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FOOTHILLS PARK ACCESS
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August 3, 2020
BRIEF HISTORY OF FOOTHILLS PARK

- 1,400-acres in the Palo Alto foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains
- Acquired by the City from the Lee family in the late 1950s for $1.3 million
- Park opened to Palo Alto residents in 1965
CURRENT FOOTHILLS PARK USAGE RESTRICTIONS

• PAMC 22.04.150(a) limits access to Foothills Park to Palo Alto residents and their accompanied guests
• Since 2005, non-resident hikers welcomed to enter via the Bay to Ridge Trail
• Unlawfully entering FHP is a misdemeanor
• No misdemeanor citation has been issued in at least the last 20 years
• Only one administrative citation has been issued (like a parking ticket)
CURRENT PARK USAGE RESTRICTIONS

- PAMC 22.04.150(k) caps visitors at 1,000 at any time:
  - In 1965, the cap was 2,000
  - In 1976, it was changed to 1,600
  - In the late 90s, it changed to 1,000
  - The 1,000-person cap roughly corresponds to parking capacity
  - Cap has not been reached in past 20 years
VISITATION TRENDS

• In past 20 years, visitation steady at ~152,000 persons visiting each year
• Approximately 292,000 visitors in 1969
• Peaked at ~372,000 visitors in the early 1970s
• Declined in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s and 1990s
• Entry fee was charged in the 1980s and 1990s to help recover costs of Boronda Lake dam repairs
• Fee removed in 2001
• Visitation bottomed out in 1998 at ~29,000 visitors
VISITATION TRENDLINE

Average Visitation 2002-2019: 152,450
VISITATION DATA

• Busiest days are holidays:
  ▪ New Year’s, Mother’s and Father’s Day
  ▪ Memorial Day, Thanksgiving, 4th of July
• Busiest months are late spring and early summer (May to July)
• Least busy months are late fall through winter (November to February)
• 5-year average of ~3,100 non-resident vehicles turned away (2015-19)
• Increase in visitation as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic
  ▪ Approximately 137% increase on weekends compared to 2019
  ▪ Approximately 8% decrease on weekdays compared to 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekends</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorial Day Weekend</strong></td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2(^{nd}) Weekend</strong></td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>after Memorial Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3(^{rd}) Weekend</strong></td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4(^{th}) Weekend</strong></td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5(^{th}) Weekend</strong></td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6(^{th}) Weekend</strong></td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7(^{th}) Weekend</strong></td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8(^{th}) Weekend</strong></td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td>24,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>10,789</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>7,593</td>
<td>18,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION PROCESS AND OUTREACH

• **Fall, 2018:** Parks & Rec Commission’s Foothills Park ad hoc committee

• **2019:** PRC public meetings on
  - July 23, 2019 Foothills Park Access Discussion
  - Sept. 24, 2019 Pilot Program Discussion
  - Nov. 12, 2019 Foothills Park Access Pilot Program Recommendation
PRC PILOT PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION

November 2019, PRC vote 6-1 to recommend pilot program to City Council

• One-year pilot to test concepts of:
  □ (1) a limited and adjustable number of Park vehicle passes for non-residents via online reservation system
  □ (2) broader availability for student fieldtrips

• Max cap of 50 passes per day (adjusted based on historic data)
• $6 fee for non-resident passes
PILOT PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION

• School Field Trip Program with reservation process

• No change in current 1000 person per day ordinance

• Prioritize resident access – no changes to current access policy

• At end of pilot, staff, PRC review Park visitation and impact data and recommend how to move forward
FACTORS SUPPORTING PILOT PROGRAM

- Effectively mitigates concern about overcrowding/overuse
- Incorporates focus for students and volunteers
- Allows adaptation based on data collection during pilot
- Fees expected to generate modest revenue
THE WORLD LOOKS MUCH DIFFERENT THAN IT DID A FEW MONTHS AGO

• COVID-19 limitations and changes in recreational patterns
• Unprecedented financial crisis
• City Council unanimously supports Black Lives Matter proclamation (Jun. 8)
• Civic and faith leaders calling for repeal of ”residents-only” ordinance
• Human Relations Commission unanimously passed recommendation to repeal “residents-only” ordinance (Jun. 11)
FOOTHILLS PARK ACCESS PANEL DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

• Panel experts provided deeper understanding of complex issues
• Increased visitation impacts wildlife, habitat, trails & visitor experience
• Impacts manageable with consistent monitoring, mitigation, adjustment
• Staff & park management affected by pilot program & visitation increase
• Access benefits physical & emotional well-being and natural environment
• Stewardship focus – preserve special community resource today & tomorrow
PANELISTS

• **Professor Nicole Ardoin** – Director, Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources, Stanford University EEES

• **Lester Hendrie** – Former Foothills Park Supervising Ranger

• **Taylor Peterson** – Director of Biological Analysis, MIG

• **Roger Smith** – Co-Founder & Director, Friends of Palo Alto Parks

• **Alex Von Feldt** – Executive Director, Grassroots Ecology
FOOTHILLS PARK ACCESS PANEL DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

- Panel experts provided deeper understanding of complex issues
- Increased visitation impacts wildlife, habitat, trails & visitor experience
- Impacts manageable with consistent monitoring, mitigation, adjustment
- Staff & park management affected by pilot program & visitation increase
- Access benefits physical & emotional well-being and natural environment
- Stewardship focus – preserve special community resource today & tomorrow
PANEL DISCUSSION OVERVIEW

• Goals
  ▪ Deeper understanding & appreciation of varied perspectives & complexities
  ▪ New expert information on potential impacts and park management issues

• Format
  ▪ Congenial panel conversation, facts & expert opinion, moderated by Chair
  ▪ Questions selected in by Chair, Vice-Chair, and CSD Staff
  ▪ Opportunity for each panelist to respond to all questions

• Questions & Comments from Commissioners, Liaison, & City Manager

• Staff Presentation (Daren Anderson)

• Public comments (7), emails to Commission (14)
IMPACTS OF INCREASED VISITATION

• Wildlife
• Vegetation / Habitat
• Trails
• Visitor Experience
• Varies by amount of human use & type of activity
• Different for high-use vs. more remote, natural areas
IMPACT MONITORING, MITIGATION, COMMITMENT

• Baseline data for vegetation, wildlife, and trails
• Multi-year monitoring & analysis of impacts
• Adaptive management to quickly address issues
• Implement changes carefully for proper assessment
• Install physical mitigations
• Commit to mitigation plan funding – “do it right”
PARK MANAGEMENT CONCERNS / FEEDBACK

• Critical importance of staff well-being repeatedly emphasized
• Palo Alto Open Space staff is very limited – 6 Rangers
• Pilot program or managing increased visitation will impact basic daily duties
• Primary infrastructure issues – Restrooms & Parking
• Budget and timing (Covid-19) concerns
• New online reservation system is an intriguing idea
• “Drive through” required for count of cars / visitors in park
• Early peak park visitation numbers likely not accurate, inflated
BENEFITS OF OPENING

• Increase ease of access to “nature rich” experiences

• Support well-documented health & developmental benefits for youth and adults

• Engender a stronger sense of belonging and support for nature

• Encourage outside partnership in environmental projects

• Reduce impact on neighboring open space preserves

• Be a good neighbor
STEWARDSHIP FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW

• Foothills Park is a special place and we can keep it special
• Preserve by carefully considering changes & investment
• Nurture outdoor experiences to develop enduring connections to community & environment
• Positive public engagement to foster ownership and commitment to sustainable behavior
• Instead of “leave no trace”, “make it better than you found it!”
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

City Council discuss the Parks and Recreation Commission’s proposed pilot plan to increase access to Foothills Park for nonresidents and either:

A. Direct staff to return with an Ordinance to amend the Municipal Code to allow non-residents to access Foothills Park under a pilot plan and a Resolution to define the pilot plan itself

or

B. Provide feedback and direct staff to explore and evaluate alternative scenarios to open Foothills Park to non-residents
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Process & Plan Bay Area 2050
Objectives for Tonight

Staff Presentation Overview
• Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)
• Plan Bay Area 2050

Action & Discussion
• Questions & Answers
• Direction to Staff on RHNA and Plan Bay Area 2050
• Motions on Draft Letters:
  • RHNA Methodology Options (Attachment A)
  • Draft Blueprint Feedback (Attachment B)
What is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation?

- Process by which the State allocates housing unit production across the state, region by region
- Focuses on total housing production by region, as well as housing offered at a variety of income affordability levels
- Uses a methodology created by regional representatives
Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND):

• HCD RHND of 441,176 new housing units on June 9, 2020
• The ABAG Exec. Board declined to appeal the determination; appeal deadline 7/10/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Housing Unit Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very-Low*</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>114,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>65,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>72,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Moderate</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>188,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>441,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Extremely-Low</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>Included in Very-Low Category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extremely-Low included in Very-Low Category
Palo Alto’s Progress Toward 5th Cycle RHNA (2015-2023)

- City received 1,988 housing units
- City planned for 2,187 units in current Housing Element
- City issued 554 building permits for housing units by end of 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Total Need</th>
<th>Permits Issued</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
<th>Above Moderate Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2006</td>
<td>230,743</td>
<td>213,024</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>153%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2014</td>
<td>214,500</td>
<td>123,098</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2023*</td>
<td>187,994</td>
<td>121,973</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-2031**</td>
<td>441,176</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only includes building permits issued in 2015-2018  **Recently issued by HCD
### Palo Alto’s Progress Toward 5th Cycle RHNA (2015-2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Low</strong></td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above Moderate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RHNA Methodology

• Method by which ABAG will distribute the 441,176 new housing units amongst 101 Bay Area jurisdictions
• Provides the total number of units, as well as affordability levels
• Housing Elements must show compliance and demonstrate the means by which to provide the units
Housing Methodology Committee (HMC)

- Convened October 2019
- Members are elected officials, staff from cities, and stakeholder groups
- Not likely to use previous RHNA methodologies for the upcoming RHNA cycle
- No decisions on the RHNA methodology to use to date
- Draft methodology likely to be released in Fall 2020
Methodology Options Considered by HMC

1. Factor Based Total Allocation and Income Shift
   • *Total units* are allocated to a jurisdiction
   • *Income shift* used to distribute that allocation among 4 income categories

2. Bottom-Up
   • Factors and weights determine the number of units distributed to each income category
   • The sum of units in each income category equals a jurisdiction’s total allocation

3. Incorporation of Plan Bay Area 2050
   • To be further discussed August 13, 2020
Ten Exploratory Factors

1. High Opportunity Areas
2. Divergence Index
3. Job Proximity – Auto
4. Job Proximity – Transit
5. Vehicle Miles Travelled
6. Jobs-Housing Balance
7. Jobs-Housing Fit
8. Future Jobs
9. Transit Connectivity
10. Natural Hazards
## Factor Based Total Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hypothetical Growth Rate (% Increase over Housing Units in 2019)</th>
<th>Hypothetical Housing Units</th>
<th>Difference from Hypothetical Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Hypothetical Baseline Allocation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Three RHNA Methodology Options (Using HMC Identified Factors &amp; Weights):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing/Jobs Crescent</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>+1,344 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Red to Address Housing Need</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6,087</td>
<td>+1,612 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Equity-Jobs-Transportation</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6,532</td>
<td>+2,057 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Income Shift Example
3-Factor Bottom Up Example

Affordable units
- Access to High Opportunity Areas: 40%
- Jobs-Housing Fit: 40%
- Job Proximity - Transit: 20%

Market-rate units
- Job Proximity - Auto: 50%
- Job Proximity - Transit: 30%
- Jobs-Housing Balance: 20%
Access to High Opportunity Areas Map (100% Factor Weight)
Hypothetical Housing Unit Allocations

Palo Alto (2019 hhs: 27629) (Santa Clara County)

- Alloc. per 2019 household share: 4480
- Crescent (2019 HH baseline): 5790
- Bottom-Up 3 Factors (2019 HH baseline): 5820
- Blueprint Allocation (Scaled to RHND): 11130
- Crescent (Blueprint baseline): 15040
- Bottom-Up 3 Factors (Blueprint baseline): 14390
RHNA Next Steps

• Continue Housing Methodology Committee Discussions
• Fall 2020 - HMC/ABAG Proposed RHNA Methodology to HCD
• Spring 2021 – Release of Draft RHNA to local jurisdictions
• Summer 2021 – Appeals of Draft RHNA numbers
• Winter 2021 – Final RHNA numbers
• January 2023 - Palo Alto develops Housing Element Update based on final RHNA; certified by HCD
Recommendations in Staff Draft Letter

• Support 2019 existing households as baseline methodology
• Support income shift up to 150%
What is Plan Bay Area 2050?

- Long-range regional plan for the 9 County Bay Area
- **State law requires (a) Regional Transportation Plan and the (b) Sustainable Communities Strategy**
- MTC and ABAG are required to periodically to update the plan
- Focus on four key issues: (a) economy, (b) environment, (c) housing (d) transportation
- Identifies policies, strategies, and investments for the region
- Does not change local land use authority
- **Vision:** To ensure a more affordable, connected, diverse, healthy, and vibrant Bay Area for all
Plan Bay Area 2050: Process and Deliverables
Plan Bay Area 2050: Growth Geographies

Priority Development Areas – Red
• Areas within ½ mile of high-quality transit planned for housing and/or job growth

Transit Rich Areas – Dark Green
• Areas within ½ mile of transit with peak headways of 15 minutes or less

High Resource Areas – Purple
• State identified high opportunity areas within 16-30 minute bus headways
Plan Bay Area 2050: Draft Blueprint: Strategies

• The Draft Blueprint is the “first draft” of Plan Bay Area 2050

• Contains 25 transportation, housing, economic, and environmental strategies

• Equity objectives advanced throughout
Plan Bay Area 2050: Draft Blueprint: Household Growth Pattern

Plan Bay Area 2040: 2010 to 2040
+0.8 million new households

MAP LEGEND
X% County’s share of regional growth, sized based upon total number of new households

KEY GROWTH STATISTICS
46% in Big 3 Cities
33% in Bayside Cities
21% in Inland/Coastal/Delta
77% in Priority Development Areas
61% in Transit-Rich Areas
22% in High-Resource Areas

Draft Blueprint: 2015 to 2050
+1.3 million new households

MAP LEGEND
X% County’s share of regional growth, sized based upon total number of new households

KEY GROWTH STATISTICS
41% in Big 3 Cities
37% in Bayside Cities
22% in Inland/Coastal/Delta
70% in Priority Development Areas
70% in Transit-Rich Areas
29% in High-Resource Areas
Plan Bay Area 2050: Draft Blueprint: Job Growth Pattern

**Plan Bay Area 2040: 2010 to 2040**
+1.3 million new jobs

- **23%** in Big 3 Cities
- **19%** in Bayside Cities
- **10%** in Inland/Coastal/Delta
- **30%** in Priority Development Areas
- **59%** in Transit-Rich Areas
- **25%** in High-Resource Areas

**Draft Blueprint: 2015 to 2050**
+1.4 million new jobs

- **13%** in Big 3 Cities
- **19%** in Bayside Cities
- **10%** in Inland/Coastal/Delta
- **44%** in Priority Development Areas
- **50%** in Transit-Rich Areas
- **19%** in High-Resource Areas
Plan Bay Area 2050 Next Steps

- **July - August 10, 2020** – Public feedback on Draft Blueprint
- **Summer 2020** – Strategy refinement; analysis of the Final Blueprint
- **Fall 2020** - MTC Commission and ABAG Executive Board adoption of Final Blueprint
- **Spring 2021** – Release of Draft Environmental Impact Report, Draft Plan Bay Area 2050, and Draft Implementation Plan
- **Fall 2021** – Adoption of a Final Environmental Impact Report, Final Plan Bay Area 2050, and Final Implementation Plan
Recommendations in Staff Draft Letter

• Time extension
• Integrate COVID-19 into the long-range model
• Update telecommuting projections
• Revise and ensure accuracy of growth geographies
• Model Palo Alto’s Office Development Cap
• Greater public transparency about methodologies
• Request for specific data about job growth projections
• Clarification of if SB 35 and other policies were incorporated
• Support for some of the draft strategies
# Plan Bay Area 2050 & RHNA and Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABAG 2023 RHNA and Plan Bay Area 2050 Key Milestones</th>
<th>Proposed Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Methodology Committee Kick-Off</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregions Form</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD Regional Housing Need Determination</td>
<td>Summer 2020 (June 9, 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Draft Blueprint</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG &amp; Housing Methodology Committee Proposed RHNA Methodology, Draft Subregion Shares</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Subregion Shares</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft RHNA Methodology to HCD for Review</td>
<td>Winter 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RHNA Methodology, Draft Allocation</td>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Appeals</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plan Bay Area 2050</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RHNA Allocation</td>
<td>Winter 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Element Due Date</td>
<td>January 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates are tentative and subject to change.
Staff Recommendation

1. Discuss and provide direction to staff as appropriate on two regional planning efforts, which are Plan Bay Area 2050 and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process

2. Authorize the Mayor to sign a letter reflecting City Council comments on the Plan Bay Area 2050 Draft Blueprint

3. Direct staff to submit a comment letter to ABAG/MTC’s Housing Methodology Committee reflecting City Council initial comments regarding the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) methodology options that are under consideration
CITY OF
PALO ALTO
Discuss Caltrain Proposed 1/8-Cent Sales Tax Measure
Timeline for Caltrain Ballot Measure

- **2017**: Senate Bill 797 authorizing consolidated election
- **April 1, 2020**: SamTrans voted to keep the option open for the Caltrain board to put a 1/8 cent sales tax on the ballot in November
- **May 5, 2020**: San Mateo County Board of Supervisors approved resolution to place a 1/8 cent sales tax on the ballot in November
- **July 14, 2020**: San Francisco Board of Supervisors declined to agendize ballot measure
- **July 28, 2020**: San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved an amended resolution
- **July 31, 2020**: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency rejected ballot measure. August 4 SFMTA meeting has been cancelled.
- **August 4, 2020**: Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
- **August 6, 2020**: Caltrain Board
- **August 6, 2020**: VTA Board