

Regular Meeting
March 16, 2015

Special Orders of the Day88

1. Presentation of Proclamation to Exchange Students from Tsuchiura, Japan and Presentation of Matt Schlegel, Marathon Runner88

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions.....88

City Manager Comments89

Oral Communications89

Consent Calendar90

2. Approval of a Contract with SCS Field Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$139,060 for the First Year to Provide Landfill Gas and Leachate Control Systems Maintenance, Monitoring, and Reporting Services and to Exercise the Option of a Second and Third Year of the Contract.....90

3. Approval of a Site and Design Application by Peck Design on Behalf of Walnut Holding, LLC for a new 13,118 sf Single Family Home, detached garage, and pool; and Associated Site Improvements on a 10.39 Acre Parcel of Land in the Open Space (OS) Zone District located at 820 Los Trancos Road. Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration has Been Prepared90

4. Approval and Authorization for the City Manager to Execute Amendment One to Memorandum of Understanding with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to Increase Palo Alto’s Total Cost Obligation by \$500,000 Through FY 2016 for a Total Cost Obligation of \$1,235,915 to Fund Water Conservation Rebate and Incentive Programs and Adoption of a Related Budget Amendment Ordinance 5313 entitled “Budget Amendment Ordinance for the Council for the City of Palo Alto for Fiscal Year 2015 to Provide Appropriation in the Amount of \$400,000.”90

Action Items91

MINUTES

5.	Comprehensive Plan Update Status and Discussion of Existing Comprehensive Plan Themes and Structure	91
6.	Review of the Adobe Creek Pedestrian & Cyclist Bridge 2014 Design Competition Process and Outcome, and Authorization to Proceed with Contract Negotiations to Develop a Scope of Work and Cost for Basic Design Services Necessary to Complete Joint California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act Review for the Adobe Creek Pedestrian & Cyclist Bridge	99
7.	Colleagues' Memo From Mayor Holman, Council Members Burt, Schmid, and Wolbach Regarding Strengthening City Engagement with Neighborhoods.....	112
	Closed Session	112
8.	PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT	112
9.	CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS, CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.8	113
	Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 A.M.	113

MINUTES

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:07 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Kniss, Schmid, Wolbach arrived at 6:21 P.M.

Absent: Holman, Scharff

Special Orders of the Day

1. Presentation of Proclamation to Exchange Students from Tsuchiura, Japan and Presentation of Matt Schlegel, Marathon Runner.

Vice Mayor Schmid welcomed students from Tsuchiura to the meeting and to Palo Alto.

Matt Schlegel was honored to represent Palo Alto at the marathon in Tsuchiura, Japan. While in Tsuchiura, he would meet with City and school officials.

Jennifer Buenrostro, Neighbors Abroad, introduced students and their host families.

Etsuo Sato, Tsuchiura City, appreciated the City's welcome and hospitality. Neighbors Abroad sponsored the exchange program for 20 years and ensured its success. The people of Tsuchiura were touched by Palo Alto's concern and donations after the earthquake four years ago. Tsuchiura looked forward to developing understanding and exchanging ideas with Palo Alto.

Council Member Kniss noted a few of the activities planned for students during the week of their visit and said Palo Alto students would spend two weeks in Tsuchiura at the end of the school year.

Vice Mayor Schmid read the Proclamation into the record.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Vice Mayor Schmid reported Agenda Item Number 9 would be postponed.

James Keene, City Manager, advised that Staff did not yet determine a date for the item to return to the Council but said it could return in April 2015.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to continue Agenda Item 9 - CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY

MINUTES

NEGOTIATORS, CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.8 to a date unknown.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Holman, Scharff absent

City Manager Comments

James Keene, City Manager, announced Electric Utility Technicians discussed the danger of live electric wires with fourth graders at Fairmeadow Elementary School. The Utilities Department was going to send reminders and tips to the community about repairing water leaks as part of "Fix a Leak Week."

Council Member Kniss read the Proclamation thanking Ray Bacchetti, Human Relations Commission, Commissioner for his service to the City and the community.

Vice Mayor Schmid remarked that Mr. Bacchetti was an ideal citizen and brought a wealth of experience and knowledge to the City.

Council Member Berman served with Mr. Bacchetti on the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission, which was just one of the many services Mr. Bacchetti performed for the City. Mr. Bacchetti was an incredible role model.

Council Member Burt commented that Mr. Bacchetti was a tireless contributor to the community.

Dennis Burns, Police Chief, indicated the Proclamation well summarized and recognized Mr. Bacchetti's service. Mr. Bacchetti was a volunteer with the Police Department.

Oral Communications

William Conlon stated the alarming number of recent youth suicides demanded the attention of the Council and all citizens of Palo Alto. He was shocked to learn that a majority of students were sleep deprived and he suggested that sleep deprivation could be a common factor in the suicide epidemic. The Council needed to alert all parents of the vital importance of adequate sleep and to implement measures to assess the quantity and quality of sleep.

Eamonn Gormley, Transform, related the supply and demand theory of economics to roads and traffic congestion.

Jeff Hoel was registering for the Comprehensive Plan Summit when he decided to read the Terms of Service, Privacy Agreement, and Cookies

MINUTES

Agreement before completing his registration. Those documents were intimidating. He felt the public should not be required to agree to those documents in order to participate in City government. Perhaps the Policy and Services Committee could review that.

Stephanie Munoz thought it was wasteful to demolish the gymnasium at Palo Alto High School and suggested it be used for temporary housing of homeless women. The City needed to buy back Transfer of Development Rights.

Catherine Marteneau shared activities and entertainment held during Arbor Week and Arbor Day. The City was presented with a "check" for \$6.6 million, which represented the value of benefits provided by Palo Alto street trees annually.

Consent Calendar

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to approve Agenda Item Numbers 2-4.

2. Approval of a Contract with SCS Field Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$139,060 for the First Year to Provide Landfill Gas and Leachate Control Systems Maintenance, Monitoring, and Reporting Services and to Exercise the Option of a Second and Third Year of the Contract.
3. Approval of a Site and Design Application by Peck Design on Behalf of Walnut Holding, LLC for a new 13,118 sf Single Family Home, detached garage, and pool; and Associated Site Improvements on a 10.39 Acre Parcel of Land in the Open Space (OS) Zone District located at 820 Los Trancos Road. Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration has Been Prepared.
4. Approval and Authorization for the City Manager to Execute Amendment One to Memorandum of Understanding with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to Increase Palo Alto's Total Cost Obligation by \$500,000 Through FY 2016 for a Total Cost Obligation of \$1,235,915 to Fund Water Conservation Rebate and Incentive Programs and Adoption of a Related Budget Amendment Ordinance 5313 entitled "Budget Amendment Ordinance for the Council for the City of Palo Alto for Fiscal Year 2015 to Provide Appropriation in the Amount of \$400,000."

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Holman, Scharff absent

MINUTES

Action Items

5. Comprehensive Plan Update Status and Discussion of Existing Comprehensive Plan Themes and Structure.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, reviewed reasons for engaging in the Comprehensive Plan Update and said the Update began in 2008. In 2012, the Council identified a process to complete the Comprehensive Plan expeditiously. The latest schedule projected completion of the Comprehensive Plan Update in the first quarter of 2016. The Leadership Group was meeting biweekly to plan a Summit on May 30, 2015. Staff viewed the Summit as an opportunity to discuss big issues and to recruit residents for work sessions. Staff was working with consultants and the Leadership Group to define outreach activities concurrent with and after the Summit. After the Summit, Staff envisioned a series of Council and community work sessions. Council work sessions would focus on big issues and inform community work sessions. Community work sessions would focus on policy and program language for the Comprehensive Plan. The current Comprehensive Plan addressed many issues thoughtfully. Staff did not believe whole sections of the Comprehensive Plan needed significant revisions or updates. However, big issues needed to be addressed. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan Update could contain significant policy adjustments where needed, while retaining many valued concepts. She questioned whether themes in the current Comprehensive Plan should be retained, reordered or prioritized, or revised to address today's challenges.

Mila Zelkha wished to extend the timeline for the Comprehensive Plan Update in order to better understand issues. She encouraged the Council to include an economic analysis of all proposed options, including the sustainability plan and performance metrics.

Stephanie Munoz remarked that a plan allowed one to invest time, work, and money on building something over 10 to 20 years, although the Council did not share that belief because they constantly changed their plans.

Bob Moss advised that the median home price in February 2015 was greater than \$2.4 million. The median home price increased 32 percent between February 2014 and February 2015. The average home price was more than \$3.2 million. Based on the sale price of the Maybell site, raw land cost more than \$8 million an acre. Palo Alto suffered from a jobs/housing imbalance over the last 35 years.

Council Member Burt reviewed Staff's recommendation to the Council and remarked that this was the Council's opportunity to provide substantive feedback. He hoped the Council would have a dialog and said the State

MINUTES

mandated a Safety Element, which was included in the Natural and Urban Environment Element. He requested Staff provide the rationale for including the Safety Element in the Natural and Urban Environment Element.

Ms. Gitelman advised that the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) made that decision prior to her employment with the City. She could consult with Commissioners and report to the Council. She requested the Council provide feedback as to whether that was an effective way to organize the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Burt noted P&TC Commissioner Michael was present and requested he provide insights, if any.

Mark Michael, Planning and Transportation Commissioner, indicated the decision was made prior to his service on the P&TC. He understood the P&TC wished to streamline the structure. It was opportunistic to include the Safety Element rather than leaving it as a standalone Element.

Council Member Burt asked if Commissioner Michael was aware of the reasons for leaving the Concept Plans for East Meadow Circle and California Avenue as separate Elements.

Mr. Michael believed the P&TC did not consider editorially either Concept Plan as part of any of the other traditional elements.

Council Member Burt inquired if Staff knew the reasons for proposing the Concept Plans as standalone Elements.

Ms. Gitelman understood the Council directed the identification of those two geographic areas. She assumed the Council directed the Concept Plans be standalone Elements.

Council Member Burt recalled the Council directed Staff to prepare Concept Plans, but did not recall Council discussion regarding organization of the Draft Comprehensive Plan. He was unsure that was the correct way to organize the Comprehensive Plan. The Concept Plans were part of the Land Use and Community Design.

James Keene, City Manager, indicated attention to the Comprehensive Plan between 2008 and 2013 was focused almost exclusively on the two Concept Plans. Organization of the Comprehensive Plan was most likely determined by various people and the current Staff was not adhering to any particular focus. At this stage, the Council planned to advise Staff about structure, themes, and other components.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt felt themes should be contemporary. The Council directed the P&TC to make the Comprehensive Plan contemporary, more readable, and better organized. Some topics in the P&TC draft were a series of substantive questions and choices that were included in the Comprehensive Plan as recommended language. The Council needed to identify the substantive choices contained in the Draft and discuss them, as well as new issues because Council had not discussed or decided to incorporate those recommendations. Environmental and sustainability issues had to be updated to reflect current thinking. Transportation was a fundamental part of the vision for the future and those two examples pointed to the need for a reconsideration of themes.

Council Member DuBois inquired whether the Council would review the Comprehensive Plan Update through 2015 with a projected completion date some time in 2016.

Ms. Gitelman answered yes.

Council Member DuBois suggested the Council discuss whether that timeline was appropriate because he preferred quality over a deadline. Separating cleanup, deletions, and accomplished programs from substantial choices was useful. He requested Staff discuss citizen involvement following the Summit.

Ms. Gitelman was working with the Leadership Group regarding structure of the post-Summit work sessions. Staff was designing a process that allowed comparison of the existing Comprehensive Plan with the P&TC's draft in order to structure community discussion of policies and programs. Community sessions would focus on the details and language of the Comprehensive Plan, while accepting input from the Council regarding policy questions. Community work sessions were going to be scheduled with advance notice so that residents could choose which sessions to attend.

Council Member DuBois liked the idea of comparing the two versions of the Comprehensive Plan. He asked if work sessions would be organized around Elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Gitelman indicated some of the work sessions would likely be organized around Elements. She said because of the complexity of some Elements, they would need to be divided into topics.

Council Member DuBois suggested the Council discuss weighting and sequencing of goals for the Comprehensive Plan. A framework for evaluating themes and goals would be useful, possibly utilizing categories of core City services, additional services to improve the City, and policies that impacted things external to the City. He asked if Staff was aware of reasons

MINUTES

for changing the Natural Environment Element to the Natural and Urban Environment Element.

Ms. Gitelman suspected the name was changed in an effort to better communicate the topics considered in the Element.

Council Member DuBois felt Natural Environment should be separate from Urban Environment and Safety. He thought topics of preservation and open space could be separate from urban environment.

Ms. Gitelman advised that one of the ideas in the existing Comprehensive Plan was that the natural elements infiltrated the urban environment. The City may have preserved open spaces, but creeks within the urban environment had natural resource value.

Council Member DuBois believed pure urban topics could be segregated. He appreciated the public communication regarding comparisons to other cities and identification of agreed upon issues.

Council Member Kniss noted the Downtown Coordinated Area Plan (CAP) had been successful in limiting growth over a long period of time. The Council needed to share the same definitions of terms in discussing the Comprehensive Plan. The Council held extensive discussions and received extensive feedback regarding California Avenue. Healthy communities were based on safety and land use. She inquired whether healthy communities could be a part of the Natural and Urban Environment and Safety. Sometimes healthy communities were a standalone Element.

Ms. Gitelman commented that healthy communities could be woven through many, if not all Elements.

Council Member Kniss stated the purposes of the existing Comprehensive Plan were livability, walkability, and urbanization. The goal was to have more near transit and a better circulation plan. She asked if Staff had a sense of the Leadership Group's desires to hold more in-depth discussions over an extended period.

Ms. Gitelman clarified that the Leadership Group's role was to assist Staff with community outreach and community engagement. She thought members of the public would attend workshops after the Summit.

Council Member Kniss knew the Leadership Group worked hard and provided valuable input.

MINUTES

Council Member Filseth appreciated the concept of prioritizing themes into categories and commented that the Council's discussion could benefit significantly from a quantitative element. There was no universal definition of quality of life or growth. Objectivity and clear definitions of and relationships among terms would facilitate the discussion. In order to take a system perspective, a person had to understand the interaction among topics beyond a conceptual level. The Council needed to attempt to measure many of their goals for the Comprehensive Plan in order to determine consequences.

Council Member Berman wanted to understand why Safety was included with Natural and Urban Environment. He asked if classification of the two Concept Plans within the Comprehensive Plan was important.

Ms. Gitelman did not believe it would be important. No matter where they were located in the Comprehensive Plan, they were part of the Comprehensive Plan. Both Concept Plans had received a great deal of separate attention over the year.

Council Member Berman thought quantifying job and population growth had merit. The impacts of changes and addressing those impacts were important. It was important for business and housing to remain compatible; however, the Council was attempting to blend residential and commercial uses within specific areas of the City.

Council Member Wolbach suggested an ideal process would include expert lectures, community outreach, community building, and a policy advisory group. He asked Staff to share thoughts about the divergence of the processes for the existing Comprehensive Plan and the Draft Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Gitelman reported the City recognized the need to update the Comprehensive Plan in 2006 and a process began in 2008. Because of the elapsed time, Staff recommended the current process. The Council was certainly able to make changes or adjustments to the process.

Mr. Keene recalled in 2006, the Council directed Staff to focus on the two Concept Plans. The economy declined, this caused a shift in the focus away from the Comprehensive Plan. As the Draft Comprehensive Plan was going to be delivered to the Council, the economic turnaround arrived, bringing the pressures of growth. The Council was aware of the big choice issues; it was a mistake for the Council to attempt to align each component and issue. Rather, the Council needed to identify the high-level themes with more details, and then reconcile inconsistencies. More public input was able to

MINUTES

occur once the Council provided their vision for the future. He encouraged the Council to identify and discuss key issues sooner rather than later.

Council Member Wolbach believed the themes from the existing Comprehensive Plan were good. He thought the language regarding physical boundaries of residential and commercial areas should be changed to consider residential areas intruding on areas that were predominantly commercial. Perhaps the Council was able to consider allowing a mixed use building that focused more on housing rather than on jobs. Meeting housing supply challenges was an important and failing component of the existing Comprehensive Plan. He hoped that theme would be retained and prioritized. The Concept Plans were important, whether they were incorporated into Land Use or remained standalone Elements. A number of areas of the City needed to have a specialized focus. He liked the idea of incorporating the Sustainability/Climate Action Plan into the Comprehensive Plan and concurred with Council Member Filseth regarding the need for quantitative data.

Vice Mayor Schmid thought the highest priority was land use. The National Citizens Survey indicated land use was a deep concern for the citizens of Palo Alto.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member XX that the Summit sessions will explore the impacts of replacing Theme Number 6 - Meeting Residential and Commercial Needs, with the following:

1. the number of residents and the number of employees will grow at the same rate over time; and
2. the rate of growth of jobs and residents will remain at or below the average from 2001-2015.

Council Member DuBois inquired whether the number of jobs and residents had to remain the same, even though the ratio improved.

Vice Mayor Schmid was asking the Summit to review the impacts of having them grow at the same rate to be discussed at the Summit Meeting on May 30, 2015.

Mr. Keene explained that the Summit would launch a series of discussions. Post-Summit work sessions focused on growth management strategies, where this type of discussion would be appropriate.

Vice Mayor Schmid was suggesting these topics be presented at the Summit for discussion.

MINUTES

MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Council Member DuBois agreed a discussion of growth management needed to be part of the Summit and workshops. The Council was able to discuss the Comprehensive Plan through a Committee of the Whole, a Committee Meeting with all the Council Members present. Themes needed to be evaluated with a rubric of "core services," including "improvements to the City," and "external things." "Core services" included schools, traffic, safety, and neighborhoods. "Improving the City" meant changes to transportation, sustainability, retail diversity, and housing supply. "External things" comprised of the City's global reputation, attracting startups, and Palo Alto as a regional destination. The Council had to quantify issues and review relationships and dependencies among data. Each of the Comprehensive Plan themes was important. He ranked themes from highest to lowest as: 1) building community neighborhoods; 2) maintaining and enhancing community character; 3) meeting the housing supply challenge; 4) protecting and repairing natural features; 5) meeting residential and commercial needs; 6) reducing reliance on the automobile; and 7) providing responsive governance and regional leadership.

Council Member Filseth mentioned the amount of the City's failure to meet Comprehensive Plan goals and said that was due to the City not following the Comprehensive Plan or to the Comprehensive Plan not addressing issues. Perhaps the Comprehensive Plan was able to include methods to correct mistakes.

Council Member Burt felt the Council would have opportunities to quantify goals. The Council determined when that type of ranking and a comparative ranking were appropriate. The Council's discussions were to be informed by the Summit. He wanted to discuss considerations in order to provide a framework for Summit discussions. Current themes overlapped and did not fully reflect current issues. There needed to be a high correlation between Core Values and Comprehensive Plan themes. The Council would have to discuss interactions among themes. Zoning Ordinance changes would reflect changes in the Comprehensive Plan and would better implement the existing Comprehensive Plan. He encouraged Staff to allow the Leadership Group to play a role in the Comprehensive Plan process. A revised theme could have a different meaning and emphasis, even though it was not substantially different from the original theme. He wanted to understand the Council's role in the process.

Ms. Gitelman reported Staff proposed involving the Council primarily at major issue points. The Council's discussion of growth management strategies was to continue on March 23, 2015. Shortly thereafter, the

MINUTES

Council was going to discuss retail preservation. If the Council wished to schedule sessions to discuss frameworks and semantics, then Staff needed time to fit those into the Agenda schedule.

Council Member Wolbach questioned whether the Council's vision included Light Rail and said the Council should provide some direction as to whether they wanted to maintain the timeline for completion of the Comprehensive Plan. He inquired whether the current timeline projected completion of the Comprehensive Plan in the first quarter of 2016.

Ms. Gitelman replied yes.

Council Member Wolbach asked if the Council wished to provide guidance to Staff regarding the calendar, themes, or the process for engaging the public and/or the Leadership Group at this time.

Mr. Keene thought the Council should not offer Motions because they did not complete the discussion. Schedules for the Summit and post-Summit periods were set. The Council seemed to be considering an elongated schedule for the Comprehensive Plan Update process. That was not as important as identifying additional Council sessions prior to the Summit on May 30, 2015 because prior to the Summit, the Council and the public needed a sense of the Council's vision. The Council was able to direct Staff to return with suggestions for other engagements with the Council regarding concepts raised in the current discussion.

MOTION: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to have a deeper discussion on the Comprehensive Plan on the overarching goals and vision statement for each element before the Summit and the Comprehensive Plan process.

Ms. Gitelman explained a discussion of an Interim Ordinance regarding retail preservation Citywide would return to the Council after a discussion of growth management strategies. She requested clarification as to whether the Motion requested Staff schedule another discussion.

Council Member DuBois did not wish to prescribe a timeframe in the Motion but a discussion prior to the Summit was helpful.

Council Member Filseth asked if the California Avenue item remained on the Agenda.

Ms. Gitelman explained that the Council would discuss retail preservation Citywide. California Avenue was going to be the first area for specific review, following the Citywide discussion.

MINUTES

Council Member Filseth believed a discussion of the California Avenue area was a higher priority.

Council Member Wolbach suggested the follow-up discussion be more specific and provide more detailed guidance to Staff, with respect to process items.

Council Member DuBois did not wish to set a schedule prior to the Summit.

Council Member Burt added that the process would include any guidance on the role of the Leadership Group.

Council Member Wolbach inquired if Staff would offer suggestions for the process in their subsequent Staff Report.

Ms. Gitelman reported Staff had not yet determined the structure for post-Summit community work sessions. If the Council intended to weigh in prior to the Summit on organization of those discussions, that was welcome. Staff wished to clearly articulate at the Summit what the community was registering.

Council Member Wolbach suggested Council Members consider details about process so the subsequent discussion would be more productive.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Holman, Scharff absent

Council took a break from 8:45-8:51 P.M.

6. Review of the Adobe Creek Pedestrian & Cyclist Bridge 2014 Design Competition Process and Outcome, and Authorization to Proceed with Contract Negotiations to Develop a Scope of Work and Cost for Basic Design Services Necessary to Complete Joint California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act Review for the Adobe Creek Pedestrian & Cyclist Bridge.

Vice Mayor Schmid inquired whether Staff proposed the Council do more than review the two projects.

Mike Sartor, Public Works Director, recommended the Council direct Staff to proceed with negotiations for concept design and environmental review with the winner of the competition. The Council was able to direct Staff to negotiate with one of the other two teams or release a Request for Proposal (RFP) as an alternative solution.

MINUTES

Brad Eggleston, Assistant Director of Public Works, outlined the process for the discussion. Teams would provide a 15-minute presentation and show a video of their designs.

Vice Mayor Schmid asked if the 15-minute presentation would include the video.

Mr. Eggleston answered no. Teams presented their original submissions and noted any changes they proposed to the design. The bridge was located just downstream from the union of Barron and Adobe Creeks. The undercrossing was closed six months of the year due to wet weather and the Adobe Creek Bridge Project became the top priority in the 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. The City secured \$8.3 million in grant funding for the Project and \$1.7 million through the City's Infrastructure Funding Plan.

Margie O'Driscoll, Design Competition Advisor, explained that a design competition was utilized in order to achieve architectural innovation and great design. Sixty international firms were invited to participate, 20 of whom were selected to submit designs. A jury selected three designs from 20 submissions. She reviewed design criteria and jury members' qualifications. Videos of the submissions were placed on YouTube and boards were located in the library. A Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) provided feedback for a final jury hearing by advising that HNTB Corporation's design most met all the criteria. The jury, along with four Architectural Review Board (ARB) Members reviewed comments from TAP and the three design submissions. The jury unanimously voted for the HNTB Corporation team.

Mr. Eggleston advised that Staff presented the three design submissions to five City Boards and Commissions for comment. Staff's recommendation was based on the jury's decision, discussions about cost and constructability, and feedback from Boards and Commissions. Staff acknowledged concerns around bird safety and was committed to a design process that coordinated with bird safety advocates. Staff requested direction to negotiate design work needed for the environmental review process and would return to the Council for approval of a contract to a certain percentage of design. The contract was not going to provide a complete design or construction. He read design guidelines regarding height of the bridge and Staff interpreted the guidelines as not establishing a maximum height for a bridge over Highway 101. All three submissions met the guidelines.

Vice Mayor Schmid requested Staff refer to each team using a single name so that everyone could refer to teams consistently. He inquired about the preferred name for the first team.

MINUTES

Mr. Eggleston answered the Moffatt and Nichol Team and the HNTB Team.

Gary Antonucci, Moffatt and Nichol, was honored to participate in the competition and to receive high marks from TAP.

Steven Grover, Moffatt and Nichol Architect, designed a beautiful, graceful, and unique suspension bridge that supported itself during construction. The bridge did not utilize cables. A single tension member provided vertical support of the main span and torsional support of the side spans. The bridge offered a visual presence that was timeless and elegant. He changed the design subsequent to the competition to refine the fencing design so it was more consistent with the overall architectural vocabulary. The design was dramatic yet context appropriate. If cost was the only criteria, then a standard box bridge would suffice. However, a standard concrete bridge did not meet the visual design goals, it impacted the Baylands more than other alternatives, and it reduced safety. His design achieved visual, environmental, and geometric goals, while retaining many cost benefits of a conventional girder bridge. While the structural system was innovative, construction methods and materials were tried and true. Design standards called for large radius curves with clear, open sightlines as provided in the design. He proposed a pathway configuration that had become a design reference. A mixing zone at the base of ramps reduced the chance of conflicts at intersections. The design did not utilize cables because they presented a hazard to birds but it followed all visual impact guidelines for the Baylands and the project. The bridge did not utilize structural supports in the wetland area. The lighting scheme lit only the traveled way and avoided upward light pollution as well as spillover to the sensitive habitat.

Tony Sanchez, Moffatt and Nichol, reported the bridge spanned 235 feet over the freeway and frontage roads. The main load carrying member was a steel box girder. This was a simple and cost effective bridge. The steel box girder on both sides of the deck connected with floor beams, which were covered by a concrete deck. The stiff deck was designed to take 100 percent of the dead load. The bridge had the capability to be erected with a partial freeway closure. Engineering and analysis indicated the bridge was well within Code limits. Jiri Strasky analyzed and tested bridge concepts.

Mr. Antonucci stated the concept met any possible interpretation of design guidelines and was vetted and endorsed by world-class bridge engineers. He would be very excited to deliver such a bridge.

Wil Carson, HNTB Corporation, indicated the defining opportunity for the project was innovation. The bridge design had the potential to create a new paradigm for what infrastructure could do. The bridge was versatile,

MINUTES

interconnected, provided for conservation, and was innovative in many ways. The bridge was designed to be as light and transparent as possible. Structural members and the bridge deck were only 18 inches deep; the bridge reached 18 feet in height over the Baylands. Over Highway 101, the arch and cable net created a cathedral-like space that gestured skyward. The bridge deck was curved and reflected the graceful contours of the Baylands. The design avoided structure in the medians, tower supports in the Baylands, and did not conflict with a gas main. Steel arches were one of the most cost-effective structure types. The bridge was visually and physically light. The bridge was to be driven into place, which resulted in closure of the freeway for only one night. Shortcut stairs were located at either side of the freeway, which allowed for direct access. The lighting design balanced pedestrian safety while minimizing environmental impacts.

Marcel Wilson, HNTB Corporation, reported the bridge would be transformative, increase public health, and increase enjoyment of the Baylands. Amenities included a tire station, water fountain, bike storage, a restroom, and seating. The area was to serve as a departure point for an outing in the Baylands, or as a destination in and of itself. The vernal pool, boardwalk, and restroom were located on a lower level and the design and elements could adapt to sea level rise.

Ned Kahn, HNTB Corporation, designed a thin metal element to make the wind visible.

Mr. Carson advised that the team met with local environmental groups regarding bird safety. Research demonstrated that bird diverters were effective. Subsequent to the design competition, the height of the bridge was reduced 20-25 feet and an on-grade ramp was added to the north side.

Judith Wasserman, Jury Chair, was surprised to receive submissions for the competition after she read the stringent design guidelines. Juror Burrows was familiar with many team members and their work. The three teams were chosen based on their qualifications and experience rather than a design. The TAP reviewed only written and graphic materials. She was astounded by the quality and beauty of the three designs. Four of the five jurors favored the HNTB team; she noted that the public presentations were unusual. Both designs were wheelchair accessible but the design and build process was not complete until the ribbon cutting ceremony was held. She encouraged the Council to follow the direction of the jury.

Keith Wandry was appalled by the cost of the proposed bridge and suggested a simple bridge at a lower cost because it could free up funds for

MINUTES

programs to prevent youth suicide. Metal disks reflected the sun into commuters' eyes.

Jeff Hosea, Sera Architects representing Google, read a letter from Google and mentioned the bridge would benefit the entire region. Google was willing to work with the City in granting an easement for the project to cross its property. Google preferred the design of the Moffatt and Nichol team.

Kirk Gharda, Sierra Club, preferred the design of the Moffatt and Nichol team because the bridge design should focus on enabling access to nature and improving the Baylands.

Alice Mansell indicated that the environmental review would be difficult and said the bird diverters would be hazardous for drivers. She requested the Council select the Moffatt and Nichol design.

Emily Renzel supported the Moffatt and Nichol design as it fit into the low-key profile of the Baylands and Palo Alto. The glint of bird diverters distracted drivers, as would birds falling into traffic after having struck bridge cables. This area of Highway 101 was a high accident area.

Roy Snyder indicated a simple, expeditiously built, and cost-effective overcrossing was needed. Bridge amenities were superfluous. The City did not need to build a star-spangled, arched bridge. The suspension arch concept detracted from the ambience and serenity of the natural beauty of the Baylands.

Carl Jones was looking forward to a bridge over Highway 101. Both designs were gorgeous. He did not favor motion-based lighting and said he favored a northbound access to the bridge.

Shelby Sinkler, Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, supported the Moffatt and Nichol submission because it embraced all design criteria and guidelines and did not attempt to mitigate bird safety. She reviewed correspondence from the public and stated that 83 letters opposed Submission A, HNTB and 76 letters supported Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol.

Claire Elliott was excited by the prospect of a year-round overpass and by Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol. She was concerned about bird safety with respect to Submission A, HNTB. Migrating birds traveled through Palo Alto.

Michael Heaney noted the Moffatt and Nichol design segregated pedestrians from cyclists with only a painted line. The HNTB design utilized a barrier. That barrier would prevent collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.

MINUTES

Shira Shaham stated the Moffatt and Nichol design met the requirement for harmonious coexistence with wildlife. The HNTB design seemed to be the better design from the user's perspective; however, the suspension structure was harmful.

Joann Edwards encouraged the Council to honor the jury process by selecting the Moffatt and Nichol design. The HNTB design offered grace and function over a lackluster freeway.

Mike Ferreira, Sierra Club, supported Submission C by the Moffatt and Nichol team. He thought Submission A, HNTB should be moved away from migration corridors.

Shani Kleinhaus, Audubon Society, explained that bird diverters were developed for use with power lines. She noted that birds would be injured by the lattice of cables in Submission A, HNTB.

Jim Foley concurred with Staff's and the jury's recommendation of the HNTB design.

Heidi Trilling felt the jury process was skewed in that the jury's selection was not final. The jury process was as important as the bridge design.

Gila Dev, Sierra Club, was excited by the prospect of a bicycle bridge. Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol was the better choice.

Beverly Benson supported the Moffatt and Nichol design.

Kirsten Daehler relayed that she was a mother and science teacher and she agreed with the selection of the HNTB design. She commended the Council for using the jury process.

Deidre Crommie, speaking as an individual, stated access to the Baylands was important. She supported the Moffatt and Nichol design and said the bridge should not be a destination but should be integrated with the Baylands.

Penny Ellson, speaking as an individual, thanked both teams for providing beautiful designs. She expressed concern about the possible danger to birds posed by bridge designs and asked the Council to make the research available to the public.

Eileen McLaughlin, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge, supported building a bike bridge. She expressed concern about the lack of environmental review in the design process.

MINUTES

James Keene, City Manager, requested Agenda Item Number 7 be continued to a date uncertain.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to continue Agenda Item Number 7 - Colleagues' Memo From Mayor Holman, Council Members Burt, Schmid, and Wolbach Regarding Strengthening City Engagement with Neighborhoods, to a date uncertain.

MOTION PASSED: 6-1 Wolbach no, Holman, Scharff absent

Mr. Sartor advised that Ms. Wasserman provided good points regarding the jury process. He supported Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Keene indicated the Council may need additional information prior to making a selection of a design.

Council Member Burt reported the Council received additional information regarding risks and benefits of Submission A, HNTB with respect to birds. Submission A, HNTB appeared to have inherently higher risks to birds than Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol. He asked how that information was considered in the review process.

Mr. Eggleston advised that wildlife safety was a design guideline for the competition. He did not recall specific discussion of threats to birds.

Council Member Burt questioned the jury's choice of a design with a higher risk to bird safety, which was contrary to design guidelines.

Mr. Eggleston stated the jury discussed the diverter disks as a mitigating factor for bird safety. Members of the public did not raise concerns for bird safety during the competition.

Council Member Burt inquired about a method to obtain an independent assessment of risks to bird safety.

Mr. Eggleston remarked that the HNTB team and the Audubon Society had provided names of experts who supported both positions.

Council Member Burt recalled Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol did not have a separation made for cyclists and pedestrians. He asked if anyone questioned Moffatt and Nichol as to whether a separation was feasible for their design.

Mr. Eggleston understood Moffatt and Nichol explained during the competition that their submission provided a small, two to three inch vertical separation for cyclists and pedestrians.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt requested the Moffatt and Nichol team respond to his question.

Mr. Grover explained that the design included a vertical separation; the same mode separation utilized in the Homer Avenue underpass and the Berkeley Bike Bridge. The mode separation was proven to be successful.

Council Member Burt asked if Mr. Grover meant a full separation was not safer for cyclists and pedestrians.

Mr. Grover explained that a stopped rider in a segregated path blocked traffic behind him.

Council Member Burt repeated his question.

Mr. Grover felt creating a barrier between the separation was a possible hazard.

Council Member Burt noted safety and hazard elements relating to a full separation, and asked if there was a net effect from those elements.

Mr. Grover advised that best practices indicated a wider path integrating mode separation, striping, and signage.

Council Member Burt requested the width of the two designs.

Elizabeth Ames, Project Manager, reported both designs could offer an 18 foot wide facility and said the HNTB clearly provided an 18 foot design. She requested the Moffatt and Nichol team verify the width of their design.

Mr. Grover indicated his design provided a six foot sidewalk and two bike lines, five feet wide each, along with shy distance. The total width was approximately 18 feet.

Council Member Burt requested clarification of the width of the design.

Mr. Grover explained that shy distance was the additional distance next to a barrier. The two lanes, sidewalk, and shy distance totaled 18 feet.

Mr. Carson clarified that the width along the mode separation totaled 19 feet. Both curves were wider by nine feet along the inner radius and 12 feet along the outer radius. Over the freeway, the width was 22 feet.

Council Member Burt inquired about validation of costs, and mechanisms that ensured a cost overrun did not occur.

MINUTES

Mr. Eggleston reported the design phase was preliminary and costs could not be fully determined. The \$8 million construction cost was included in the competition. Teams submitted estimates of construction costs. The TAP advised that elements of the designs would not dramatically increase costs.

Council Member Burt asked what would happen if the selected design exceeded \$8 million in costs.

Mr. Sartor relayed that the contract could include a requirement for the designer to remain within the budget. Cost estimates were to be performed at various stages of design. If cost estimates exceeded the budget, the designer was required to alter the design or to perform "value engineering," a method used to improve the value of goods or services by using an examination of function, to bring costs within budget.

Council Member Burt inquired about the consequences if the design had to be altered to remain within budget and those alterations affected aspects favored by the City.

Mr. Keene was asking about the ability to change designs in a value engineering situation.

Mr. Eggleston believed the next design phase, which included environmental review, would provide better cost estimates. The cost for the next design phase would be a couple hundred thousand dollars.

Council Member Burt understood the City could have more confidence in cost estimates at the next design phase. Should cost estimates exceed budget in the next phase, the risk to the City was a couple hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. Eggleston concurred.

Council Member Burt asked if Staff agreed that Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol could have fewer problems obtaining Caltrans' approval, along with the environmental approvals.

Mr. Eggleston reported Caltrans did not typically review these design ideas and they were not keen on the City utilizing a design competition. Comments regarding Caltrans review came from the TAP meeting.

Council Member Burt inquired whether Staff could provide additional information regarding the design least likely to have problems with the environmental and Caltrans reviews.

Mr. Eggleston responded yes.

MINUTES

Council Member Wolbach questioned whether the competition provided options that would not have been provided through a Request for Proposal (RFP) and remarked that the Council should not simply defer to the jury's selection. The competition was primarily an architectural contest. Design, construction, and lifetime costs should be inexpensive. He asked if mosquitoes were a consideration in designing the vernal pool of Submission A, HNTB.

Mr. Eggleston believed the water was static.

Mr. Wilson advised that water in the vernal pool would act like water in the Baylands. The vernal pool was a facility that treated storm water.

Council Member Wolbach inquired about lifetime costs and including those in a contract.

Mr. Eggleston offered to provide that information at a later time. Neither design was expected to have significant costs, and both were expected to have long life spans.

Council Member Wolbach asked if construction times were comparable for the designs.

Mr. Eggleston thought they would be the same.

Council Member Wolbach asked if a contract could provide penalties for construction delays and overruns.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported public agencies could incentivize prompt building in the construction phase. In the current phase, teams were concerned with constructability.

Council Member Wolbach inquired whether the Moffat and Nichol design addressed the PG&E easement.

Mr. Eggleston was not aware of a conflict between Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol and the easement, as Moffatt and Nichol had utilized the alignment provided with the design guidelines.

Ms. Ames advised that a 20-foot easement and a 36-inch gas main were located near the column proposed by Moffatt and Nichol. No structure should be placed in the easement.

Mr. Sanchez reported that the column was located a sufficient distance from the easement. If the City proceeded with the Moffatt and Nichol design, they were to verify there was no conflict with the easement.

MINUTES

Council Member Wolbach asked if improving bike and pedestrian safety on the San Antonio overpass was considered as a viable and less expensive alternative.

Mr. Eggleston understood that was not considered in the Feasibility Study.

Mr. Keene did not recall any discussion over the past four or five years in that regard.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether public comment would be allowed at a subsequent meeting, should the Council direct Staff to return with additional information.

Ms. Stump answered yes.

Council Member Kniss expressed concern that Mayor Holman could not be present when she was responsible for the competition. She requested Staff comment on whether this item could be continued to allow Mayor Holman to participate.

Mr. Keene was not able to contemplate a subsequent meeting without taking public comment and Staff providing additional information.

Council Member Kniss asked if Submission A, HNTB provided divided lanes for cyclists and pedestrians.

Mr. Eggleston replied yes.

Council Member Kniss heard the design team state both designs were safe, yet she was not convinced of that. She preferred a barrier between the lanes.

Mr. Eggleston indicated the barrier was discussed during the competition, and Boards and Commissions supported the vertical separation.

Council Member Kniss did not wish to delay the project further but said she was concerned about safety. She thought either design would be spectacular.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member XX to direct Staff to proceed with contract negotiations with HNTB Corporation, the party voted the winner by the design competition jury of the Adobe Creek Pedestrian & Cyclist Bridge 2014 Design Competition. Contract negotiations will develop a scope of work and cost of the basic design services necessary to complete joint California Environmental Quality

MINUTES

Act/National Environmental Policy act review for the Adobe Creek Pedestrian & Cyclist Bridge.

MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Council Member Berman inquired about the meaning of "very successful" in relation to a design and about the safety of the Berkeley Bike Bridge.

Mr. Grover was not aware of any accidents on the Berkeley Bike Bridge. The lanes in the design were separate. The sidewalks on the bridge were separated from the pathway by a 2 ½ inch sloped curb. The curb was sloped to provide some safety to a cyclist who lost control of his bike.

Mr. Keene advised he was City Manager of Berkeley when the bike bridge design was chosen. He did not encounter any issues with the design of the Berkeley Bridge while using the bridge. A lane separation was an advantage for multigenerational users of the Palo Alto Bike Bridge.

Council Member Berman asked if the safety concern was a fatal flaw for the Moffatt and Nichol design.

Ms. Wasserman reported constructability and aesthetics rather than safety concerns pushed the jury toward selecting HNTB's design.

Council Member Berman asked if the bird diverters created noise.

Mr. Kahn relayed that the disks would make a subtle sound in extreme wind, but it would not be audible over traffic noise.

Council Member Berman asked if 100 disks would make sufficient noise to be audible.

Mr. Kahn could design the disks to be silent if noise was an issue.

Council Member Berman asked if car lights would reflect off the disks.

Mr. Kahn noted that it was possible to adjust the surface reflectivity of disks from shiny to matte. He had 60 installations of disks across the world, and disks had not caused any auto accidents. Disks reflected only a tiny fraction of light.

Mr. Carson asked if Council Member Berman meant to question whether the disks would be visible at night.

Council Member Berman wanted to understand whether car lights would reflect off disks.

MINUTES

Mr. Carson asked if Council Member Berman understood the function of the UV element.

Council Member Berman responded no.

Mr. Carson explained that bird diverters contained an element that absorbed light during the day and emitted it at night. Night birds were able to utilize that light to image the disks.

Council Member Berman recalled comments that the HNTB design would have northbound access on the west side of the highway. He asked if that also applied to the Moffatt and Nichol design.

Mr. Grover answered yes. Google favored stairs at that access location. He offered to include a bike rail, as a member of the public suggested.

Council Member Berman asked if Staff made it clear that the Council would have final approval of the design.

Mr. Eggleston responded yes.

Council Member Berman asked if Staff made it clear that the Council did not have to accept the jury's selection.

Mr. Eggleston answered yes.

Council Member Berman did not believe the Council should concede approval of a design or construction project to any entity. Both designs were well executed and appropriate. The lower profile of the Moffatt and Nichol design was appropriate for the Baylands environment.

MOTION: Council Member Berman moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to proceed with contract negotiations with Moffatt and Nichol Design Group.

Council Member Filseth concurred with Council Member Berman's comments. Both designs were beautiful bridges. In the long run, Palo Alto residents were happier with the Moffatt and Nichol design. He thought in 20 or 30 years, the absence of architecture in the Baylands would be striking.

Council Member DuBois favored emphasizing the Baylands over the bridge.

Council Member Burt agreed Submission C, Moffatt and Nichol was context appropriate for the Baylands; both designs were exceptional. He preferred to have information about bird safety before selecting a design though.

MINUTES

Vice Mayor Schmid agreed bird safety was an issue. The arch design was a distraction from the openness of the Baylands.

Mr. Keene wanted to perform additional research regarding costs before spending a couple hundred thousand dollars for additional design. The Moffatt and Nichol design had not been implemented previously. Managing costs was always a concern for the City.

Council Member Berman agreed with Staff performing due diligence.

Vice Mayor Schmid asked if Council Member Berman wished to include a timeframe for Staff to return with information.

Mr. Keene advised that Staff could provide that information along with the contract.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Holman, Scharff absent

Council Member Burt reported the design competition provided two exceptional designs. The Council selected a context appropriate design over an exceptional architectural design. The process worked well.

7. ~~Colleagues' Memo From Mayor Holman, Council Members Burt, Schmid, and Wolbach Regarding Strengthening City Engagement with Neighborhoods.~~

Closed Session

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Wolbach to go into Closed Session.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0 Holman, Scharff absent

The Council went into the closed session at 11:32 P.M.

8. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT
Title: City Clerk
Authority: Government Code Section 54957 (b)
9. ~~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~~

MINUTES

~~Under Negotiation: Purchase: Price and Terms of Payment~~

The Council reconvened from the Closed Session at 12:29 A.M.

Vice Mayor Schmid advised no reportable action.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 A.M.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

City Clerk

Mayor

NOTE: Sense minutes (synopsis) are prepared in accordance with Palo Alto Municipal Code Sections 2.04.180(a) and (b). The City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are made solely for the purpose of facilitating the preparation of the minutes of the meetings. City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are recycled 90 days from the date of the meeting. The tapes are available for members of the public to listen to during regular office hours.