regarding elimination or modification of Downtown parking exemptions. That language seemed to indicate the study would be limited to the permanent elimination of the 1:1 FAR exemption and the 200 square foot exemption from parking. She inquired whether the language illustrated one aspect of the study or indicated the likely items included in the recommendation.

Mr. Williams clarified that the study would include but not limited to those two choices. Those were the two most obvious exemptions. Staff would also review the code section that allowed the Director to make parking reductions based on proximity to transit and mixed use.

Council Member Price asked if the Director had to make findings in order to make parking reductions.

Mr. Williams responded yes.

**MOTION:** Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Price to direct Staff to evaluate and implement near-term (1-6 months) downtown parking improvements, including but not limited to: e) eliminating or revising zoning exemptions from parking requirements.

Council Member Kniss stated Staff's explanations allowed her to support inclusion of item (e).

Council Member Burt asked what the zoning exemptions from parking requirements were. The Council acted on the moratorium for the 1:1 FAR.

Mr. Williams reported Staff identified at least one other exemption, a 200 square foot exemption on many Downtown projects. It was applied regularly, but was not significant because it was only one parking space. The Council should either severely limit or eliminate its use. Staff would review the Director's ability to reduce parking based on certain circumstances.

Council Member Burt inquired whether those two exemptions were listed in the Staff Report.

Mr. Williams indicated they were not listed under exemptions.

# MINUTES

Council Member Holman inquired whether this item would be appropriate for consideration of a threshold for implementing TDM monitoring.

Mr. Williams replied yes, because TDM monitoring was connected to the section regarding reductions in parking.

Council Member Holman suggested adding monitoring and enforcing TDM programs for existing projects.

Mr. Williams did not know if Staff had the authority to require monitoring of existing projects.

Council Member Holman recalled Staff could impose a TDM program if a property owner applied for another permit for the same property.

Mr. Williams reported evaluating thresholds for TDM monitoring and enforcement would require more time and effort and could delay analysis of programs.

Council Member Holman requested Staff include analysis of transit-oriented developments (TOD) and mixed use.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether that would make the analysis too difficult for Staff to perform in the short time allotted.

Mr. Williams suggested "revising zoning exemptions from parking requirements and Director-approved parking adjustments."

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to add after parking requirements: "and evaluate Director approved parking adjustments."

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the zoning evaluation statement included analysis of the Emergency Parking Ordinance and adjustments resulting from the Development Cap Study.

Mr. Williams reported it did not. The proposed projects were short-term and should be completed prior to completion of the Development Cap Study.

Council Member Schmid asked how Staff's evaluation would relate to the Emergency Parking Ordinance.

# MINUTES

Mr. Williams explained the evaluation would likely make the Emergency Parking Ordinance a permanent measure by deleting the provision subject to the moratorium.

Council Member Schmid noted the moratorium extended only 12 months, and the Development Cap Study might not be completed in that timeframe.

Mr. Williams reported the moratorium as adopted did not rely specifically on the Development Cap Study.

Council Member Burt stated the Staff Report did not consider density of employment per square foot, and inquired whether restricting the number of employees of a business in relation to the number of parking spaces was common practice.

Mr. Williams felt more cities were considering a ratio of number of employees to number of parking spaces.

Council Member Burt noted the two largest employers Downtown had employee density less than 1 employee per 250 square feet.

**AMENDMENT:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to add after e) eliminating or revising zoning exemptions from parking requirements, and: "Staff evaluate mechanisms to control the relationship between employee density and parking."

Council Member Burt believed omitting this evaluation ignored the obvious.

Council Member Holman agreed with Council Member Burt's comments. Evaluation of the relationship between employee density and parking was a practical matter. Staff could control employee density through a certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Williams explained that was part of the Development Cap Study. Evaluation of the relationship along with other programs required more time and effort than Staff could provide in six months.

Council Member Berman reiterated that the Council needed more data to make informed decisions. He did not understand how employee density correlated to modification or elimination of Downtown parking exemptions. Employee density should be addressed on its own merits.

# MINUTES

Council Member Price agreed employee density was a critical issue for parking; however, the Downtown Cap Study would address the issue. Employee density had many enforcement issues.

Council Member Klein agreed employee density did not fit with modification of parking exemptions. Employee density was a topic for a long-term project, not a near-term project.

Council Member Holman explained the short-term component was matching employee density to parking requirements for available parking.

**AMENDMENT FAILED:** 2-5, Burt, Holman yes, Scharff, Shepherd not participating

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED:** 7-0 Scharff, Shepherd not participating

Council Member Berman recused himself from the discussion of item (f) at 10:24 P.M., because he had an interest in his residence, which was in a neighborhood adjacent to the Commercial Downtown District.

Council Member Holman recused herself from discussion of item (f) at 10:24 P.M., because she had an interest in her residence, which was within 500 feet of a residential neighborhood adjacent to the Commercial Downtown District.

Council Member Klein inquired whether the Council needed a unanimous vote to pass the item due to the Council having only five Council Members with no conflict of interest.

Ms. Stump answered no. The item was a direction to Staff, not an item requiring a majority vote.

**MOTION:** Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Price to direct Staff to evaluate and implement near-term (1-6 months) downtown parking improvements, including but not limited to: f) initiating parking restrictions and/or permit parking in adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Council Member Kniss felt the community discussed this issue the most. Parking in Downtown neighborhoods was a serious issue.

Council Member Price agreed this was a key issue. Given the amount of community interest, she favored an analysis and evaluation of options. She assumed part of the analysis would note Staff costs to monitor enforcement.

# MINUTES

Council Member Burt recalled the Council considered a ban on non-resident parking the prior year in a smaller area, and asked what percentage of the Downtown map was comprised of the smaller area.

Mr. Rodriguez reported a majority of the Professorville area was included in the map.

Council Member Klein noted the Council did not have a quorum with the temporary absence of Council Member Price.

Council Member Burt believed advantages of the Santa Cruz program were revenue from the sale of permits could pay for residents' permits; the number of permits could be limited; and permits would allow variable pricing. Residents generally wanted a parking space at or near their residence.

Council Member Schmid indicated parking permits were a near-term solution. The program may require revisions once the Downtown Development Cap Study provided information.

Council Member Price preferred having a simple and easily enforceable program. A complex program could be difficult to implement.

Council Member Klein was aware developing and implementing a permit program was difficult; however, permit programs were successfully utilized in many other cities.

**MOTION PASSED:** 5-0 Berman, Holman, Scharff, Shepherd not participating

Mayor Scharff, Vice Mayor Shepherd, and Council Members Berman and Holman returned at 10:30 P.M.

12. Infrastructure Committee Recommendation to Modify List of Projects Approved by Council for Public Opinion Research for a Potential Infrastructure Revenue Ballot Measure.

Brad Eggleston, Assistant Director Public Works, noted the Infrastructure Committee (Committee) revised the Council's approved list of infrastructure projects. Byxbee Park was removed from the list, because of uncertainty regarding the composting facility. The Cubberley Replacement and Expansion Project was removed, because of the lack of time to review the Cubberley Community Advisory Committee Report. Staff analysis determined the Post Office Project would not need additional funding. The

# MINUTES

School Childcare Sites were removed, because the City paid for the sites through the Cubberley Agreement. Parking garages in Downtown and California Avenue were added to the list after discussion of the Council's Priority and parking impacts. The History Museum at the Roth Building was added to gauge public support for funding. Staff requested Council approval of the project list for public opinion polling, so that polling could occur in April 2013. Staff would present survey results in June 2013.

James Keene, City Manager, stated it would be a mistake to think of the list as the infrastructure project list. This was a list for baseline polling. The Council could subsequently modify the list. Polling on a set of projects would not influence a subsequent poll.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, noted Council Member Holman would need to recuse herself from consideration of the History Museum. Staff recommended the Council vote on items serially or as a group while holding out the History Museum discussion and vote.

Adina Levin, Sierra Club and Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, supported funding bike and pedestrian projects. Consideration of parking garages prior to having parking data was premature.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to make the following changes to the list of projects approved by the Infrastructure Committee on March 7, 2013 for the public opinion research firm to use in development of polling questions on a potential ballot measure to fund infrastructure needs: Remove Byxbee Park project, remove Cubberley Replace/Expand project, remove the Post Office project, remove the School Childcare Sites project, add the Downtown Parking Garage and California Avenue Parking Garage project.

Council Member Klein stated the list was not an endorsement for any project; it was a means for the Council to gather information. Polling helped the Council make decisions regarding the number of libraries and the library bond measure. The Council had approximately one year to gather information in order to decide whether or not to include a bond measure on the 2014 ballot.

Council Member Burt agreed that polling was a method to learn the community's opinions. He requested Staff's rationale for including streets and sidewalks when the City had a plan to accelerate improvements.

# MINUTES

Mr. Eggleston stated including streets and sidewalks in polling would indicate public support for further acceleration of the program to reach the 2021 goals for the Pavement Condition Index.

Council Member Burt inquired about the length of the bond.

Mr. Keene reported recent data indicated street conditions were a primary public concern. Polling could allow the Council to learn whether the public was aware of improvements underway, and whether accelerating the program was worthwhile.

Council Member Burt believed questions framed to ask the public's current impression and impression after being informed would be informative. He questioned the removal of Byxbee Park from the list, because uncertainty would be eliminated before polling was completed.

Mr. Eggleston noted Staff raised the uncertainty about the potential composting facility. Polling about Byxbee Park could lead to public confusion, because of the controversy.

Council Member Burt noted several items were included only to gauge public opinion, and Byxbee Park would be the same. Uncertainty regarding the composting facility would be eliminated by the time the Council decided which projects to place on a ballot.

**AMENDMENT:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to include Byxbee Park completion in the poll.

Council Member Holman stated no matter what happened with a compost facility, the remainder of Byxbee Park would need to be completed, and the City did not have funding for that.

Mr. Keene felt obtaining funding for Byxbee Park was not crucial to moving forward. The Council could include a number of smaller projects in a bond measure, simply because the community supported those projects.

Council Member Klein reported the Committee removed Byxbee Park from the list, because of concern that it would lead to controversy. The Committee did not want to bias the survey. The Committee discussed the number of items to include in a poll, and the pollster indicated the number did not make a difference.

# MINUTES

Council Member Kniss recalled the Committee narrowed the number of items to poll. She felt it was early to perform a poll, and requested comments on that.

Dave Metz, FM3 Research, reported this poll was proposed as the first in a series of research projects which would culminate in a Council decision whether to place a measure on the 2014 ballot. The poll would not test final packages of projects and the way they might ultimately be presented to voters. The poll was a means to determine the public's enthusiasm for projects. Based on data from the initial poll, he would perform a series of other research projects to provide specific data for a ballot measure.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether successive polls would determine which projects had a good chance of being supported in an election.

Mr. Metz indicated he would begin with the broadest set of projects, and then narrow down that list.

Council Member Kniss believed the framing of the question and identifying the projects the public strongly supported would be important.

Mr. Metz was comfortable that the number of projects identified on the list was manageable for the first poll.

Council Member Berman stated Byxbee Park was controversial, and the Committee did not want controversial issues on a ballot measure.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the poll would be responsive. Without background information, he did not believe the data would be reliable.

Mr. Metz indicated that was the art of polling. He could design an entire survey for just one of the projects.

Council Member Schmid felt some previous polls were valuable in helping the Council make its decisions.

Mr. Metz explained an initial survey determined community support for projects, a second survey determined interest in packages of projects, and from that information he determined community support for packages. Data from the first poll informed a second poll, which helped determine groups of projects that achieved public support. The first poll would not be an in-depth exploration of any one project. The poll could point to those projects

# MINUTES

where further investigation could be needed and distinguish projects the public had a clear opinion on.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether Mr. Metz expected four or five projects would be dropped after the first survey.

Mr. Metz stated that was possible.

Council Member Schmid was skeptical that the quality of the data would be good enough for the Council to make decisions.

Mr. Metz would work with the Committee to develop a questionnaire that was concise, clear, and capable of providing actionable data.

Council Member Price asked if the initial survey would contain the broadest questions.

Mr. Metz answered yes.

Council Member Price inquired whether the Committee would review the questionnaire to ensure projects were not dismissed at the first stage.

Mr. Metz responded yes.

Council Member Price felt the public had varying degrees of understanding and familiarity with projects, and the list was too long.

Vice Mayor Shepherd regretted that she did not vote in Committee to poll for undergrounding utilities, and wanted to understand the importance of parking garages to the community. Polling was an analysis of the community's interests and an indication of how the Council should spend its time.

**AMENDMENT FAILED:** 4-5 Burt, Holman, Kniss, Schmid yes

**AMENDMENT:** Council Member Berman moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd to remove "(accelerate resurfacing and Charleston/Arastradero)" from the list.

Council Member Berman felt the Charleston/Arastradero Project was controversial, and polling about it with street and sidewalk improvements would not provide accurate information.

# MINUTES

Council Member Holman inquired about the status of funding for the Charleston/Arastradero Project.

Mr. Eggleston indicated the Project was the most complicated. The City received a \$450,000 grant, and budgeted \$250,000 for design from the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Budget. The City applied for three grants for which no information was available.

Council Member Holman asked how much funding was in place, assuming the City received the additional three grants.

Mr. Eggleston reported the City needed approximately \$2.1 million to reach the \$10 million total cost of the Project, assuming the City was awarded the three grants.

Council Member Holman would support the Amendment.

Council Member Price felt it was premature to remove the Project, and would not support the Amendment.

Council Member Berman clarified that the Amendment was to remove only the language in parentheses; Streets would remain on the list.

**AMENDMENT PASSED:** 5-4 Burt, Klein, Price, Schmid no

Council Member Holman inquired about the factors that would determine the projects placed on a potential ballot.

Mr. Metz explained that statistical theory said a random sample could speak to the opinions of a larger population with a known margin of error that was independent of the size of the population. A sample of 400 people in Palo Alto would have a 5 percent margin of error. Public input, funding, priorities, and other factors would contribute to the Council's decision-making process.

Council Member Holman inquired whether the Committee discussed undergrounding utilities.

Council Member Klein reported the Committee felt undergrounding was not a viable project; therefore, polling was not needed. In addition, undergrounding was a Utilities item as opposed to a General Fund item.

Council Member Holman was confused by the information presented on Packet page 693 regarding the Animal Services Center.

# MINUTES

Mr. Eggleston reported the cost estimate of \$6.9 million was predicated on the Animal Services Center being relocated and rebuilt at the Los Altos Treatment Plant site, if there was a project for the Animal Services Center.

Council Member Holman recalled the Project would cost approximately \$7 million to rebuild the Animal Services Center at its current location.

Mr. Eggleston understood the cost estimate was based on relocating the Animal Services Center, but he would review the information.

Council Member Holman inquired whether polling language would indicate the Animal Services Center would be relocated.

Mr. Metz stated if the Project assumed relocation, then that would be mentioned in the survey question as contributing to the total cost of \$7 million.

Council Member Holman was troubled by the language being included in the polling, because the Council had not formulated policy on the issue.

Council Member Klein reported including projects in the poll was not indicative of the Council's approval of the projects.

Council Member Holman expressed concern that positive polling results regarding the Animal Services Center could be used to say the community supported the Animal Services Center if the Council relocated it.

Mr. Keene explained cost estimates were developed when the Council was considering relocating the Animal Services Center and reusing some of the site for other purposes. Polling would provide information for the Council to decide whether to refine project details or consider alternatives.

Council Member Holman was troubled by the description for the Animal Services Center Project.

Mr. Keene did not have an alternative description, since the description in the Staff Report was the only one Staff had analyzed.

Council Member Holman believed a cost estimate was determined for rebuilding the Animal Services Center in place. Her concern was the relocation aspect.

# MINUTES

Mr. Keene suggested the poll did not have to speak to the issue of relocating the Animal Services Center.

Council Member Holman agreed.

Mayor Scharff believed the poll should include Charleston/Arastradero but not as a part of the Streets Project. Charleston/Arastradero as part of Streets could skew poll results.

**AMENDMENT:** Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to include a separate item for polling on Charleston/Arastradero.

Mayor Scharff felt it was time for the City to complete the Charleston/Arastradero Project.

Council Member Burt supported the Amendment for the same reasons he supported including Byxbee Park.

Council Member Berman suggested negative poll results could cause the Council not to support and fund the Charleston/Arastradero Project.

Mayor Scharff stated having information was good.

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked how the poll would be conducted when a large portion of the community did not use the Charleston/Arastradero area.

Mr. Metz explained he would know the exact physical address of each person interviewed, and could separate them by precinct or by streets. The analysis could identify geographic differences to the extent they existed.

**AMENDMENT PASSED:** 8-1 Berman no

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED:** 9-0

Council Member Holman recused herself from discussion of the History Museum Project at 11:30 P.M., because she had received income within the past 12 months from the Palo Alto History Museum.

Council Member Kniss left the meeting at 11:30 P.M.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to add the History Museum Project to the list of projects approved by the Infrastructure Committee on March 7, 2013 for the public opinion

# MINUTES

research firm to use in development of polling questions on a potential ballot measure to fund infrastructure needs.

**MOTION PASSED:** 6-1 Klein no, Holman not participating, Kniss Absent

~~13. (Former Agenda Item Number 10) Policy & Services Committee Recommendation to Approve Revisions to Section 2.4 of the City Council Protocols Setting Forth the Conduct of Council Liaisons to Palo Alto Boards and Commissions.~~

## COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Klein said he was one of three Council Members who attended the National League of Cities Congressional Conference the previous week. He said he rejoined the Steering Committee on Energy Environment and Natural Resources. He said the post office sale could move forward as early as the upcoming spring, but discussions with the post office team were on-going.

Vice Mayor Shepherd also attended the National League of Cities Congressional Conference and attended meetings with the Army Corps of Engineers to review with the California Civil Deputy ways to move the creek study forward and relieve the flood zone issues. She also reported the General Obligation Bond tax exemption was still in the Federal Budget. She also discussed the Amazon Tax and asked Staff to review what affect that would have on Palo Alto. She discussed a student exchange program with Yangpu District.

Council Member Berman left meeting at 11:41 P.M.

Council Member Schmid said he was disappointed the City Council did not see the Downtown Development Cap Request for Proposal prior to release.

Council Member Price announced she attended the Youth Council Retreat the previous week. She also attended a meeting regarding the Connected City Program. She said the Valley Transportation Authority Policy Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee both voted to reject a connection between participation in the Habitat Conservation Plan as criteria for One Bay Area Grant funding.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 P.M.