

# CITY OF PALO ALTO MINUTES

Special Meeting January 27, 2014

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:04 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss, Price, Scharff, Schmid,

Shepherd

Absent:

## **CLOSED SESSION**

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS
 California Government Code Section 54956.8
 Property: U.S. Post Office, 380 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto 94301
 Agency Negotiators: James Keene, Lalo Perez, Hamid Ghaemmaghami, Joe Saccio, Hillary Gitelman, Aaron Aknin, Meg Monroe, Molly Stump, Cara Silver

Negotiating Parties: City of Palo Alto and United States Post Office Under Negotiation: Purchase Price and Terms of Payment

The City Council returned from the Closed Session at 7:22 P.M. and Mayor Shepherd advised no reportable action.

## SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

2. <u>Resolution 9390</u> entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Alison Williams on her Retirement."

Council Member Burt read the Resolution into the record.

Alison Williams thanked the Council for its support of Palo Alto Children's Theatre. Past and present Staff, children and parents made it a pleasure to work at Palo Alto Children's Theatre.

Christina Stankovich stated Ms. Williams was a mentor and colleague. She was inspired by Ms. Williams' dedication to her craft and the profession of costuming. Ms. Williams touched the lives of thousands of Palo Alto children and supported their growth as artists and citizens.

Rebecca Krieger related her experiences of working with Ms. Williams. Ms. Williams supported all the children and was always present at the theatre.

Dalia van Zyll thanked Ms. Williams for making her experiences with Palo Alto Children's Theatre incredible. Ms. Williams put hard work into each of the thousands of costumes she created.

Jeremy Erman indicated Ms. Williams was more than just a costumer for Palo Alto Children's Theatre. Ms. Williams created program covers and posters. Ms. Williams encouraged all the children.

Paula Collins thanked the Council for recognizing Ms. Williams' service. The recognition validated the importance of Ms. Williams' service to Palo Alto Children's Theatre, parents and children. She looked forward to the City employing someone with similar expertise and competence to replace Ms. Williams.

Karen Hickey recognized Ms. Williams' strategic planning and creative abilities. Ms. Williams considered present and future uses when designing costumes. She appreciated Ms. Williams' service to Palo Alto and the community.

Derek Zhon loved seeing his costumes for productions. They always made him feel special and completed his character.

Nicholas Tachibane believed a costume added to a character.

Alicia Gans reported Ms. Williams and other costumers spent an incredible amount of time on costumes. Costumes were an integral part of Palo Alto Children's Theatre.

Stephanie Munoz sang a song saluting Ms. Williams. It was an honor to be associated with Ms. Williams.

Rhyenna Halpern noted a reception was held the previous evening honoring Ms. Williams. On behalf of the Community Services Department, she thanked Ms. Williams for her service.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to adopt the Resolution expressing appreciation to Alison Williams on her retirement.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

## CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

James Keene, City Manager, announced a summer camp and aquatics registration fair would be held Saturday, February 1, 2014. The City received final approval to change the type of landfill cap to an environmentally friendly cap. The City recently completed installation of a new landfill gas flare inside the Water Quality Control Plant property. On January 25, 2014, Staff, Audubon Society volunteers and an owl expert installed eight artificial owl burrows in Byxbee Park. The Chief Planning Official approved the new configuration for the California Avenue Farmers Market. Within the next month, Staff would provide the Council with an Study Session regarding drought conditions and implications for Palo Alto. The Council's Priority Setting Retreat was scheduled for February 1, 2014 at Ventura School.

## COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Price attended the 150th Anniversary of Caltrain Celebration and the Pencil In event held January 24, 2014 at the Palo Alto Arts Center.

Council Member Burt reported the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority moved closer to resolving the remaining issues of funding and permitting for the 101 to the Bay Project. The first outreach meeting regarding alternative designs for the Pope-Chaucer Street Bridge was held the prior week, with a second meeting scheduled for January 29, 2014 at 6:00 P.M. He and Council Member Klein attended the first San Francisquito Creek Sub-Basin Ground Water Meeting regarding sustainable ground water use. A Silicon Valley Sustainable Landscape Summit was scheduled for March 24, 2014.

Council Member Berman encouraged the public to participate in the City's Core Values discussion through Open City Hall on the City's website.

Mayor Shepherd attended the Northern California Power Agencies' Strategic Initiatives Conference the prior week. She highlighted information and speakers at the conference.

# **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Stephanie Munoz felt the well endowed citizens of Palo Alto had an obligation to support less fortunate citizens. Palo Alto and surrounding communities were not providing housing for workers.

## MINUTES APPROVAL

**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to approve the minutes of December 16, 2013.

**MOTION PASSED: 9-0** 

### CONSENT CALENDAR

Joe Hirsch noted the first reading of Agenda Item Number 11 indicated Chapter 18.15 rather than Chapter 18.14. He urged the Planning Department to review the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) percentage in the residential Density Bonus Ordinance. Given a particular zone and a particular number of units, increasing the FAR would increase the size of units which seemed to be counter to the idea of smaller affordable units.

Stephanie Munoz suggested the size of affordable units be smaller. She requested the Council consider restricting a complex to low-income people who did not own cars. That would remove many objections to low-income housing. The City needed Vice Mayor Kniss to stand up to the State of California and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to stop density bonus.

Donna Grider, City Clerk, reported the title of Agenda Item Number 11 was corrected to indicate Chapter 18.15. The Resolution contained within the Council Packet had the correct information.

**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-13.

Council Member Klein recorded a no vote on Agenda Item Numbers 10 and 11.

- 3. Approval of the Renewal of a Public-Private Partnership Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and West Bay Opera for the Use of the Lucie Stern Community Theatre.
- 4. Approval of the Renewal of a Public-Private Partnership Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and TheatreWorks for the Use of the Lucie Stern Community Theatre.
- 5. Approval of an Amendment to the Agreement with the Palo Alto Recreation Foundation, to Include \$5,000 Funding to Support the Coordination of the 2014 World Music Day Event.

- 6. Approval of a Public-Private Partnership Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and the Palo Alto Players for the Cooperative Use of the Lucie Stern Community Theatre.
- 7. Approval of a Five-Year Contract with Accela, Inc. for Software Maintenance for Accela Citizen Access and Accela Automation, Not to Exceed \$658,000.
- 8. Approval of Contract for Professional Services with Waters Consulting Group, Inc., and Adoption of a <u>Budget Amendment Ordinance 5229</u> entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto In The Amount Of \$98,050 for a Total Compensation Market Study for the Management & Professional Classifications."
- 9. Appointment of 2014 Emergency Standby Council.
- Ordinance 5230 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto to Amend Sections 18.04.030 (Definitions), 18.16.060 (CN Zone), 18.18.060 (CD Zone), 18.20.030 (ROLM(E) Zone) and Add Section 18.46 (Reasonable Accommodation) of Title 18 (Zoning) of Palo Alto Municipal Code to Implement 2007-2014 Housing Element Programs (First Reading: January 13, 2014 PASSED: 7-2 Klein, Schmid no)."
- 11. Ordinance 5231 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto for a New Chapter 18.15 (Residential Density Bonus) to Include in Title 18 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Implement Government Code Section 65915 (First Reading: January 13, 2014 PASSED: 8-1 Klein no)."
- 12. Request for Authorization to Increase Existing Contract with the Law Firm of Ginn & Crosby by an Additional \$135,000 For a Total Contract Not to Exceed Amount of \$200,000 for Legal Services.
- 13. Approval of Amendment No. 2 to the City's Power Purchase Agreement with Ameresco San Joaquin, LLC to Extend the Landfill Gas Electric Generating Facility's Commercial Operation Date to April 30, 2014 Upon Receipt of a \$120,000 Administrative Payment.

**MOTION PASSED for Agenda Item Numbers 3-9 and 12-13:** 9-0

MOTION PASSED for Agenda Item Numbers 10 and 11: 8-1 Klein no

## **ACTION ITEMS**

14. Council Review and Policy Direction to Staff on the Residential Parking Permit Program Framework (Continued from December 16, 2013).

Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning and Community Environment, noted the item was originally scheduled for December 2013. Because of community input, Staff's thoughts had changed since the Staff Report was prepared for the December 2013 meeting. Staff wished to create consistent criteria and procedures for the establishment of Residential Parking Permit (RPP) Districts and to prioritize proposals for RPP Districts. To eliminate potential conflicts of interest for Council Members and Staff, Staff and the Council could utilize an overarching framework to provide input regarding In the prior month, Staff discovered a great deal of commonality in opinions regarding a number of aspects of RPP Districts. RPP Districts were the nexus between а Transportation Management (TDM) approach and parking supply strategies. The goal was to establish an RPP conceptual framework to develop a community process with ample engagement from neighborhood and business interests. proposed RPP framework contained three things: criteria for establishing RPP Districts; a process to establish Districts; and a series of implementation questions regarding individual Districts.

Jessica Sullivan, Senior Project Engineer, explained the proposed criteria for establishing an RPP District. The first criterion was to identify a source of non-resident parking intrusion into a potential RPP District. Residents from one neighborhood parking in an adjacent neighborhood would not be a trigger for establishing an RPP District. The second criterion was the average occupancy on the streets needed to trigger an RPP District. Staff proposed 75 percent occupancy; however, community feedback proposed a slightly lower threshold. The City of Berkeley utilized a threshold of 75 percent, the City of San Francisco 80 percent, and the City of San Mateo 60 The third criterion was the level of support needed from neighborhood residents. Staff proposed 70 percent support or a supermajority. Community feedback proposed 51 percent. Staff proposed a five-step process to establish RPP Districts. First, the neighborhood residents of a potential District would self-organize and propose to Staff that their neighborhood become an RPP District. The City would then receive the request and provide a standard petition form to residents. Staff would also request that the residents contact the perceived source of the parking intrusion. Assuming a petition received 51 percent support, and then Staff would begin data collection and analysis. Staff would conduct an occupancy analysis of the impacted streets and determine the level of intrusion that existed in the neighborhood. The City would also generate a survey for

> Page 6 of 19 City Council Meeting Minutes: 01/27/2014

neighborhood residents. Staff suggested 70 percent support be returned from the survey and a 75 percent occupancy threshold. Assuming the District achieved the thresholds needed in Step Number 2, Staff would hold a community outreach meeting, and the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) would review the proposal. A community outreach meeting would be coordinated by City Staff and would include residents of the impacted area, adjacent neighborhoods and the source of parking The purpose of the outreach meeting would be to outline a timeline of implementation of the RPP District, present results of the occupancy study, and discuss costs. The P&TC would either make a recommendation immediately for Council approval of a trial RPP District or request additional information and discussion. A trial period could be eliminated and Staff could implement an RPP District and monitor its progress. Implementation questions would need to be addressed for each District. The answers to implementation questions could be different depending on the particular District. The first question was the number of residential and non-residential permits that would be issued in a particular The second question was the permit costs and level of enforcement. The third question was the concurrent or prerequisite actions needed per neighborhood, such as TDM strategies or parking supply initiatives. Staff collected a great deal of data from residents, and proposed that the data be incorporated into the RPP framework process for District development. Community input indicated a desire for a simpler process, such as a block-by-block opt-in and a 50 percent plus one majority vote in support of a block becoming an RPP District, and for a solid implementation timeline. Staff researched and reviewed RPP Programs in other cities and could answer questions.

Ms. Gitelman reported Staff would present TDM strategies to the Council on February 24, 2014. Staff would recommend the Council take the first steps toward establishing a TDM Authority; and include a discussion dramatically expanding the City's shuttle service, improving infrastructure, and implementing car share and ride share programs. Staff would present the Council with parking supply strategies and initiatives on February 10, 2014. Initiatives and strategies would include a contract with a parking attendant company for a trial program at one parking lot; first steps towards construction of a garage; solicitation of interest in public-private partnerships to expand parking supplies in Downtown and California Avenue; a proposal for satellite parking for Downtown with free shuttle service to Downtown; garage technology solutions; and planning and coordination with other partners of an expanded Transit Center with parking supply. requested the Council direct Staff to prepare a draft Ordinance that provided a process and criteria for establishing a Citywide framework for individual RPP Districts. Staff would disseminate the draft Ordinance for public review

and comment. Staff also requested the Council direct Staff concurrently to convene a stakeholder group of residents and businesses to develop a draft implementation strategy and timeline for the first RPP District. Council comments regarding criteria, process, and prerequisites would be helpful to Staff in drafting an Ordinance. Staff felt the stakeholder group for the first RPP District would determine specific details and predicate actions. Staff requested an opportunity to respond to public comments and questions.

Mayor Shepherd noted Staff received input from residents and businesses in preparing the Staff Report.

Chop Keenan believed an effective RPP proposal should come from residents and businesses. Staff did a good job with predicate actions. He suggested the Council consider a robust TDM Program, more parking supply, smart parking meters, free alternatives to parking in neighborhoods, and a Greater Downtown Parking Task Force under the City's auspices involving all stakeholders and at least two Council Members.

Mike Folan, Whole Foods Market, was concerned about parking for 200 team members at Whole Foods Market. Parking in neighborhoods was an issue. The first step had to provide a parking supply for workers in the Downtown and South of Forest Avenue (SOFA) areas. He suggested the City exclude Caltrain and Stanford workers when determining the parking need.

Hal Mickelson, Chamber of Commerce, reported the Chamber supported a three-pronged approach to parking. The process for establishing an RPP District must recognize that existing businesses and employees relied on street parking to supplement available lots and garages. The Chamber supported the generous issuing of permits to both residents and employees of nearby businesses in the initial phase of an RPP District and adjusting the issuing of permits once TDM Programs were implemented and additional parking supply was provided.

John Garcia, Mollie Stone's Market, indicated his employees could not afford to live in Palo Alto, and public transportation was awful. The City should consider employees' safety and whether employees were serving the community when reviewing employee parking.

Simon Cintz, paloaltoparkingsolutions.org, opposed the Downtown RPP Program proposed at the September 2013 public meetings. The proposed framework did not allow both residents and businesses to share streets in a reasonable manner. The framework must include a requirement to provide parking alternatives for employees prior to implementing parking restrictions. Public transportation was not an alternative for most employees.

Page 8 of 19 City Council Meeting Minutes: 01/27/2014 William Hanley felt the RPP Program was not workable. He supported The Simple Parking Solution (TSPS) which seemed to encompass all aspects of parking for residents, employees and businesses.

Brian Quo indicated that the proposed RPP framework would be detrimental to his small business and would chase businesses away from Palo Alto. Moving vehicles every two hours was not feasible.

Stacey Quo believed some features of the proposed RPP Program would make serving the community difficult for small businesses. Public transportation was not an option for most employees. Moving vehicles was not an option in a medical practice.

Rob Fischer stated the City should stop offering an in-lieu parking fee to developers as part of the parking solution. Providing employee parking further away from businesses would make staffing an issue for businesses.

Reza Riahi worried about his female employees walking to their vehicles, especially as they often worked late hours. He opposed the proposed RPP framework as it would hurt his business.

Gary Laine indicated the Council should address the issue of multiple families living in apartment units. He wondered about the effect of parking penalties for shoppers on businesses. He could not imagine the disruption to his medical practice if an RPP Program was implemented. Implementing the proposed RPP framework would be detrimental to the City.

Ben Cintz felt the proposed framework lacked flexibility and did not address alternatives. TSPS would address overcrowded streets and would not spread parking problems across the City.

David Sass, LYFE Kitchen, believed his employees were part of the community. He understood public parking was available for the whole community. Employees could not move their vehicles every two hours and could not afford alternative transportation.

Cassandra Berg liked the proposed framework; however, the percentage of neighborhood support should be 70 or 75 percent.

Delores Eberhart indicated workers were not neighborhood intruders. Most employees lived outside Palo Alto and deserved a place to park. She hoped the Council would reconsider the proposed action.

Eric Filseth, speaking for a group of five members of the public, encouraged the Council to proceed with directing Staff to draft an Ordinance. The real issue was the effect of overparking on a neighborhood. Overparking

> Page 9 of 19 City Council Meeting Minutes: 01/27/2014

endangered traffic, pedestrians, cyclists and children. The boom of commercial development in Downtown resulted neighborhood in overparking. An RPP Program should be implemented in residential neighborhoods by September 1, 2014. An RPP Program should be Citywide and applied block by block without supermajorities and redundant reviews. There should be a defined allocation of permits to Downtown employees. Staff and stakeholders proposed satellite lots, shuttles, valet parking, and better utilization of current empty garage spaces as means to reduce the number of cars parked in neighborhoods. The Council should act promptly.

David Bena stated the Council should not proceed with an RPP Program before mitigating other areas. An RPP Program would not resolve the parking problem.

Nathan Hanley hoped the Council would consider impacts to both businesses and residents. Any program should not be a financial burden for the average worker, should not discourage future employees from working in Palo Alto, and should not force employees to leave their current employment.

Susan Reth utilized two-hour parking spaces while working at her job. If RPP Districts were implemented, there would be no vacant spaces for her to utilize.

Susan Nightingale, Watercourse Way, hoped the Council would continue to take a balanced approach and consider businesses. She concurred with Mr. Keenan's suggestions. Employees moving their vehicles every two hours would cause further congestion and pollution.

Norman Beamer supported a general Ordinance. Staff's proposed procedure for implementation was cumbersome and should be simpler. The solution was to spread the problem wider. Areas adjacent to an RPP District should be allowed to opt into the RPP District.

Debra Peterson expressed concern about the safety of employees walking to their vehicles in the evenings. The cost of permits should be reasonable for employees.

Russ Cohen, Palo Alto Downtown Business and Professional Association, indicated the business community should not bear the sole responsibility for resolving the parking problem, because it was not the sole cause. An RPP Program could be one tactic utilized to relieve the parking intrusion; however, it was best utilized as the last tactic.

Stephanie Munoz suggested the Council consider a free shuttle system with parking on the outskirts of Palo Alto. The Council should also consider a forprofit parking garage.

Sylvia Gutierrez could not utilize public transportation from her home to her job in Palo Alto. She often got off work during the nighttime and did not have coworkers to walk with her to her vehicle.

Elaine Uang supported an RPP approach to parking. The discussion should be holistic and include approaches of TDM and parking supply.

Charlene Gibson believed other options should be considered prior to consideration of an RPP Program to keep the focus on all Palo Alto constituents.

Galen Fletcher, Sundance Steakhouse, reported that a lack of parking would be detrimental to his business and employees. The City needed realistic alternatives for parking. No parking, no employees, no business, and no sales taxes.

Richard Brand indicated most cars parked in neighborhoods did not belong to hourly workers. He suggested retail and medical businesses work with their employees to form car pools as most vehicles were driven by one person. Safety issues applied to residents as well as employees. He supported an RPP Program and sharing neighborhood parking with employees.

Vanessa Avila, The Village Cobbler, felt there would be no parking for customers if employees occupied street spaces. A shuttle system to a parking lot in the Baylands area would require excessive travel time.

The Council took a break at 9:24 P.M. and returned at 9:36 P.M.

Ms. Gitelman explained parking restrictions in neighborhoods would apply during the daytime such that safety would not be a concern. The proposed RPP framework was not a fait accompli. Staff requested Council direction to prepare a draft Ordinance and to convene a group of stakeholders. Staff wanted to engage stakeholders in a discussion of prerequisites and a schedule of implementation.

James Keene, City Manager, appreciated the balanced discussion. Topics for Council discussion were multifaceted with advantages, disadvantages and consequences. Staff drafted a framework that allowed the Council to proceed. Delaying action on an RPP Program would delay action regarding TDM and Comprehensive Plan issues. Staff presented a simple method for the Council to consider issues that could inform the Ordinance. A draft Ordinance would provide a larger framework with a subsequent specific

Page 11 of 19 City Council Meeting Minutes: 01/27/2014 implementation process. A stakeholders group comprised of residents and businesses would be part of the conversation regarding specific details of an RPP Program in a specific District. Staff was flexible regarding analysis of proposed alternatives. He encouraged the Council to direct Staff to draft an Ordinance and to convene a stakeholder group.

Council Member Burt supported Staff's concept as it was comprehensive. Needed approaches to resolving parking problems were an RPP Program, increased parking supply and decreased parking demand. Staff would return with an Ordinance containing a process and criteria. A stakeholder group comprised of residents, businesses and property owners would develop a draft implementation strategy and timeline. Possibly the stakeholder group would inform the process and criteria. He requested Staff's vision regarding the specificity of the draft Ordinance and whether the draft Ordinance could be modified based on stakeholder group recommendations.

Ms. Gitelman recommended Staff draft an Ordinance concurrently with stakeholder group discussions. The Ordinance would create a framework and would enable the stakeholder group to discuss details. Stakeholder discussions could inform the Ordinance.

Council Member Burt stated it was important to anticipate unforeseen consequences. The stakeholder group would identify many, but not all, of those consequences. Once the Council adopted the Ordinance and Staff implemented it, the framework would not be perfect and would need modifications.

Mr. Keene concurred. Any framework would need to be adjusted after it was put into practice.

Council Member Burt understood there would be scenarios that no one could anticipate. An informal stakeholder group proposed early implementation measures. Many of those measures needed to be implemented prior to implementation of RPP Districts. The Council could consider two tiers of permits for those who parked in neighborhoods. He questioned whether the tiers should be based on price or form of work. He acknowledged that some workers would report to work during the day and not leave until after dark. With respect to RPP Programs in other cities, he inquired about the majority percentage required to opt into an RPP Program.

Ms. Sullivan reported the threshold varied from 51 percent to 66 percent to 75 percent.

Council Member Burt believed employers needed to be active participants in helping employees reduce their number of car trips. The City should provide tools and collaborations to assist employers with expanding parking programs.

Council Member Price felt the key element was stakeholder engagement which would determine next steps. She assumed implementation would involve performance measures. She expressed concern that Staff could expend a large amount of time and labor to ensure RPP Districts worked efficiently. RPP Programs in other cities cost the cities large amounts of money. Permit costs needed to be reasonable for lower-paid workers. The system had to be fair, balanced and effective.

Council Member Berman indicated the issue was complex. Staff and the Council received a great deal of public input. He asked about the timeframe between residents approaching the City and implementation of an RPP Program.

Ms. Gitelman stated that the process would most likely require nine to twelve months because the process was iterative. A one-year trial period would be in addition to that period.

Mr. Keene noted the first criterion was identification of the source of non-resident parking intrusion. Secondly, Staff would have to prioritize their support and evaluation of the formation of an RPP District. Priority would be given to those areas with the most crucial problems.

Council Member Berman inquired about the method for identifying the source of neighborhood intrusion.

Ms. Gitelman explained two possible methods. In collecting and analyzing data, Staff would attempt to elicit whether the intrusion was coming from residential or non-residential sources. The Downtown CAP Study was reviewing employee parking demand and could provide information for RPP Programs. The second method was an opt-out option. An RPP Program would provide different permits to residents and employees and thereby immediately quantify employee demand. The challenge for that method was slowly phasing out employee permits as TDM measures and parking supply measures were implemented.

Council Member Berman would support the opt-out method. The goal was to incentivize the purchase of permits. Employees should not incur the entire cost of permits. Business owners needed to participate in decreasing demand. Homeowners should not expect parking spaces in front of their homes. He encouraged Staff to streamline the process. When implementing an RPP Program, Staff should consider that any parking problem would

spread to surrounding areas. He inquired whether community outreach listed in Step Number 3 should be conducted prior to the community survey.

Ms. Sullivan reported community outreach conducted in Step Number 1 would be informal while formal outreach would be conducted in Step Number 3.

Council Member Berman asked if residents would vote between Step Numbers 1 and 3.

Ms. Sullivan noted the occupancy study and the follow-up survey would occur between Step Numbers 1 and 3.

Council Member Berman suggested robust community outreaches occur prior to a community vote in order to provide the most information for residents. He inquired about the reasons for having outreach to the business community in Step Numbers 1 and 3.

Ms. Sullivan explained that the intent of outreach in Step Number 1 was to make businesses or the source of intrusion aware of a potential RPP Program.

Council Member Berman asked if outreach would be conducted for each proposed District.

Ms. Sullivan reported outreach would be specific to each District and would be conducted for each proposed RPP District.

Council Member Berman felt outreach to a source of intrusion would be difficult in the Downtown area, because it had a more dispersed source of impact.

Ms. Gitelman agreed some areas would be challenging. Outreach was included in Step Number 1 because Staff wanted neighborhood advocates to consider how they would connect with employees and businesses that an RPP Program would affect. Staff could help convene conversations between the different interest groups.

Council Member Berman inquired whether it would be possible to issue a different number of permits for homes with driveways or garages.

Ms. Gitelman believed that could be considered. Such an option would have to be resolved in each District rather than in a Citywide Ordinance.

Council Member Berman asked if businesses would be eligible to buy permits for employees. Businesses could not purchase permits for employees at City parking garages.

Ms. Gitelman reported the number of business or employee permits would be a critical issue for each District and would be discussed in each District. Interested parties could also consider rules regarding distribution of permits.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, indicated the restrictions for parking garages built with tax-exempt municipal bonds did not apply to RPP Districts. Employer purchase of permits was within the Council's discretion.

Council Member Schmid believed the discussion was extremely helpful with a broad variety of the public expressing opinions. Staff provided a concrete proposal. The National Citizen Survey reported dramatic declines in the areas of traffic, land use and parking. Any solution to help one party would hurt other parties. If the Council wished to set priorities and establish costs, it needed to know the scale of the problem. The Council needed City data regarding parking deficit and intrusion. The primary element was base data.

Council Member Holman explained that workers were not intruders to neighborhoods. The term intrusion applied to vehicles. In the past, the P&TC led community outreach such that general outreach meetings were not held. That could allow for greater efficiency by not duplicating outreach meetings.

Mr. Keene requested clarification regarding P&TC outreach.

Council Member Holman explained that in discussing the Comprehensive Plan, broad community outreach meetings were held at P&TC meetings. Because of the large number of restaurants in Downtown, she suggested restaurant owners collaborate regarding employee parking. Costs of permits as stated in the Staff Report seemed high in comparison to the costs in other cities. The opt-out method could be more efficient and expedient. She inquired whether Staff felt dedicated employee parking spaces on each block would be feasible.

Ms. Sullivan reported other cities utilized designated employee parking spaces in such a manner. That method could be considered in the analysis of individual Districts. Some cities designated specific areas for employee parking. Those were viable options in certain Districts.

Council Member Holman felt the neighborhood support threshold should be 51-55 percent as many people did not respond to surveys. She inquired

whether Staff could utilize data prepared by neighborhoods in parking analyses.

Ms. Sullivan noted both residents and Staff had parking inventory data. Staff was compiling maps for parking inventory. Consultants prepared occupancy studies at varying times of day. Staff was working with residents regarding data.

Council Member Holman indicated the list of items on the Council Agenda was helpful, and suggested the list include points of action and calendar dates. The issue was carrying capacity, and the Council had to address that.

Council Member Klein inquired about a change in Palo Alto High School's student parking policy.

Mr. Keene did not have information about Palo Alto High School's parking policy. He would inquire with the Palo Alto Unified School District.

Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to: 1) direct Staff to draft an Ordinance that provides a process and criteria for establishment of individual Residential Parking Program (RPP) Districts based on input received this evening and disseminate the draft Ordinance for public review/comment prior to review by the Planning & Transportation Commission, 2) direct Staff to concurrently convene a Stakeholder Group of residents, businesses, and landowners/landlords to develop a draft implementation strategy and timeline for the first RPP District, 3) urge Staff to simplify the process outlined for neighborhoods starting from scratch to enact a trial process so it is no more than one year from the time start of the process, 4) direct Staff is to return with timetable by March 3, 2014, for various activities such as Stakeholder Group, Planning & Transportation Commission and the modified draft Ordinance, so that we can have a trial period begin by the first business day in January Staff is to work back from that date so Council could take action 2015. around November 15, 2014.

Ms. Stump reported Staff structured the item to be general in nature and deferred specific neighborhood issues where Council Members and key Staff might have conflicts. The Motion included recommendations with respect to specific neighborhoods. Specific neighborhoods could be deferred to Staff for consideration.

Council Member Klein expressed concerned that neighborhoods should not have to duplicate their work. He suggested that item be separated for Council vote.

Ms. Stump noted potentially four Council Members and several key Staff members had conflicts. Council Member Klein could accomplish his intent by deferring to Staff. Alternatively, Staff could bring the item back in a narrow way.

Council Member Scharff suggested the Planning Director make the initial decision regarding two neighborhoods.

Mr. Keene indicated Staff in general was a better description than Planning Director.

Council Member Klein suggested "Staff may exclude a neighborhood from the requirements of that section if the City Manager finds sufficient work has already been completed prior to the enactment of the Ordinance."

Ms. Gitelman felt the Stakeholder Group would work through such issues.

Council Member Klein requested the City Attorney's opinion regarding his suggested language.

Mr. Keene suggested "direct Staff to be flexible in the determination of meeting the threshold test when working thru the implementation phase with any initial District."

Council Member Klein accepted Mr. Keene's language.

Council Member Scharff concurred.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to** direct Staff to be flexible in the determination of meeting the threshold test when working thru the implementation phase with any initial District.

Council Member Klein noted the fifth item of the Motion was for Staff not feel constrained by the idea of the program being cost neutral.

Council Member Scharff wished to ensure that an RPP Program would proceed in a specific timeframe. The stakeholder group and Staff should provide a menu of parking options for businesses.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to direct Staff to develop a plan with Stakeholder Groups/owners to minimize disruption when the RPP is implemented.

Council Member Klein felt Staff should return with programs that would clearly state the RPP Program(s) would proceed in an expedited manner.

Page 17 of 19 City Council Meeting Minutes: 01/27/2014 He noted the Council had to balance distribution of parking spaces with demand and supply.

**RESTATED MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to: 1) direct Staff to draft an Ordinance that provides a process and criteria for establishment of individual Residential Parking Program (RPP) Districts based on input received this evening and disseminate the draft Ordinance for public review/comment prior to review by the Planning & Transportation Commission, 2) direct Staff to concurrently convene Stakeholder Group of residents, businesses, landowners/landlords to develop a draft implementation strategy and timeline for the first RPP District, 3) urge Staff to simplify the process outlined for neighborhoods starting from scratch to enact a trial process so it is no more than one year from the time start of the process, 4) direct Staff to return with timetable by March 3, 2014, for various activities such as Stakeholder Group, Planning & Transportation Commission and the modified draft Ordinance, so that we can have a trial period begin by the first business day in January 2015. Staff is to work back from that date so Council could take action around November 15, 2014, 5) Direct Staff to consider issuing an RFP to private landowners for potential leases of parking spaces on their properties, 6) direct Staff to be flexible in determination of neighborhood, meeting threshold when working through the implementation phase, and 7) direct Staff to not feel constrained with ensuring the program is cost neutral.

Ms. Gitelman expressed concern that the language would direct a facilitator to begin with a predetermined proposal.

Council Member Scharff explained that a second component included Staff providing a menu of options for businesses and employees. Staff would draft different menus, and the stakeholder group would determine which menus were appropriate.

Mr. Keene understood the intent of the language was to minimize disruption.

Council Member Scharff agreed the intent was to minimize, not eliminate, disruption.

Mr. Keene remarked that the scheduled timeframes took precedence over minimizing disruption. He inquired whether that was accurate.

Council Member Scharff believed a deadline had precedence.

Vice Mayor Kniss indicated the Motion was the Council's plan to fix the parking system.

Page 18 of 19 City Council Meeting Minutes: 01/27/2014 Mayor Shepherd did not believe the language regarding disruption was needed. Downtown was under parked, and parking had to flow into neighborhoods in order for people to get to work. She referenced potential legislation requiring businesses with more than 50 employees to have a TDM Program. She preferred 55 percent for the neighborhood support threshold.

Council Member Klein inquired about a date for Staff to return with a timetable.

Mr. Keene reported March 3, 2014.

Council Member Holman suggested a trial program begin no later than January 1, 2015. Typically Council direction was not so prescriptive.

Mr. Keene interpreted the language as no later than January 1, 2015.

Council Member Klein did not want merchants to work on modifications to a trial program between November 15, 2014 and January 1, 2015.

Council Member Holman inquired whether Staff would return earlier if the work could be completed earlier.

Mr. Keene believed work could be accomplished sooner.

#### **MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

Council Member Price noted the impact of construction workers parking in residential neighborhoods was not mentioned. In addition, she was concerned about the impact of this project on Staff's other projects.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 P.M.